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Introduction

WILLIAM S. BUDINGTON

Were one asked to identify the half dozen phenomena of the twentieth century most affecting life in these United States, the processes of urban change and metropolitanism would have to be included. Directly or indirectly, the cultures and environments of our peoples are being reshaped, and that portion embodied in “library services” is no exception. Shifts and changes in the demographic character of our metropolitan areas have created wholly new stresses and demands—in our ways of living, in the levels and means of learning, in the exercise of our rights and talents. Questions posed by the urban community dominate the thinking in many areas of our professional activity; it becomes exceedingly difficult to bring into focus the elemental forces of change, our tentative and disparate responses to these forces, the responsibilities laid on, and the qualities and objectives at stake.

Suffusing all forms and types of library service, this is a parameter of common concern—one which in 1970 and 1971 drew together representatives of two ALA units: the Urban University Libraries Committee of the ACRL University Libraries Section and the Metropolitan Area Library Services Committee of the Public Library Association. Among various projects jointly conceived was the instigation of a Library Trends issue which might section library service at this plane or dimension, exposing those facets common to various types of libraries. Having next recruited the writer as issue editor, the two committees (and a subgroup thereof) were most helpful in offering suggestions and providing discussion of appropriate topics and candidate authors. We have been fortunate in assembling a highly qualified group of contributors, and the editor is most grateful for their cooperative and substantive support of this endeavor.

Certain elements of librarianship and library service, of course, are more subject to the urban impact than others, and some of these have
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been separately examined in earlier issues of this journal, including demographic aspects, university libraries, services to the disadvantaged, and main libraries. The cut across proves difficult to attain, similar (one would estimate) to tracing the impact of library service on all aspects of metropolitan life. It is, nonetheless, illuminating and perhaps responds to the need, expressed by Ralph Conant some years ago, for “library leaders . . . to rethink the fundamental character and objectives of their institutions from a fresh perspective.”

The complex nature of the urban change is explored first in this issue by Kenneth Beasley, who sees political and social forces altering the planning, decision-making and accountability functions; while cooperative movements are admirable, inherent difficulties are formidable. The user now tends to consider any possible information source as accessible by right; yet the user is hard to identify and measure satisfactorily, as Guy Garrison discovers in reviewing numerous recent studies. John Eastlick traces the changes in funding sources and channels, these having special significance in the public and educational sectors. The miscellany of governmental units per unit of geography works against cooperation, which is perhaps more successful in service areas other than those that are library-based. Alphonse Trezza notes that a principal contribution by the state is in achievement of some higher degree of systematization. Federal support has been vulnerable and not entirely rational, and John Frantz sees national goals as achievable mainly through a better developed role for states and a much changed legislative approach.

Professional education is being sorely tested across the spectrum of libraries, according to Billy R. Wilkinson. Personal characteristics have probably not changed much, though certain skills are now much in demand and metropolitan areas see the emergence of the library technical assistant as an important staff adjunct. Particular skills and knowledgeability are essential and often lacking, says Genevieve Casey, in dealing with the disadvantaged on both sides of the desk. Russell Shank notes the opportunities and also the constraints in metropolitan area cooperative efforts: while several levels of objectives can be identified, the threat of system/network overlap is intensified in this context, and poor evaluative procedures are of little help. Finally, Hugh Atkinson considers the principal effects of technological change; while media, communications and services will undergo significant alteration, the total effect may well be further
decentralization, thus returning to one of the basic controversies spelled out by Beasley in the opening chapter.

It is intellectually tempting to view all libraries and information sources as a single, unified resource—a goal projected by the U. S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and as organizationally achieved, in part, in the British Library. The metropolitan layer will be a most important part of that total structure, and should be of greater consequence than it is to its citizenry. In the context of urban developments noted at the outset of this introduction, one must believe that the metropolitan library (i.e., the total resource) can at last be the effective library called for by Lowell Martin, that it can help "to get at the root causes of the urban problem: people unprepared to take their place in the economic order and people divided by lack of understanding. And an effective library serves to sustain the quality of life for all, not in utilitarian and civic matters alone, but also in the fulfillment of mind and spirit."  

References

This Page Intentionally Left Blank
There is a strong temptation to write this article as a very short essay by encouraging the readers to study Anthony Downs's *Urban Problems and Prospects*. In it, one finds as succinct a review as possible of the many issues and insoluble problems with which the urbanite struggles. As one reads the chapters, he experiences short moments of optimism where he can see that progress is being made toward that undefinable better life. And then, despair settles in for long periods as he recognizes that demands exceed capability to deliver, populations are not sure they want urban living but do not see how it can be avoided, and the large urban setting of the United States has a multitude of inner contradictions which somehow maintain a continuous system rather than destroying itself. Philip Hauser and others have even argued that there is no solution.

Defining the political parameters affecting library service implies some ability to perceive the future. Yet Downs suggests that by using only ten variables and several arbitrarily chosen values for each one, there are more than 98,000 combinations of potential forms of urban growth. For which form we do try to identify parameters? After a discussion on this and other points, Downs concludes his first chapter with the famous statement of Pogo: “We have met the enemy and he is us.” Can we, if he is correct, either perceive or set our own parameters? At the same time, an inner striving which some behaviorists believe is imbedded deep in the soul of man seems to compel both urban and rural dwellers to seek out some beliefs which offer a rationale for an existence in an apparently unreal world.

It is in this setting that suggestions are offered in this article for apparent parameters. They are not the standard descriptive ones (such as population trends and political structures), but more analytical ones involving attitudes and behavior. Obviously, only a few illustrations can
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be noted in a short article, and they must be generalized grossly. The generalizing, in turn, demands that the parameters be examined critically as to their applicability to each metropolitan area. One of the challenges that needs to be made in our thinking is to the past assumption of both state and federal policies that the homogeneity of the metropolitanism is more dominant than heterogeneity. For certain social services such as libraries, the latter characteristic may be more accurate.

**Attitudinal Parameter.** The first parameter is strictly attitudinal. More than a decade ago, the public began to address itself to critical social deficiencies ranging from civil and economic rights to structural political reform, and to emphasize some absolute (minimal) social and political values. The motivation was in many cases a deep-seated guilt created in part by an educational system that described to students in graphic terms what our social goals were and then without any orientation pushed them into the living pattern which was markedly different.

Sincere efforts were made to rehabilitate the poor and reorient much of the middle class and the rich (in different ways and for different reasons) and to redo the physical world so that it complemented the rehabilitation. That effort now looks as if it has peaked and is slowing down. There is a new attitude with fewer outward manifestations of collective guilt and more interest in selective reform. For example, nearly all of the innovative poverty programs are now assigned to the older and more entrenched federal agencies; and there is much more emphasis on decision-making by the less ardent, and more personalized, metropolitan political and bureaucratic structures. Urban political systems, it should be recognized, have often been a foe of reform!

Some of the slow-down, it must be admitted, has had merit because a number of the innovators had become too enthusiastic about new forms at the price of continuity and, moreover, were adopting their own form of bureaucracy. A few communities have actually experienced strong reactions to both. This new attitude is important politically and socially for all social services because it forces advocates of new programs to assume a burden of proof entailing both fact and emotion at essentially unknown or random decision points in the political process. Facts must be amassed because the demand for rational public decisions is still strong, but only the emotional appeal can meet the latent force of fear of uncertainty. Political leaders in
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particular know that social and political forces in the United States are very finely balanced despite the country's long history of relative stability.

A practical application of this attitudinal position in the library field can be noted briefly. Libraries are now being asked to justify their position rather than being accepted as they were for many years as the *sine qua non* of a community or quality education. Libraries, in becoming more prestigious in the 1950s and 1960s, also became politicized—although usually nonpartisan. It is reasonable to expect, accordingly, that as libraries are challenged and compete with other social services they will move even faster toward broader political participation. Contrary to what some of the more timid supporters of classical library service may feel, there is nothing fundamentally wrong with this change, although it will require the profession to develop new controls to prevent the evils of excessive politicization.

An Argument Parameter. Although one does not often think of an argument as a parameter, a major force for librarians to contend with in the immediate future is the intensification of the current debate on urban centralization and decentralization in terms of administration and political decision-making.

The best guesses and intuition of professionals seem to be that future urban growth will be smaller than earlier predictions (estimates of the population in the year 2000 range from about 250 to 360 million), no new major metropolitan areas are likely to develop, but peripheral sprawl will continue, probably in those areas where it is already a major characteristic.

The very large metropolitan central cities are trying to decentralize certain social services (e.g., education, law enforcement, libraries, medical service, and counseling facilities) in the hope that communities can be reestablished to exercise political control as it was known in the past. Success has been very limited because in the centralizing process of prior years most of the areas that could be communities have not developed any talented leadership, and, equally important, they have not had the opportunity to go through the necessary growth process to form an institutional memory. Both of these elements are necessary for any stable political community. In many ways, these hoped-for decentralized urban communities are like the old frontier towns in that each one has to learn for itself and institutionalize in different forms both its political errors and successes.

Suburbanism is a form of decentralization which has been made
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rigid by formal boundaries approved by the states. While the problems of suburbs are numerous, they have nearly all of the off-setting advantages of decentralization; overall it is doubtful if suburbanism has had a detrimental effect.

The centralists, in contrast, are a conglomerate who would not normally identify very closely with each other. They include those people who have a compulsion for organizational neatness and clarity (including some political scientists), certain planners who advocate a new life in the central city, political workers who want more simple devices for political organization, and state and federal bureaucrats who argue for economy, efficiency and coordination.

Since the form and type of library service tends to be a product rather than a causal factor of social change, a certain amount of uncertainty can be expected for it in the development of metropolitan services. Direct library service which maximizes the use of resources and attempts to meet all needs is likely to remain in the realm of philosophical discussion with marked variations among the states.

One of the biggest problems librarians will have will be to recognize this debate on centralization and decentralization for what it is—an effort to determine how decisions can best be made in a democratic society which is very complex—and to adapt to it directly without having to go through a long process of formulating a rationale. For example, we know that in terms of most social services the need for detailed coordination (by organizational techniques) has been largely overstated and can be handled more easily by mass communication programs which develop public awareness. Stated in library terms, we should ask ourselves if the public can be taught to use what seems to us to be a complex library structure, but which may not be complex to the great majority of users.

**Politicization of The Planning Process.** Closely related to the previous parameters is a clearly increasing politicization of the planning process. Almost the ultimate in this trend is the recent consideration of the controversial bill by Congress to provide special aid to states taking action to control general land use. Land use has long been a local matter except in certain rare instances of state or federal public necessity.

Planning was originally concerned primarily with physical objects and to a lesser extent with organizational structure. As early as the 1930s and 1940s, public administration literature began to formulate the concepts leading to the famous acronym PODSCORB. The “P”
stood for planning and meant the rational formulation of organizational structures and goals. Planning was also intended to add a dimension of objectivity to decision-making and to counter the discontinuity associated with poor systems for feedback from the public (due to an imperfect mass communication system) and a high turnover in both elected and appointed officials.

Negatively, planning gradually became the property of the middle class. It was goal-oriented, growth-conscious, and built on the belief of perfectability in society. It was, consequently, often status quo in orientation; and planning staffs tended more and more to be college graduates trained in academic programs for what was thought to be a new profession. Even though the better academic programs, once they had become established formally, emphasized popular participation in the planning process, there has always been implicit in planning in the United States both direction and determination; and without personal criticism planners have assumed this role—particularly in the more complex urban areas and in the more complex tasks where the public normally does not have the time nor the immediate capability to resolve conflicts. None of these comments are meant to derogate the function of planning as it originated and matured because it probably had to go through developmental stages like most technological advances and social reforms.

A congressman is reported to have said at one time that the depression in the 1930s would not have been so bad if it had not come during hard times. Similarly, what can now be called classical planning would probably have fulfilled its original objectives if the social and economic structure had not changed so rapidly in the 1960s and early 1970s and displaced existing values. Like most other social institutions, planning did not foresee the magnitude of the change and is still adapting to it.

The adaptation is to bring planning directly into the political process. Much of the funding of urban planning is now federally subsidized and under the overall direction of state planning agencies, with the more common organizational pattern for these agencies being extensions of the office of the governor. Federal funding, furthermore, is set largely according to predetermined values, i.e., stimulation of local governmental units to stress or initiate specific programs. Councils of governments, although increasingly well-staffed professionally, are coordinating bodies to facilitate political decision-making in a direct manner. Coordination is the professional word which the councils use, and which carries now in the literature a
well-developed philosophical and administrative meaning.

It is too early to assess the full meaning of the politicization because of the different attitudes toward it. For professional personnel, it will appear to add complexity to decision-making and will in fact remove some of the decisions they have traditionally made. Political leaders will benefit by adding to their control and by providing an added means to express alternative forms of action and to communicate with the active electorate; in the process, political stability will be furthered in a small measure. To lay people (the general public or consumers of special services), the effect of the politicization is not at all clear. In many ways, it is a device to simplify decision-making for complex problems by personalizing them (even though in the process the personalizing does not improve the public's understanding or add to its own direct control of political events).

As the chairman of a city-county mental health and mental retardation board, at one time or another I have had all of the above feelings and still cannot conclude whether this new aspect of planning is an improvement in the political structure or whether it is one of those changes which periodically captures the imagination of people because it has a philosophical and empirical soundness but loses its meaning in implementation. Maybe it is a political rainbow which radiates beauty and is only to be observed.

If one looks specifically at the library in the context of the discussion in this section, one inevitably concludes that libraries in general will have to become defensive while acknowledging the reality of change. The library has strong psychological strength in the urban centers, but in any serious political struggle for privacy, it is essentially impotent for fairly obvious reasons. It is not socially essential in exactly the present form, many of its supporters are not activists and indeed cannot be, and as long as it is a free institution engaged in disseminating ideas it is threatening. To extend the conclusion noted in one of the previous sections of this article, the evidence is that the library in all forms must become more political to survive, but to survive the profession must also define very sharply the distinction between politicization of the library, and the politicization of the profession to accomplish goals.\(^3\)

*Citizen Involvement in Decision-making.* One of the major characteristics of urban social services in the last fifteen years is citizen involvement in decision-making. As early as the 1950s, citizen advisory committees were advocated strongly as a way to minimize the excesses of partisan elections, assure added continuity, buffer public officials from
conflicting demands of lobby groups, offset the authoritarian tendency of professionals who wanted to determine what was good for the public, and counter (to a small extent) the growing anonymity of urban life.

Although the overall effect of these committees at the local government level was salutary, they had a serious limitation stemming from the general social attitudes of the time: all segments of the community were represented, but the preponderance of membership was usually from what C. Wright Mills termed the power elite. The committees, having no formal authority except to recommend, relied on the unofficial power of the elite to persuade officials to accept recommendations. Internal conflict within the committees were minimized accordingly, and recommendations were couched in carefully worded compromises.

The upsetting days of the 1960s produced a new thrust in that citizen groups become operating organs and the membership was altered to include consumers almost entirely. Representation of the entire community was subordinated to the concept that the beneficiaries (who were nearly always the economically, socially, and electorally disadvantaged) should determine what they receive. These new groups were sometimes incorporated, but commonly they were very loosely organized with a fluid membership — directors often elected other directors and their successors. Financing and major support came from the federal legislative and administrative action.

The original citizen advisory groups were a reform while the new citizen groups have bordered on revolution. In urban area after urban area, the poverty action committees, for example, could bypass almost the entire local political structure and many of the state organs and go directly to their sources of funding. This funding was then used as pressure on local decisions in just as effective a manner as the more classical pressure of large campaign contributions. Equally important, these new groups, now policy-making and administrative, initiated and tested major innovations in the delivery of social services, the most well-known one being the support of paraprofessionals to upgrade services in the ghetto and the consequent demonstration that many deliverers of social services are overtrained.

Somewhat related to the new citizen group as an operating agency through its receipt of grants-in-aid is the recent revival of the use of private business contracts for the delivery of social services. The justification in this instance is less a desire for participation per se and more a feeling that the inertia and power of the large bureaucracies
must be countered in some way. As Peter Drucker argued some years ago in *Age of Discontent*, *reprivitization* is a realistic alternative for us.\(^5\) The most prevalent use of business contracts now is to construct and operate physical plants, but experiments are underway to administer educational, health, hospital, and transportation activities.

Reprivitization and the more consumer-related emphasis of citizen participation have an overall effect of blurring the traditional forms of accountability and the belief in a distinctive private and public life. This blurring is not restricted to urban areas alone; rural communities have experienced and accepted it since at least the days of Populism. The blurring becomes a new dimension for urban government, however, when added to an already complex political structure.

**Interface.** An apparent parameter needing careful study is the present form of the interface of public school academic and special libraries. Several years ago, the need for extensive interaction among all types of libraries was recognized and advocated by most leaders in the profession. Although many types of cooperative systems were formed to facilitate bibliographical searches, retrieval, and the use of material, in terms of total library service throughout all of the United States, there has never been much advancement beyond the philosophical concept. The reason is that implicit in nearly every system then and now is the assumption that all material is to retain its original ownership; and each type of library is still considered to have a sufficiently identifiable clientele to warrant separation in development and to be interactive with other libraries in only selected areas. Until these two assumptions are challenged, there can never be a fundamental change in the style of service. The advocate programs are beginning to reflect this position, but nationwide very few curricula and faculty attitudes have been modified—in accordance with the time-honored slowness of academic responsiveness.

**Fiscal Support.** The parameter of fiscal support is the most difficult to describe, but the most important one to library supporters. *Adequate* funding, or the professionally set *minimal funding* during the growth situation of the last 20 years, has been a salvation to most administrators of social services because program decisions could be (and were) made in a broad context which often obscured poor judgments in the alternative use of resources. An unwritten law of budgeting and appropriating is that the higher the level of the funding, the more nearly equal are alternatives perceived by both
professionals and the public! The corollary is that there is less criticism until a felt need to change surfaces, and then criticism becomes condemnation.

No one can foretell at this time what the level of public support will be in the next five years or which units of government will be most active in allocating money to libraries or other services; but as can be surmised from the previous discussions, there is not likely to be any major net growth. The leveling off of the population, slightly declining school populations, the rapid expansion of libraries in the past two decades, alternative forms of gathering and disseminating information, and the demand to solve urban problems critical to social and political stability are a few of the factors which seem to support this conclusion.

In my judgment, however, the level of funding is not the important issue. Much more significant as a determinant of any fiscal parameter are the form of expenditures and the purpose of the library. After at least two decades of discussion, funding agencies still consider the response to these two factors to be inadequate.

With regard to the first factor, an attack is being made on the rather rigid recommended allocation of resources between personnel and material. There is good logic in the professional librarian's belief that material without assistance to use it destroys part of the material's value. However, a contrary position also has validity in that (1) librarians are just as prone as any other group to assure and advance their own bureaucratic advantages; (2) there might well be instances where acquisition and holding material is more important than a set staffing pattern; and (3) users could be taught to be more self-reliant in their bibliographic searches. Libraries will probably be faced with a steady-state system like educational institutions will be in the 1980s, in which case a clearer statement on the use of expenditure will become mandatory.

With regard to the second determinant—purpose—little needs to be said that has not been expressed in many articles and books except to suggest that discussions are not keeping pace with social change. The awakening of libraries since the late 1950s has led to an effort to give service to the entire population. Social responsibility advocates provided much of the force behind this goal in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as they did in many other social services. At the risk of sounding elitist, it seems that none of the social services including libraries, have approximated broad service; indeed the trend in society is to fractionate agencies so that no such comprehensive ministrations can
be carried out. This seems to be society's control device.

If this perception is true, then declarations of the purpose of libraries should become more specific than general and should recognize the merits of pluralism. Integration (consolidation) becomes of secondary concern, even to efficiency and economy, and the objective of a national library system is more a counterforce to excessive division stemming from pluralism than a realizable goal.

In this regard, the more sophisticated efforts in the field of library measurement seem to conclude repeatedly that various aspects of library services can be measured quantitatively and that the actual services reflect much more specific objectives than do articulated statements of state, regional or national goals. At this time, statements of purpose seem to be evolving slowly from practice, which in the short run may mean that the character of library service may be set more by nonprofessionals than by professionals.
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The Metropolitan Matrix of Libraries and Users

GUY GARRISON

The concentration of the population of the United States in its metropolitan areas is so marked that it is hard to separate any discussion of library users, services, or problems into metropolitan and nonmetropolitan categories. The 1970 census of population, for example, revealed that 70 percent of U.S. residents live in the standard metropolitan statistical areas; that the rate of population growth in metropolitan areas between the 1960 census and 1970 census was twice the general U.S. rate; that nearly all of this growth was in the suburban areas around the central cities; that 78 percent of all Blacks lived in central cities, and that all of this metropolitan population was concentrated in less than one percent of the land area of the country.¹

Whether one views the future of America in terms of a continuation of the trend toward dense concentration of population in major urban areas (twelve areas in 1970 had over 2,000,000 residents) or a reverse movement of population into the far reaches of exurbia and back to the small towns and cities, it is clear that the metropolitan area is here to stay for the immediate future.

All of the challenges identified in the cities in the 1950s and 1960s will continue in the 1970s and beyond—unplanned growth, depletion of resources, racial tensions, crime, unemployment, housing shortages, the necessity for changing the orientation of institutions such as schools, churches, libraries and museums. Depending on which pundit one reads, the prospect for the metropolitan area is either stability and balance or a deterioration of quality of life which exceeds anything now considered tolerable. Commentators agree, however, that information as a commodity will be increasingly important in the decades ahead and that libraries, as one of the major links in the information chain, will play an increasingly important role.

In considering the metropolitan matrix of users and library services,
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it is impossible, in a single article, to achieve precision and completeness either in identifying all user groups or in describing their use of libraries and/or information. Any such attempt, even for a single metropolitan area, at dividing the population into user subgroups based, for example, on demographic characteristics (age, sex, occupational status, educational level) and at constructing a matrix of types of user and types of service will fail. Any given individual can be a user or potential user of so many information sources and belong to so many population subgroups that no single categorization will be acceptable.

The approach used in this article will be to concentrate on the user and his needs, not on the institutions and services built to respond to his needs, in the belief that an information delivery system cannot be built, or an existing one evaluated, unless the information needs of people are the starting point.

An effort will be made to characterize some of the research on user needs (as it applies to the subject of this issue) and to point out some of the major gaps. Representative research studies and action research projects that have special significance for urban libraries will be cited and, to a degree, described. With this background, a few generalizations will be attempted on a subject which is probably not amenable to generalization—the user and his library needs in the metropolitan setting.

Inevitably, discussion of this subject will reflect personal points of view and personal biases. The major ones are listed here and the reader is forewarned:

1. The future of libraries depends on less attention to the containers of information (books, etc.) and more attention to information itself—not just for the student, the professional or the specialist, but for the total community.
2. People, metropolitan dwellers or not, have a multitude of information and library needs—both occupational and nonoccupational—that are not met within existing information systems. Libraries constitute only one part—a minor part—of such systems.
3. A user approach will show that library response is even more limited than we like to admit in meeting the informational needs of people. Libraries do poorly in supplying the documents, and even less well in supplying the facts, the interpretation and the guidance.
4. The accepted institutional goals of libraries (for instance, the research collection goal of large public libraries) are often at
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variance with the objectives of the people who use these libraries. A strong corrective, in the form of user studies, is needed in the setting of goals.

The literature of user studies is extensive but not comprehensive. A number of landmark studies exist and a number of methodologies have been developed. Many of the best user studies are concerned with the user of scientific and technical information in job-related activities in research and/or academic settings. Fewer are concerned with the library use or information-seeking behavior of the general public. Too many user studies, both of technical and general groups, limit themselves to library use alone instead of seeing libraries as only one of many possible sources for reading material and information.

The corpus of user studies has been surveyed and summarized in a number of fairly recent studies, and extensive bibliographies exist. Among the most useful are the articles in the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, the bibliographies in works by Zweizig, Warner, Bates, Grundt and the reports done for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Although many recent user studies concentrate on urban residents, others that lack an announced urban focus are equally applicable. Most user needs are not distinctive to urban areas, although some may be peculiarly heightened there. While patterns of organization and of fiscal support for information and libraries may be greatly affected by metropolitan versus nonmetropolitan location, user needs are less apt to be so affected.

Examination of the literature on user studies confirms the impression that, despite some excellent studies with provocative research findings, there exists a shortage of data on the library and information needs of urban residents in all the complexity of subgroups and overlapping populations. The general needs of people in urban areas have been the focus of many library demonstrations and action research projects, but they are in general less well documented and less well researched than are the specialized information needs of distinct small groups. The best studies methodologically tend to be restricted to small and carefully delimited audiences.

The literature reveals many studies on the information needs and behavior of characteristically metropolitan subgroups who might be expected to be heavy users of libraries—the well-educated, those with higher incomes, those in managerial and professional positions (especially those in research or academic jobs), and students. Studies, however, even of these groups, focus largely on occupational and
school-related needs and do not explore as carefully other nonoccupational but equally important information needs.

There is a thriving literature on information use by scientists and researchers, well documented in the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*. These studies range widely over the entire spectrum of the information system—from the invisible college to browsing use of libraries. The studies reveal many deficiencies, including resistance by such professionals to actual use of libraries.

Fewer studies relate to the use of technical information by laymen and practitioners (as opposed to researchers and teachers)—probably because the people doing the research are themselves academicians and researchers and turn to their own peer groups for subjects. Research on the use of information by scientific and technical persons is of limited applicability in the study of more general library users. Relevance and recall studies, for instance, mean little in the context of the public library where much of the use is not task-related but recreational. The lack of recognized output measures makes it difficult to design a valid research project. The very multiplicity of audiences for reading and information services in the metropolitan area confounds the researcher. The wealth of available resources and the wide-ranging habits of metropolitan library users makes precise study difficult.

As compared to use studies in the scientific and technical field, the body of research on public, school, and general academic library use is limited and noncumulative. Available tools for study of general library use are few—the analysis of circulation statistics or of reference questions is imprecise, self-administered questionnaires are hazardous, relatively few structured interview studies have been done, observation studies are generally not rigorous, and critical incident or diary methods of data collection are seldom attempted. Studies are solitary and seldom build on the past. Even when good studies are done at the same time and in the same city, as with Martin and Warner, they are unrelated.

When it comes to rigorous analysis of the reading and information needs of the metropolitan subgroups least likely to use libraries and least likely to display a fair knowledge of available resources and a rational information-seeking behavior—the poor, the undereducated, the social and ethnic minority groups—the number of useful studies drops. Yet, it is realistic to assume that needs for the information and library services do exist here, as Voos and Childers have shown. It is to these groups that many action research projects have been addressed.
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The study of information needs and of library use by these groups, as well as by the more general user of public, school, and academic libraries, will never be as useful as the studies of information use by scientists and professional groups until librarians create services as essential to the general user as those services now supplied to the specialist user. When the school or academic library truly becomes the "heart of the school," and when the public library truly becomes a community center providing information vital to the total community, then their effectiveness can be measured and their success evaluated in the same sense that this is now possible for the scientist's special library or technical information system.

The more or less annual summary articles on information use and users in the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* provide a convenient index to at least part of the literature, although the bias lies with scientific and technical information. Careful reading of the articles themselves and selective examination of the cited literature opens up a wealth of data on the use of documents and information by a wide variety of user groups under varying conditions. The scope of the literature is wide and by no means restricted even to library use of documents. Since such a large number of the laboratories, industrial concerns, and academic institutions of the country are in metropolitan areas, much of this literature is relevant. These articles record a remarkable growth of studies over the past decade, and delineate important differences in the use of information by basic and applied researchers, by professionals and academicians, and by technical personnel. They reveal that accessibility and ease of access to documents and data are no less important to the scientist than to the man on the street, and that both, in their own way, depend greatly on interpersonal communication for their information.

User studies outside of science and technology have been common for years. They gained added stature, however, when the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, as did its predecessor the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, determined that in discharging its responsibility for developing overall plans for library and information service adequate to the needs of the nation, it would focus on the user and his needs rather than on the institutions. The papers commissioned by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, as published in *Libraries at Large* and separately, had a strong user orientation and provide useful statements on user needs, as well as making available a great amount of original survey data. *Libraries at Large* provided a useful categorization of the
users of libraries, applicable to metropolitan and nonmetropolitan settings alike, in terms of the nonspecialist and prespecialist user (public, school, college), and the specialist user (scholarly, scientific, research, and professional).

Studies supported by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science since that time have extended this discussion by a consideration of the needs of special subgroups, some of which are closely identified with the urban environment and constitute identifiable groups within "the general public"—children, aged, minorities, women, foreign-speaking, economically and socially disadvantaged, handicapped, etc. The commission's interest in such user groups was also reflected in an invitational conference on user needs held in Denver in May 1973, which brought together a number of people with research interests in the information needs of particular groups.12

An imperfect but provocative further look at the needs of special groups was prepared for the commission by the Institute for Library Research.13 Basically a review of the literature, it is an effort to identify population groups that have information needs differing from those of the general public. It is a useful summation of the literature in the Berelson14 tradition but contains no new data. Another work which is essentially a bibliography and which has much material applicable to the understanding of a major part of the urban public is Childers's Knowledge/Information Needs of the Disadvantaged.10 The plethora of outreach programs and of efforts to design library programs to aid the urban disadvantaged proceeded over the last decade without much research into information needs and behavior. The Childers study is an effort to pull together existing data on the needs, not the programs. The literature review shows that data are fugitive, uneven and unconsolidated, and that definitions are lacking. The disadvantaged adult differs significantly from the average adult in his awareness of information sources and in his needs. The survey suggests the need for research and experimentation in the packaging and delivery of information on such crucial topics as health, home and family, consumer affairs, housing, employment, welfare programs, legal matters, political process, transportation, education and recreation. The implications for urban libraries are obvious. Generally speaking, they are not now really prepared to deal with information needs of this kind in a manner useful to the disadvantaged adult.

The need for more studies of the information needs and the information-seeking habits of the adult residents of cities is obvious.
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One good example of a study of information-seeking behavior that took an audience rather than an institutional focus is Parker and Paisley's interview survey conducted in San Mateo and Fresno, California.\textsuperscript{15} It is a good corrective to those who think that libraries are places to which people turn for information.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize about metropolitan users, user needs, and library response. The available studies are not comparable, not well controlled, and are seldom designed to yield data on use. Of the hundreds of projects designed over the last decade to improve library service to the urban disadvantaged, for instance, few were designed with evaluation studies or impact measures in mind. They are also impaired by lack of continuity, since they seldom last more than a year or two.

Unquestionably the best recent study of urban information needs is Warner's work, done in Baltimore.\textsuperscript{14} The study sought to find out what the information needs of the urban community are, how these needs are presently met, and what institutional forms could be devised to satisfy these needs better. It is not restricted to the needs of the disadvantaged in any sense, but it comes across not as another look at the library-related needs of the student, the researcher, and the professional, but as a look at the "typical resident in an urban community and his everyday information needs and problems."\textsuperscript{16}

Warner's rewarding study cannot be summarized easily and briefly, but a few of its conclusions are highlighted for their implications here:

1. The study confirms what we all know, that certain groups—the educated, the economically advantaged, the young—are more likely to seek information to solve their problems and are better at the search.
2. Librarians generally have limited awareness of other information systems and how they are used by people. Further, by its reliance on the printed document, the library limits its effectiveness as an information source.
3. Research shows that people want advice and active involvement, but library tradition is strong in saying that we should provide documents and facts without interpretation.
4. The ability of a library to deliver information would be greatly increased by linkage in some formal or informal way to other parts of the urban information system.
5. Libraries—public, school, academic—inevitably favor those subgroups of the urban population best able to respond to that
which is offered—the young, the well-educated, the more affluent, the print-oriented—and fail to address fairly the just-as-real needs of those whose response is less easy to elicit. The “system” sustains itself.

Warner’s research provides extensive data on the information needs not only of library users but nonusers as well, and is valuable because of that broad scope.

Another extensive study done in the Baltimore-Washington D.C. metropolitan area but unfortunately limited to users (public library users) is Bundy’s 1968 survey. Based on questionnaires answered by 21,385 users of libraries, the study provides good data on the use patterns of adults who actually make use of public libraries. The study revealed that, in this metropolitan area, large numbers of adults use public libraries, use them frequently, and are reasonably satisfied with what they find. The public libraries attract a middle-class audience and much of their use is definitely for leisure and recreational purposes. Information demand is less in evidence and library response is less effective. There is heavy use for school-related purposes; attempts to use the libraries for professional and job-related purposes are less successful.

The Baltimore area has been well served by surveys of library use, and at least one other needs to be cited—Lowell Martin’s recent study of library service in the Enoch Pratt Free Library to out-of-school, nonspecialist adult readers. Martin concludes that Baltimore adults do read, but not always books and not always from the library. He estimates that 40 percent of adults are readers of sorts, that 30 percent are potential readers, and that the rest resist print. He classes the readers into: (1) casual readers who read what comes their way; (2) “trendy” readers who are actively curious and keep up with books, magazines, and reviews; and (3) focused readers who keep up with some specialized small area, buying books, subscribing to journals, and seeking out libraries. Martin estimates that there are 80,000 readers out of 580,000 adults in Baltimore and that 14 percent of out-of-school adults use the library in one year. While Martin has doubts about the future of the public library as a supplier of reading to the masses, he recognizes that adults use the library for enjoyment and life enhancement, not strictly for utilitarian purpose. He believes that this deserves recognition.

Another city for which some good user survey data have been published is Cleveland. Changing Patterns, a report done for the
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Cleveland Public Library and the Cuyahoga County District Library, was intended to guide the development of neighborhood library services. The study included a survey done at 21 branch libraries (4,263 questionnaires) and an at-home survey of 2,000 households in the metropolitan area. The former was designed to represent the average public library user; the latter to obtain data on nonusers as well as users. The home survey is of particular interest. Among the findings: nearly 50 percent of the respondents had used some kind of library in the six weeks prior to the survey; virtually all the users had visited a public library, but more than half of these had also used another type of library as well; of those who had not used a library most were adults who “felt no need” or were “too busy”—poor service or location were not the problems.

Also among the better examples of user-oriented surveys is the Ernst and Ernst survey of the Cleveland Public Library branch system. The survey utilized questionnaires at all branches and at selected public schools, interviews at shopping centers and community agencies, and public meetings. In all, 8,567 responses were received from adults fifteen years or older.

The survey showed that: (1) most users of branches were better educated than the public as a whole in their age bracket; (2) most adult users of branches were students of some variety; (3) most users lived quite close to the branch, depending on public transportation scarcely at all; and (4) users found the book collections adequate but the programs poor. The survey of nonusers was chiefly through interviews and shows that (1) nonuse is associated with low educational attainment; (2) nonusers know where the branch is but regard it as a place for others, chiefly youth; and (3) people do not think of the library as a place for useful information.

The survey supports recommendations that the Cleveland Public Library (1) experiment with keying the branch services more closely to the needs of the immediate neighborhood, (2) reduce bureaucratic centralism in book selection, (3) increase the role of the library as a supplementary educational force for the community, and (4) invest heavily in publicity. The survey also urges experiments with minibusses to the library, dial-a-ride service, and more mobile units, illustrating the extent to which much of Cleveland has become a hostile environment through which people hesitate to travel to reach public service outlets, especially in evening hours.

Knowledge of the school-related use of libraries is limited. Numerous articles exist, especially on student use of public libraries,
but little solid research has been done. Unfortunately, the most comprehensive survey of student use of libraries remains unavailable in full detail, though completed in 1970 and reported in broad outline in 1971.\textsuperscript{21} The Philadelphia Student Library Resources Requirement Project, a multiphased and federally supported project, is now well into its demonstration phase and deserves to be more widely known, since its earlier research phase is the major source of actual data on how urban students use public and school libraries. Although conducted in Philadelphia, this work has implications for library services to students in all large urban areas. Survey data came from 10,000 students, 184 teachers, and staff in 51 school libraries and 9 branch libraries. In addition, resource data were gathered for 320 school libraries in public, parochial and independent schools.

The survey data show that student demand for library material, both print and nonprint, is tremendous and exceeds the supply available in school and public libraries. Students turn indiscriminately to school and public libraries for this material (42 percent use both school and public libraries, 30 percent use school libraries alone, 13 percent use only public libraries, and 13 percent depend on other sources). Students have moderately good success; approximately one-half say they get what they need and are satisfied with their libraries. The more interesting and controversial findings include the fact that attitudes toward libraries and toward reading in general change sharply as students advance in school. A decrease not only of library use but of interest in reading occurs. The drop-off in use is largely accounted for by a decrease in school, not public, library use. The findings of this research project are of special interest because the data came directly from students themselves, not from those who work with them. The adequacy of school and public library service to students, as seen by the students themselves, falls short of expectations.

The so-called “Action Library,” the experimental learning resource center developed as the demonstration phase of this project, has for nearly two years been trying to put into practice some of the concepts of joint planning and promotion of reading suggested by the research data. When the reports are all in, we can begin to see how much of the project can be generalized to the complex problems of better library service to students elsewhere.

Much useful data on urban users and nonusers of libraries, and on the effectiveness of programs designed to demonstrate better services, can be found in Lipsman’s \textit{The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness}.\textsuperscript{22} Requested by the U.S. Office of Education in an effort to provide data
to guide the funding of library service projects in low-income areas, the
study provides a comparative analysis of a number of such projects as
well as some survey data on users and nonusers. It is not an evaluation
of specific projects but rather an examination of typical projects in
fifteen cities. Data were collected by means of a program interview
guide, a user-nonuser questionnaire, and a community agency
interview guide.

One basic summary statement is that “these findings imply the need
for substantial changes in concept if libraries are to meet the functional
service needs of the disadvantaged.”23 The book is rich in data and
insight into the problem. Only a few points can be highlighted here.
The data suggest that the principal characteristic that distinguishes the
user from the nonuser of libraries in disadvantaged areas is
participation in some type of educational program, formal or
informal; and that the collections and programs of libraries are of
interest to low-income people mainly when they are engaged in such
efforts. The interested group, however, is very small. The heavy
emphasis on print and the failure to develop multimedia collections
limit the library in gaining a broad audience. Also, it is recognized that
the pressure of existence and survival are so great for most of the urban
poor that book-oriented library services do not really relate to the
satisfaction of needs.

Concern with the information needs of the inner-city resident has
led a number of libraries to experiment with information and referral
services as a substitute for—or at least an addition to—the traditional
book services. The Enoch Pratt Free Library’s Public Information
Center is an early example but it never lived up to the description
proposed when it was first organized.24 The Model Cities Community
Information Center, a joint venture of the Philadelphia Model Cities
Program and the Free Library of Philadelphia, has had some success, at
least from the technology standpoint, in linking inner-city residents
with the scattered sources of assistance in such fields as health,
unemployment, legal aid, housing and education.25 The reliance on
phone contact, even with the use of three-way conference phones, has
perhaps limited the impact of the project, although direct outreach
services are available through community workers. The vagaries of
funding have put limits on the project and the planned provision of
information and referral services through branch libraries has not
been realized.

There is increasing recognition that the library, and especially the
urban public library branch, should be made part of the network of
social agencies providing information and referral services. The city of New York has announced a program to build up such services in all branches of the Brooklyn Public Library, tying each branch to a computerized data bank, which provides basic information on a wide range of services. This Citizens Urban Information Center proposed for Brooklyn has also attracted attention and support from the Council on Library Resources.

Meanwhile, other similar efforts by libraries proliferate, mostly funded with federal grants. The current status of the information and referral movement was well summarized in articles in RQ for summer 1973. The major funded effort has been the Neighborhood Information Center project, headquartered at the Cleveland Public Library and involving demonstration services not only in branches in Cleveland but in Houston, Atlanta, Detroit and Queens. The concept of the branch library as an information and referral center is especially well worked out in the Detroit Public Library, where library services both at the central library and at branches have been substantially altered to accommodate a new emphasis on information service.

The final results and evaluation of these projects are not yet available, nor are we able yet to judge their general impact on urban libraries, but clearly the role of the library in its relationship to users and nonusers alike will be enlarged if they are successful.
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Financial Problems Affecting Metropolitan Libraries

JOHN T. EASTLICK

Of the total population of the United States, 68.6 percent live in metropolitan areas. Of these metropolitan dwellers, 31.4 percent live in the central or core city and 37.2 percent live in suburbs outside the core city.¹ These statistics are indicators of major trends occurring in American society in recent decades. These trends include the flight from the farms to the city, the movement of the mobile urban population to the suburb and now the far suburb, and the in-movement to the city of people with less education and fewer skills and financial resources. The core city in recent years has actually been a center for the recycling of people.

For the purpose of this paper, a metropolitan area is defined as a central city having a population of 300,000 or more, surrounded by incorporated suburbs (thus preventing the core city from annexing land), with a substantial portion of the work force commuting daily to the central city.

There is no need to document here the social and economic effect such population shifts have had on the character of the American metropolitan area. Suffice it to say that these core cities are beset with increasing crime, declining schools which are not relevant to the needs of the new resident, inadequate public transportation, declining property values, inadequate welfare and social services, poverty and pollution.

And what of the suburb? It may be defined as a small or medium-sized city, town or village with open land for expansion of residences, industrial parks, and large shopping centers. Its population is more educated, more skilled and wealthier than that of the core city. The suburb has adequate to good schools reinforcing the mores of the more affluent, predominantly white population. It has an expanding tax base not only because of the ability of the people to pay
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higher taxes on newer property, but also because of the residential and commercial expansion. There is crime, but it is not as prevalent as in the ghettos of the city. There is pollution not only from the city but from the numerous cars which form the personalized transit system.

The emergence of our suburbanized society in the last twenty-five years has changed the composition of the metropolitan central city. At least one-sixth of the urban population—approximately 5 million families—lives in a slum environment. Seventy-four percent of the 27.7 million Blacks in the United States live in metropolitan areas, and 78 percent of those living in metropolitan areas live in the central cities. In 1970 more than 80 percent of the 10 million Spanish-speaking population lived in an urban environment. During the 1950-60 decade the white population of the central cities increased by 5.7 percent while the nonwhite population increased by 50.6 percent. During the 1960-70 decade the white population of the central city decreased by .2 percent and the nonwhite population increased by 32.1 percent. These statistics cannot portray the human problems created by such movement, nor can they possibly reflect the impact of such change on the institutions of the central city.

There are 18,666 incorporated municipalities in the United States. In this examination of library financial problems, only those in metropolitan areas as defined above are being considered.

The 1970 census reported that forty-eight municipalities had a population of 300,000 or more. In 1960, forty-three cities exceeded this population figure. This study is primarily concerned with an examination of financial problems and trends in those forty-eight cities having more than 300,000 population and comparing those financial problems with the problems existing in 1960. It must be kept in mind that for 1970 the U.S. census reported that six municipalities had populations of 1 million or more, twenty-one municipalities had populations between 500,000 and 999,999, and twenty-one were included in the population bracket of 300,000 to 499,999.

Municipalities in most states are authorized to assess taxes and establish fees only as permitted by the state government. States have permitted tax restructuring in several areas. State legislatures have recognized the problems of municipal governments through this restructuring, but not to the degree which meets the needs of the municipal government. Some states have permitted local governments to establish or expand municipal income taxes, increase sales taxes on many items such as cigarettes, fuel oils, liquor, and many other items. New sources of income have been created, such as sale of urban
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Sources</th>
<th>48-City Total</th>
<th>1,000,000 or more</th>
<th>500,000 to 999,999</th>
<th>300,000 to 499,999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental revenue</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From state governments</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From federal government</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From local government</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Revenue from own sources</td>
<td>11,785</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>8,999</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General sales and gross receipts</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected sales and gross receipts</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current charges</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous revenue</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,264</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,557</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

renewal property, airport fees and numerous licensing charges. There has been a very strong movement to equalize or reduce taxes on property. It has long been recognized that the concept of a property tax based on the assessed valuation of real property is an unfair and inequitable tax. Different bases for determining assessed valuation are used, resulting in keeping the poor community poor and the affluent community wealthy. Legislatures across the nation have been trying to reduce or eliminate this tax, which has been in the past the primary source of municipal income.

Table 1 shows sources of revenue received by the 48 largest cities in the United States for 1971-72. Data reported in this table are based on a similar study by Harold Hacker in 1968.6 The pattern of municipal financing has changed greatly since Hacker's study, which was based on 1960 statistics. Table 2 compares certain sources of municipal income for the 1971-72 48 cities with the 1960 43 cities all having a population of 300,000 or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Revenue</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1971/72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Revenue (43 Municipalities)</td>
<td>% of Total Revenue (48 Municipalities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes property</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes income</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State sources</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal sources</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local governments</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table 2 indicates that there has been a reduction in the property tax in the years from 1960 to 1971/72. There has been a substantial increase in municipal income taxes. But during that decade, the great increase in state aid to municipal governments is most significant. That the federal government, too, increased its aid to municipal governments is not unexpected.

In each of the three population categories being examined, a similar reduction in the property tax income is noted (see table 3).
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TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF TOTAL MUNICIPAL INCOME FROM STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, 1960 AND 1971/72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Municipalities 1 million or more</th>
<th>Municipalities 500,000-999,999</th>
<th>Municipalities 300,000-499,999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971/72</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Extracted from Table 1.

Municipalities having a population of 1 million or more received 33.3 percent of their income from property tax in 1960 and only 25.5 percent in 1971/72. Similarly, cities having a population of 500,000 to 999,999 experienced a reduction from 37.2 percent (1960) to 27.7 percent (1971/72). For cities in the population bracket 300,000 to 499,999 a reduction in property tax income was also effected: 34.3 percent in 1960, as compared to 27.8 percent in 1971/72.

It is of course apparent that the largest municipalities—1 million or more population—are receiving extensive state assistance. However, these figures may not be representative of aid given to all municipalities in this population category. Extensive state aid by one or two states such as New York could cover lesser amounts of aid given by other states. But the increase in state and federal aid to municipalities is significant. Not all such aid, of course, goes to libraries. A large portion goes to education, for which 16.3 percent of all municipal income was spent in 1971/72. Expenditures for education represent the largest category of municipal spending for that year. The second largest expenditure made by municipalities in 1971/72 was for police protection (11.0 percent).  

Future federal assistance to urban libraries is questionable. While it was thought that, with the establishment of the National Commission on Library and Information Science and the enunciation of the federal policy toward libraries, continued federal support could be anticipated, recent action by the federal administration proves this assumption untrue. The impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress to categorized library programs, and the zero budgeting of such programs proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1974...
indicates a drastic change in attitude. The reestablishment of categorized budgeting for library programs for fiscal year 1974 is probably a temporary measure. The President's Budget Message of January 24, 1974 suggests that a new form of library assistance would be proposed for 1975. The details of the proposed Library Partnership Act, to replace existing federally funded library programs, are largely unknown at this time, but seem to concentrate on reference and information services on a demonstration basis.10 (See Appendix A.)

General revenue sharing funds which became available to municipalities in 1973 have aided some metropolitan libraries. Cities such as Chicago, El Paso and San Francisco all received substantial funds, probably because public libraries were listed among the eight “priority expenditures” programs of local government for which general revenue sharing funds could be used.11 In many cases such funds were used for capital improvements or one-time special book purchasing programs. In other cases large sums of revenue sharing funds were allocated for general operating expenses, but the municipal library budget was reduced by an equivalent amount.12 In many instances municipal libraries have been warned not to anticipate future additional funds; they have had their turn.

Complete records reporting revenue sharing funds received by libraries are not yet available, but preliminary reports indicate that the amount of revenue sharing funds received are far less than those which would have been received from LSCA for Titles I and III. The ALA Washington Office reported in May 1973 that $10,575,035 of revenue sharing funds had been received by libraries, whereas through LSCA $40,709,000 would have been received to develop public library services and programs to persons without such services; to provide library service to the handicapped, institutionalized and the disadvantaged; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries; to strengthen the capacity of the state library agency and to develop systematic and effective coordination of the resources of all types of libraries.13

Revenue sharing is not the answer to the federal government’s assistance to metropolitan public libraries. First, it is an insecure source of funds—softer than soft money. It is allocated at the whim of the local government, and changes can reduce or eliminate library programs developed through the use of these funds. Second, revenue sharing funds are directed to individual cities and towns. This eliminates the use of such funds in programs which cut across governmental jurisdictions. Rather than encourage cooperative programs by
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metropolitan libraries involving various types of libraries, revenue sharing may discourage or prohibit such activities by forcing localities to be concerned solely with local projects.

In summary, it would appear that current federal government plans to provide support to libraries are very bleak. In spite of a nationally enunciated policy of support, the present administration is withdrawing existing support as rapidly as possible, and the threat of a new program of reference and information services on a demonstration basis is ominous. But efforts to effect strong federal library programs must not cease.

As shown in Table 3, the support given municipalities and their libraries by state governments has grown extensively from 1960 to 1971/72. This is particularly true for the six largest metropolitan cities having populations of 1 million or more. Probably the New York State programs affect these figures extensively. Other states such as California, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Illinois have not been as aggressive in obtaining funds for libraries.

It is interesting to speculate on the future financial role of the states to support library programs. When the crisis of zero funding by the federal government developed, different state legislatures responded in different ways. In Colorado, responding to a groundswell of support from librarians, trustees and interested citizens, the legislature replaced with appropriated funds all of the cuts being threatened by the federal government. In Utah just the opposite occurred; there the state legislature tried to abolish the state library agency on the grounds that with no federal funds to administer there was no justification for its existence. These completely opposite actions indicate that the states are not positive as to their responsibility to support what has been in the past a totally local responsibility.

There is a growing feeling among administrators of metropolitan libraries that state governments hold the key to future library development. The reasoning is: It is probably pie-in-the-sky to believe that in the near future there is going to be a consolidation of the many political units in a metropolitan area. While a few political units have combined into one, there is no identified movement in this direction. No metropolitan library service authorities are emerging. This lack of movement is due to a large degree to local vested interests within the individual political units. Problems resulting from metropolitanism will have to get worse before they can get better. If this assumption is accepted, then some agency must be found which can equalize the cost of library service being provided by one political
unit to residents of another. This is essential if the basic concept of free access to information is maintained. Also, such an agency must have the power to plan, coordinate and develop resources—human and other—within a state. That agency must have the political clout to work efficiently and effectively with the state legislatures. The state library agency, by whatever name it is officially called, becomes the key to library development in forty-nine states (Hawaii is already structured this way).

But it is not enough to have just a strong state library agency. Library service must be mandated by state legislatures. Only New York has made significant progress in this area. The reasoning is: In the past few years all state library agencies have been required by HEW to prepare long-range plans for library development. These have included the development of systems of libraries, expanded service to urban citizens of all types, service to handicapped, institutionalized and disadvantaged, networks for information transmission both within the state and from outside the state. These plans, duly prepared, have been approved by state library boards, or whatever the governing agency is called. The plans have been approved but they have no base in law. Except in New York, the last step has not been taken. That step is approval by the state legislature with a legal commitment to fund such plans. If this happened, metropolitan libraries, as major links in the state plan, would receive greater state aid commensurate with their responsibility for statewide service.

It has been indicated in a recent report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that while most local areas (cities and towns) have reached or are near the maximum effort they can fiscally put forth, state governments generally could exercise more effort to help support local services. Elementary and secondary education has experienced the effect of this additional effort by the states and, until recently, so have state-supported institutions of higher education. In spite of the fact that Table 3 showed a substantial increase in state aid to municipalities, metropolitan libraries have felt minimal impact of the states' efforts to fiscally support local services. At least two reasons account for this:

1. Libraries are not visible—they are not recognized as the major link between data sources and user needs in this information-hungry nation.
2. Libraries have not developed the political power to affect legislative bodies.
These weaknesses must be corrected.

The metropolitan public library is faced with great competition for the local tax dollar. All other metropolitan services are experiencing the same problems of growing demands, inflation, and obsolescence. It might be said that in older metropolitan areas obsolescence is a major problem. Not only the deterioration of the core city—its buildings and streets—but also the virtual collapse of the utility systems—sewers, gas and water mains, etc.—increase the competition. As a whole, libraries in the United States have not fared well in comparison with the importance of these other services. The 18,666 cities, towns and villages in the United States received 42 billion dollars in revenue for municipal services in 1971/72. Libraries received only 1.3 percent of this income. However, it appears that libraries in communities with a population of 300,000 or more fared better and libraries in smaller communities poorer. Table 4, an extension of data reported by Hacker, shows that generally, libraries in the 300,000-499,999 population category and those in metropolitan areas over 1 million received a larger percentage of municipal revenue in 1971/72 than in 1964/65. Libraries in the population range 500,000-999,999 have steadily, since 1964, received a smaller share of municipal revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cities 1,000,000 and Over</th>
<th>Cities 500,000-999,999</th>
<th>Cities 300,000-499,999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total operating costs, 1960</td>
<td>$2,219</td>
<td>$1,105</td>
<td>$1,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library costs, 1960</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library percentage, 1960</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating costs, 1964/65</td>
<td>$3,299</td>
<td>$1,489</td>
<td>$786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library costs, 1964/65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library percentage, 1964/65</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating costs, 1971/72</td>
<td>$11,945</td>
<td>$5,416</td>
<td>$2,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library costs, 1971/72</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library percentage, 1971/72</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salaries for library personnel is the largest item in any library budget. Public libraries spend approximately 70 percent of their total income for personnel, while academic libraries commit approximately 50 percent. Salaries have increased consistently during the last twenty-five years. A review of the annual survey of average salaries paid to new graduates of accredited library schools discloses that from 1961 to 1971 the average salary rose 64.9 percent. Salaries in 1972 rose 4.6 percent over 1971. Frarey and Learmont\textsuperscript{17} report that most graduates entering the labor market in 1972 received a salary between $8,500 and $9,000 (see Table 5). A few individuals having special skills, knowledge or experience received salaries much higher, so that the average salary reported for 1972 was $9,248.

The question always asked is: Is the salary of professional librarians keeping pace with inflationary costs? Table 5 indicates that professional salaries have risen from an index base of 100 in 1967 to 126 in 1972. When this index figure is compared with the consumer price index for December 1972\textsuperscript{18} it is apparent that professional salaries have failed to keep up with inflationary costs; the consumer price index for that month was 127.3 (1967=100). The median increase in all wages for 1972 over 1971 was 6.6 percent,\textsuperscript{19} as compared with Frarey and Learmont’s reported 4.6 percent for professional librarians. One can only speculate what will happen when 1973 and 1974 statistics are available. It is probably that while salaries will rise, the same pattern will exist and they will not rise at the same rate as the cost of living.

Salaries, of course, varied in different geographic areas of the United States. The highest salaries were paid in the northeast and western states and the lowest in southeastern states.

Since salary costs are the major item in any library budget, political bodies and institutions have attempted to reduce this cost in several ways. First, many administrators of both academic and public libraries have tried to reduce the number of professional staff and increase the number of support (including work-study) staff. In the past a general ratio of 25 percent professional to 75 percent support staff has been maintained in many academic libraries. Perhaps this will change to 80 percent or more support staff in the near future. Public libraries, too, have changed their ratio of professional to support staff. Not many years ago many public libraries operated on a ratio of 50 percent professional to 50 percent support staff members. Now a frequently found ratio is 30 to 70 percent and this may change in the future.

In addition, the governing political agency in core cities has
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TABLE 5

AVERAGE SALARY INDEX FOR STARTING LIBRARY POSITIONS BASED ON REPORTS FROM ALA ACCREDITED SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Library Schools Reporting</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Average Beginning Salary</th>
<th>Increase in Average</th>
<th>Beginning Salary Index $^{1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>$7305</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4625</td>
<td>7660</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4970</td>
<td>8161</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5569</td>
<td>8611</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5670</td>
<td>8846</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6079</td>
<td>9248</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6396</td>
<td>9423</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^{1}$ In January 1971, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Living Index base year was changed to 1967, so this table corresponds to the current COL Index.

frequently tried to cut personnel costs by freezing positions, by requiring cuts in authorized positions, or ordering across-the-board cuts. In the latter case, personnel are usually greatly affected since other budgetary items have already been reduced to a minimum level. The Detroit Public Library was so affected in 1967; the New York Public Library faced this crisis in 1969, as did the Brooklyn Public Library. Philadelphia had very drastic cuts in 1970. The Philadelphia Free Public Library was forced to reduce its budget by $1 million. This represented 100 positions, since their salaries at that time averaged $10,000. A classic case also occurred in 1969 when the Newark Public Library announced that it would be closed April 1 of that year due to budget cuts by the governing political body. This action was rescinded prior to the April 1 deadline. At the present time the Los Angeles Public Library is protesting a $1.47 million cut for 1974/75. Many staff members as well as programs will be affected if such a cut is actually taken.

In a recent survey of twenty-five of the largest public libraries in metropolitan areas, only three reported frozen positions. Positions which might have been eliminated previously may not have been replaced, but at least existing positions are functioning.

Because of problems relating to salaries and fringe benefits, it is
expected that metropolitan libraries will experience more union activity. Collective bargaining will expand in both public and academic institutions. Many of the large metropolitan public libraries are already unionized. While some union activities have been concerned with hours of work such as Sunday service and four-day work weeks, the majority of union activity has related to salaries. Significant salary increases have occurred in academic and public libraries as a result of such organized action. In most cases the funds required to meet such increases were forthcoming from the governmental or institutional organization. But in a few cases, notably the Philadelphia Free Public Library, the library was required to effect the increases without additional funds.

The cost of books, like all other library resources, continues to increase. Based on an index figure of 100 representing book costs in 1967, the average index for hardcover books in 1972 was 154. Many categories of books such as education, history, biography, music, poetry, drama, religion and fiction exceeded that index figure. The 1972 average price for a hardcover book, $12.99, declined slightly from the average cost of $13.25 in 1971. In the trade paperback field, the average price of books showed a considerable drop—over 16 percent from $5.09 to $4.24. However, among the mass market paperback prices, the average is up 11 percent from $1.01 in 1971 to $1.12 in 1972.

Consideration of per capita expenditures by public libraries as a basic factor in evaluating the efficiency or effectiveness of a library has always been of questionable value. Generally a per capita expenditure figure is considered only of nominal interest. However, it does give an indication of the degree of local effort which is put into library support. Table 6 shows the 1961 per capita expenditures for the 43 municipalities having populations of 300,000 or more and Table 7 shows the 1971/72 per capita expenditures for the 48 municipalities having the equivalent population. The per capita expenditures presented for 1961 show nothing particularly startling. The range from $5.67 to $0.37 represents local income at a time when LSCA was still rural oriented and few programs of state aid had developed. But the per capita expenditures reported for 1971/72 show a very different picture. The range from $27.02 to $2.09 indicates that something dramatic has happened. The increase in these per capita expenditures is not all the result of local effort; both state and federal funds are included. Where large per capita expenditures are reported, some form of a state reference and information system has developed. This
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is certainly true in Boston which has a state-mandated reference service. The lesson to be learned here is that involvement in state systems and networks brings benefits to the local municipality—increased funds which help expand and enrich the core library.

Metropolitan libraries, therefore, have very serious financial problems. A shifting pattern of federal programs, generally a fluctuating base of state support and a reduction in the percentage of income of total municipal revenue place the largest metropolitan libraries in jeopardy. As one director said: "Our predicament is extremely precarious." Faced with continued inflationary trends, the situation cannot help but worsen.

To offset these problems, many of the metropolitan libraries are searching for funds not emanating from their parent or political body. In addition to continued effort to maintain federal and state support, libraries are looking to foundations, industry and individuals for assistance. Granted, such income is usually for one-time special projects. Libraries are also taking advantage of federal or state programs not directly aimed at libraries. Such programs as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Emergency School Assistance Program and the Environmental Education Program are just some sources of funds utilized by metropolitan libraries.

While there are some who feel libraries should charge fees for all services—registration, each reference service performed, etc.—most librarians resist this concept vigorously. To charge such fees would result in limiting the availability of information for those who need it the most. The objective of the library is to make information freely accessible—not restricted by charges. Some public and academic libraries do charge fees for special services such as literature searches, but this is not yet a strong trend.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s a new level of government began to emerge in metropolitan areas. Councils of government have consisted primarily of elected officials of political units comprising a metropolitan area. At first councils of government performed only advisory and consultative services, but gradually they are assuming more power. Financed by funds from the participating political units, councils of government now have the ability to make metropolitan surveys and studies on numerous metropolitan problems. Councils of government are gaining strength and power in forcing metropolitan cooperation because federally funded programs such as highway construction, sanitation and public library construction utilizing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1961 Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>7,781,984</td>
<td>$26,318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>3,550,404</td>
<td>7,186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>2,479,015</td>
<td>6,688,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2,002,512</td>
<td>4,805,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>1,670,144</td>
<td>5,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>939,024</td>
<td>3,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>938,219</td>
<td>840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>876,050</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>750,026</td>
<td>1,955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>741,324</td>
<td>2,491,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>740,316</td>
<td>1,917,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>3,952,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>679,684</td>
<td>1,892,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>627,525</td>
<td>596,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>604,332</td>
<td>2,230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>587,718</td>
<td>512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>573,224</td>
<td>1,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>557,087</td>
<td>2,185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Buffalo, New York</td>
<td>532,739</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>502,550</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>500,409</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Population 1960</td>
<td>1961 Library Expenditures</td>
<td>Per Capita Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>497,524</td>
<td>947,000</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>493,887</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>487,435</td>
<td>857,000</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>482,872</td>
<td>2,726,000</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td>476,258</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>475,539</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>471,316</td>
<td>1,523,000</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>439,170</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td>405,220</td>
<td>1,943,000</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td>390,639</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>372,676</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Oakland, California</td>
<td>367,548</td>
<td>1,418,000</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td>356,268</td>
<td>479,000</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Long Beach, California</td>
<td>344,168</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Birmingham, Alabama</td>
<td>340,887</td>
<td>641,000</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>324,253</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Rochester, New York</td>
<td>318,611</td>
<td>1,283,000</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>318,003</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>313,411</td>
<td>999,000</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Norfolk, Virginia</td>
<td>304,869</td>
<td>1,264,000</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>301,598</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7
1971/72 Per Capita Expenditures by Public Libraries in Municipalities Having Populations of 300,000 or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population 1970, Census</th>
<th>1971/72 Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>7,894,862</td>
<td>$63,960,000</td>
<td>$8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>3,369,359</td>
<td>14,072,000</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>2,809,596</td>
<td>13,507,000</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,950,098</td>
<td>10,540,000</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>1,513,601</td>
<td>7,477,000</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>1,232,802</td>
<td>4,126,000</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>905,759</td>
<td>6,575,000</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>844,401</td>
<td>4,947,000</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>756,510</td>
<td>8,837,000</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>750,879</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td>744,743</td>
<td>5,954,000</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>717,372</td>
<td>5,368,000</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>715,674</td>
<td>4,377,000</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>697,027</td>
<td>3,020,000</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>654,153</td>
<td>1,424,000</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>641,071</td>
<td>17,321,000</td>
<td>27.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>630,528</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>623,530</td>
<td>3,215,000</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>622,236</td>
<td>3,757,000</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>593,471</td>
<td>1,424,000</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>581,562</td>
<td>2,141,000</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>540,025</td>
<td>2,946,000</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>530,831</td>
<td>3,832,000</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>528,865</td>
<td>1,401,000</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 7 — continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population 1970 Census</th>
<th>1971/72 Library Expenditures</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>520,117</td>
<td>2,377,000</td>
<td>$ 4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>514,678</td>
<td>4,465,000</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>507,330</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>497,421</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Buffalo, New York</td>
<td>462,768</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>452,524</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td>447,877</td>
<td>5,502,000</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. San Jose, California</td>
<td>445,779</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>454,400</td>
<td>2,824,000</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td>393,476</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>383,818</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td>382,288</td>
<td>1,885,000</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>380,555</td>
<td>1,261,000</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>368,856</td>
<td>2,182,000</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td>361,958</td>
<td>1,142,000</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Oakland, California</td>
<td>358,633</td>
<td>2,288,000</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Long Beach, California</td>
<td>346,929</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td>334,859</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Miami, Florida</td>
<td>300,910</td>
<td>1,833,000</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>307,951</td>
<td>1,353,000</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>309,828</td>
<td>1,194,000</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

federal funds (while LSCA Title II was funded) have to be approved by these councils of government.

Metropolitan libraries must participate in such councils of government. Here is where the problems and inequities of library support and use can be effectively presented to elected officials of all the political units comprising a metropolitan area. Also in this framework, cooperative plans can be developed and implemented to provide financial assistance to the core library for support and service given by it to suburban libraries and suburban users.

It is ironical that some administrators of large metropolitan libraries indicated that they could do a better job of providing quality library service if they had the authority to manage the library system free of bureaucratic restrictions. Within the older, larger metropolitan areas, the bureaucratic structure is impossible to change. Thus, through pork-barrel politics, new branches are built when not fully needed and inefficient and ineffective branches are maintained. The metropolitan library receives funds for new visible programs which make the politician look good to his constituents. However, it is very difficult to receive funds after the first year to keep the program viable or to provide support staff for the expanded program. Obviously the sources of these comments cannot be identified, but proof is available through taped interviews.

In 1971 a new organization was formed to seek financial assistance at all levels for metropolitan libraries. It is independent of the American Library Trustee Association.

The Urban Library Trustees Council is a non-profit organization under the laws of the State of Illinois, or urban or metropolitan libraries. The Council believes that the major public libraries have particular and peculiar problems of their own. To resolve these problems the Council shall have the following goals and objectives toward which they shall work through social and legislative action at local, state and federal levels:

1. To identify and make known the expanded role of the urban library.
2. To develop legislation supporting urban library programs.
3. To disseminate information on existing legislation and programs as other sources of financial support.
4. To facilitate the exchange of ideas and programs of member libraries and of other libraries.
5. To organize for collective action on matters which affect our libraries.
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6. To devise techniques and methods for our libraries to effectively operate in the political arena.
7. To develop programs which enable member libraries to act as a focus of community development and to supply the informational needs of the new urban populations.
8. To support and effect fair socio-economic representation on urban library governing boards.24

The Urban Library Trustees Council commissioned the Library Research Center of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science to make a study of urban library needs. This study, accomplished by Cathleen Palmini, concludes with the following recommendation:

When it comes to the programs deemed necessary for urban living, an increasing number can neither be developed nor maintained on a strictly local basis. The federal government is already responsible for a great deal having to do with the future shape of urban America with such federally supported urban projects as transportation, pollution control, hospital and health facilities, housing and urban renewal projects. The city can no longer provide adequate financial support for the urban library from its declining tax base. Additional funds are imperative to support the urban library's efforts to serve the residents of disadvantaged, inner city neighborhoods and to continue the urban library's service as reference and research center for the metropolitan region.25

This movement, while commendable, needs to maintain close liaison with both the American Library Trustee Association and the ALA Legislative Committee. To have different groups going off in different directions, thereby creating a splintering of effort and diversity of goals, would be fatal to library financing by governmental agencies. The most valid solutions to metropolitan library financial problems seem to be the following:

1. A greater effort to develop statewide library systems supported to a large degree by state funds.
2. Continued pressure to maintain viable federal library programs.
3. Strong emphasis on local programs to make the library more visible in its own community.
4. Concentration on programs which are educational in nature so that the library is more clearly identified as an educational institution eligible to receive educational funding.
JOHN T. EASTLICK

APPENDIX A

PROSPECTS FOR FEDERAL AID TO LIBRARIES

On March 8, 1974, U.S. Education Commissioner John Ottina addressed a group in Chicago convened by the President of ALA. The group consisted of ALA’s Executive Board, Legislative Committee, the presidents of ALA division and the presidents of the Association of Research Libraries and the Special Library Association. Ottina spoke about the administration’s proposed Information Partnership Act—originally named Library Partnership Act. The following is excerpted from his presentation:

We also know that the library demonstration funds have been successful in generating new information delivery systems. The sites of such projects as the Philadelphia Action Library, the 5-city Neighborhood Information Centers, and the College Entrance Examination Board which demonstrate experimental uses of public libraries across America have been visited by concerned professionals and have led to systematic changes in operating library and information systems. The support of these demonstrations evolves out of the national concern to focus on change in traditional and non-responsive library service patterns. In these latter efforts, the federal involvement has been particularly effective in generating state, local, and private matching monies. We propose that demonstrations of this nature be continued under the proposed Information Partnership Act. Although all projects would be fully funded for their first year, a built-in escalating clause will be recommended in the Act to require an increasing contribution of state and local funds for subsequent years for multi-year grants. For fiscal year 1975 we are recommending that the Information Partnership Act be funded at $15 million to support these activities during the LSCA phase-out period.26

It must be pointed out that the proposed $15 million in fiscal 1975 is a large reduction from fiscal 1974 funds for LSCA Titles I and III and Title II-B of the Higher Education Act. The amount of federal assistance to libraries is being reduced by the present administration and the uses to which such funds may be applied are being shifted. These changes cannot help but alter the programs of metropolitan libraries. It seems from Ottina’s comments that there is to be a great de-emphasis of programs aimed to assist the core city disadvantaged, system development and collection development. In reality, since the
Financial Problems

new federal program is based on a demonstration concept, the future HEW program of library support will be totally phased out in the near future.
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The Role of Local and State Governments

ALPHONSE F. TREZZA
and
ALBERT HALCLI

STATE AND LOCAL governments provide the framework within which the public library operates. Society, as distinct from government, provides the raw material which gives library service its meaning, but government creates the necessary organizational and fiscal structure that makes library functions possible. The public library is subject to public control. It does not operate in a vacuum, and in only a narrowly defined sense does it act with complete freedom. It is responsible not only to a public which it must serve, but to a public which is also its master.

Of the two levels of government, state and local, the latter has far greater impact on the library. In the mind of the public, the library and the public schools are emphatically local institutions. This status gives both institutions a special aura. Both have a certain quality which makes them seem like extensions of the home. Perhaps this is because both have such impact on children. No theory of service can gain much support that does not recognize this fact of public life.

In popular political tradition, state and local governments are usually spoken of as two different sources of authority. From the administrative point of view, of course, they are different. From the constitutional point of view there are only two levels of political authority—federal and state. The United States is a federation of states, but the states are not federations of local governments. However in this, as in the other spheres, the tradition is as important as the written constitutional word. Indeed, in the minds of a significant portion of society, the local government has become the last bastion of defense against an all-encroaching government. This, too, is an essential reality that we may forget only at our peril.

In legal jargon, public libraries are the creatures of the local...
government. Beyond the limits of its “creature” status, the public library cannot venture very far. Within these limits it theoretically has a wide range of options in how it will respond to the needs of the metropolitan area. The range is theoretical because the provision of good library service to the people in metropolitan areas is only one of a number of staggering problems facing metropolitan governments. Our “sick cities” have become microcosms of all the ills of an over-industrialized, overly technological and less than humanistic society. The revolutionary forces of our time have been focused on cities and on campuses.

One of the frustrating aspects of the situation is that the burden of too many of these ills has been thrust on one level of government—the local unit. In our political tradition the local government, as the government nearest the people, has been assigned a wide sphere of responsibility for basic community services in accord with a democratic and federal theory of government. However, it is now becoming increasingly obvious that local units can no longer adequately fulfill their responsibilities without extensive outside help; the burden is too great. Local governments have been asked to bear, with their limited resources, a disproportionate share of the responsibilities belonging to society as a whole.

They are forced to meet their problems in the context of two overwhelming realities. The first is that of the central city itself—its sheer physical and social presence. Can it be governed? Can urban institutions bear the strain being placed on them? These are not academic questions. The second reality relates to the metropolitan area as a whole. The area is unquestionably a social, economic and cultural unit, but there is no corresponding form of government. Instead, there is a maze of governmental units exercising, or trying to exercise, the traditional functions of government over fractional areas of the greater metropolitan unit. Metropolitan area planners who have had to run the gauntlet of local autonomy have had truly shattering experiences.

The metropolitan area, then, is not governed as a unit. Instead it is torn by conflicting forces that tend to draw it together on the one hand (e.g., economics and technology) and to pull it apart on the other (e.g., special interests). In most areas these counterbalancing forces are made more intense by the pervasive problems of race, minorities and low income. It is within this overall frame of reference that metropolitan library development must take place.

In general, local government fulfills three broad essential functions:
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(1) it creates the public library and provides for its government; (2) it provides it with a source of income from public revenues; and (3) it provides a broad framework of regulations within which the local library must function. In this context “local government” as a concept is not limited to local corporate bodies, but includes the local electorate as well. Some libraries, such as district libraries, are created directly by the people, and library funding beyond a basic minimum is generally authorized by direct referenda.

In creating the local public library the local government usually gives it some degree of autonomy. Although not universal, the board of directors and executive pattern is still the most common form of library government; this is an old tradition persisting into the present. In the nineteenth century, democratic theory dictated maximum decentralization of government, and even the standard governmental units hesitated to use their power to the fullest. When new problems arose, new boards and commissions were appointed on the model of school district government (which was not actually created by local government but by the state). In recent decades most of these boards have been dissolved and the local government has reasserted its full power. School and library boards remain as holdovers from the earlier period.

Usually, then, the library has two representative bodies in its overall structure: the local governing council, board of supervisors, township board, or whatever; and the library board itself. In the complex world of metropolitan affairs, a tremendous responsibility has devolved on these bodies. This gives a heightened value to the role of urban trustees. It is they who must interpret the library’s needs to the community at large, and it is they who must represent the total community to the library staff. Since metropolitan areas are whirlpools of various interests, the job of urban trustees is far from easy. They face two big challenges. The first is getting the attention of the community. There is an old joke about a man with a club and his mule: the punch line is that you can get a mule to do almost anything if you can first get his attention. Libraries are in a somewhat similar predicament. They must try to get a reasonable priority among services with frequently clashing claims for support. Unfortunately, their club is not particularly hefty. Too often the library is the last to get the increase, but the first to get the cut.

A second major challenge to urban trustees lies in the very atmosphere of much of our local government, both urban and rural. It appears to be a kind of political law that the closer government comes
to the individual citizen, the more conservative it becomes. Although there are countless exceptions, there is a strong tendency for local government, as “low man on the totem pole” of government, to be defensive against possible threats of encroachment on its powers, and to be very protective of local property interests. Both characteristics can be productive in promoting the welfare of local populations; they can also be self-defeating when the result is resistance to change.

The urban trustee has a unique role to fill that requires skill, vision and courage. He must preserve the local sense of autonomy; he must also give full scope to the aspirations of all segments of the local community for expanded opportunities for personal and group development. The latter goal is not attainable without help from outside the community; hence the dilemma. For the trustee it is not unlike walking a shaky tightrope over an open fire. Too often the local board either regards its role as primarily defensive or achieves a kind of balance on dead center. In either case the library does not make much headway in getting the attention of the community. Unfortunately it is fair to say that attention is precisely what some boards do not want.

From the point of view of administration, the local library must work within the framework created by local government. This means some degree of policy control, especially fiscal control. Thus the library must also accommodate itself to the operating regulations of other units of government which have responsibilities in such areas as civil service, planning, buildings and purchasing. In addition, if it is to provide any in-depth service, the library should be prepared to cooperate with other libraries.

The two aspects of library administration just referred to—finance and cooperation—are important enough to merit more extensive treatment and will be handled in greater depth after the full general context of local and state government has been discussed. These issues are, in our opinion, the major ones in metropolitan library administration.

Throughout this discussion, it has been assumed that the library functions of local government are limited to the local public library. This is not entirely true. In larger metropolitan areas the local government may also provide municipal reference and/or law libraries. The existence of such libraries can be essential in the specialized areas of service in which they function.

At this point it is appropriate to touch upon intergovernmental cooperation. This kind of cooperation has made some significant advances in the last decade in the fields of physical and economic
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planning, in planning for special services such as education, health and law enforcement, in the creation of special projects and authorities, and in the development of contracts for services. Although this activity has fallen short of actual needs, it has proceeded, generally, at a faster pace in the above-mentioned areas than in the library field.

The implications of this development for libraries is obvious. The way is being prepared for library cooperation on a massive scale. The precedents are there; what is needed is leadership among libraries. One special aspect of intergovernmental cooperation needs to be pointed out: many large urban areas sprawl over state lines. This means that the way must be cleared at the state level for interstate cooperation.

Discussing state government means entering a sphere in which there has been a rapidly developing range of activity. So recent has been this growth that one is apt to forget that the state role in library development has always been an essential albeit an unobtrusive one. In fact, there could never have been any public libraries without the prior concern and cooperation of the state.

The basis of the state’s involvement in library development has been stated very succinctly in a standard textbook on library development: “The state, as the fountain of residual powers, may do anything not reserved exclusively to the federal government or to the people or prohibited to the state. In addition all powers delegated to local units emanate from the state.”

If local governments have the power to create libraries they have received this power through state enabling legislation. This grant of power is based on the state concern for education and the diffusion of knowledge. In the late nineteenth century, when transportation and communication were still relatively primitive, the states developed the traditional pattern of delegating the responsibility for public education and public libraries to local units. Eventually this pattern came to be hallowed as the unique American way.

This pattern has provided a great motive force in our society and has heightened the sense of citizen participation in our government. However, this tradition was never a monolithic one of state disinterest or noninterference. In fact, before the nineteenth century closed, the pattern was already undergoing modification, and modifications have continued to this day.

During the 1890s what came to be called library extension began as a state effort to stimulate and promote the growth of library services, especially in areas where none existed. Eventually every state
established an extension-type service. During the 1890s, Connecticut began to provide state grants-in-aid, thus initiating a new type of state participation in library development. By 1956, twenty-two states, less than half, had grant-in-aid programs. In 1973, thirty-three states had such programs. In 1958 only one state, Michigan, had a constitutional provision for establishment of libraries. By 1970, fifteen states had some kind of constitutional provision.

The above items of data are only a few of the many types of statistics that might be cited to illustrate what is beyond dispute—the growing state commitment to library development. However, in no way do we envisage metropolitan area libraries losing or suffering any diminution of their responsibility and leadership. Indeed, we feel that metropolitan libraries are now called on for a greater degree of both responsibility and leadership than ever before. What we do envisage is a state-local partnership, in which the state not only assists the metropolitan area in the solution of some of its problems, but in which the metropolitan area, through networks, shares its resources with other parts of the state which are less well endowed. This can be a fruitful relationship for both partners under both aspects of giving and receiving.

The state role in metropolitan library development is, of course, one phase of its role in statewide library development. This role has been defined in many ways with varying degrees of specificity. We feel that the following list includes the major roles that the state has to play in metropolitan area development:

1. Provision of a sound legal basis for the development of libraries.
2. Provision of supplementary services and resources.
3. Development of networks and larger units and systems of service.
5. Planning and coordinating development of all kinds of libraries.
6. Provision of specialized information services.

However, we would hasten to add that there are many other roles and services properly belonging to the state level, although they are not assigned to a single state library in most states. These roles and functions are treated extensively in ALA's Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. A comprehensive list could include consultant and promotion service, promotion of standards and certification, programs for trustees, research and statistics, personnel development, service to the blind and physically handicapped, services to institutions, genealogy and history, archives and record
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management, law libraries, services to schools, and the processing of materials.

In an article of this kind it is neither possible nor desirable to discuss all aspects of the states' role in metropolitan library development. We should, instead, focus our attention on the two aspects of library development that have the greatest impact—finance and cooperation. What happens in these two areas will have a determining role in shaping the future of libraries in metropolitan areas.

At present the basic and usually the only financial support for libraries in metropolitan areas is from the property tax. It is basic to the support of education in general. Recently this tax has come under considerable criticism in the courts. The charge has been made that it is unfair in that it does not provide an equitable base for educational services. For the moment at least, the U. S. Supreme Court has said the property tax is not unconstitutional. But it also said that it is not an equitable tax and supplementary means of taxation for education are essential.

The property tax for support of the urban library is not only not equitable, but is diminishing in the central cities. In suburban areas it is, of course, increasing as a source of revenue in the communities that are growing. With industry leaving the central cities, and middle- and upper middle-class persons fleeing to the suburbs, the income available from property tax is seriously decreasing. Increasing the tax rate for those who can least afford it is no solution.

The problem of adequate municipal income has created a national crisis involving far more than libraries. Two methods have been at least partially successful in helping to meet the problem over the last twenty years—state and federal aid. Unlike federal aid, state aid has not been universal and, even where it is available, is often so inadequate that it has had little impact, at least on library development.

The state must provide metropolitan libraries with financial support—not only on a grant-in-aid basis but on a continuing and guaranteed basis. About 65 percent of the states provide some assistance through grant-in-aid programs. No state provides more than $1.00 per capita. State support varies from zero to 16 percent of a metropolitan library's budget. Federal support has averaged 2 to 6 percent, and unfortunately the lack of firm and continuing commitment by the federal government in the support of libraries has made any kind of long-range planning impossible.

If libraries in metropolitan areas are to effectively meet and serve the needs of their varied constituencies, then the adoption of a policy by
both the state and federal governments of a true financial partnership—a firm, categorical, permanent commitment—is essential. Revenue sharing on either the state or federal level is undoubtedly a useful financial tool by which local units of government can adapt financial aid to their own local priorities. However, it should never be thought of as a substitute for direct, categorical aid. This would be disastrous for libraries.

We urge a permanent program of federal support at $1.00 per capita matched by required state funding at $1.50 per capita and local funding at $3.50 per capita as a minimal beginning. These amounts should be translated into a formula so they can reflect changing costs of personnel, services, etc. Local support should be 60 percent, with the state contributing from 20 to 30 percent of required funds, and the federal government contributing about 10 to 20 percent.

In addition, special grants for buildings, for both central and branch operations, development of new experimental programs and expanded programs of research must also be available from state and federal sources. Obviously, funds of this volume cannot be a free gift; that could also be disastrous in its own way. The funds should be dispensed on the basis of sound local, state and federal planning, and libraries accepting such aid must be required to meet minimum or qualifying standards. Evaluation of library programs to assure a reasonable level of cost effectiveness is an essential part of a federal, state and local financial partnership.

This kind of financial partnership will not, by itself, solve the urban library's problems. In our increasingly cost-conscious society, programs of aid, even when they are generous in comparison with what now exists, cannot realistically be expected to reach the proportions ideally necessary for each library to provide its community with good, modern library service. Cooperation among libraries and the sharing of resources is absolutely essential. The acceptance by the urban libraries of state and federal support implies—or, more emphatically, requires—responsibility for multitype library cooperation. Local needs and priorities must be integrated with state and national needs and priorities.

In a large metropolitan area a coordinating library council reflecting all types of libraries is highly desirable. The best use of the taxpayers funds (local, state and federal) requires the sharing of materials, personnel services and, to some extent, space. The metropolitan area must develop cooperation to assure full and rapid access to the intellectual resources for all persons regardless of their economic,
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educational or cultural level. Metropolitan institutions of learning must participate in these systems. The elitism of academe must be tempered by the egalitarianism of the city street. In the inner-city the person in the street may well be educationally and culturally impoverished. Or he may just be an ordinary citizen badly in need of a wide range of information to cope in a society which often seems ready to swallow him up as a nameless, faceless statistic.

Although it may not be immediately obvious, it can be easily shown that highly systemized cooperation is not possible without strong state action. There must be a substantial input at the state level in planning and coordinating cooperative systems to insure that a well functioning and fully compatible network emerges on a statewide basis. Financial assistance for networking purposes is also necessary. In the next step the states, as units, should participate in regional, multistate and national networks.

Interlibrary cooperation in the abstract is like motherhood—it is hard to argue against it in principle. In practice it is difficult to achieve because of administrative fears of losing autonomy and of exposing the library's resources to drain by outsiders. To develop cooperation requires farsighted leadership both on the local and state levels. Fine sentiments are not enough; someone has to be ready to go on the firing line. Cooperation requires both giving and receiving. This may be a gross truism, but it is a flagrant aspect of human nature that we all much prefer to receive than to give, and this particular failing affects decisions made, or not made, in libraries throughout the county. Cooperation, ultimately, is against our lower nature and comes about only when there is enough vision to measure immediate loss against larger gain.

Multifaceted financing can lead to a quicker acceptance and realization of cooperation not only in principle, but in actuality. The benefits of new technology, new approaches to delivering services and meeting the human and informational needs of the urban citizen can and must become a reality. A real understanding of the responsibility as well as the benefits of cooperation is needed. A continuing educational program for staff at every level and for all parties in library institutions is basic for the achievement of this goal.
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The Role of the Federal Government

JOHN C. FRANTZ

This paper will attempt to examine the role of the federal government in relation to library services in metropolitan areas, and to discuss legislative efforts to achieve library objectives. In doing so, one encounters an immediate problem, in that the terms "federal role," "national policy" and "public interest" are more deceptive than the chameleon. They have the ring of clarity and the appearance of self-evident definition, but the closer one approaches, the faster and further they recede. Librarians are probably as guilty as any other interest group of using these terms and their permutations as though they had a rational, objective, generally accepted definition. Unhappily, they do not.

Senator Fulbright, addressing this problem, noted that: "Perhaps in the abstract sense there is an objective category which can be called the 'national interest.' Human affairs, however, are not conducted in the abstract, and as one moves from the theoretical to the operational, objectivity diminishes and sentiment rises; ideas give way to ideology, principle to personality, reason to rationalization . . . the national interest is a subjective and even capricious potpourri, with ingredients of strategic advantage, economic aspiration, national pride, group emotion, and the personal vanity of the leaders themselves."

One reason for the recently recognized vulnerability of federal library grant programs is probably that the authorizing legislation came into being not by presenting a coherent, organized rationale for library assistance, but rather by shrewd and skillful exploitation of political opportunities in Congress, in the White House and in the administrative agencies. The Library Services Act of 1956, achieved after a decade of concentrated and intelligent lobbying, was the first in a series of essentially ad hoc components of a federal library policy. The "intent of Congress" for this library demonstration bill was to extend public library service to rural areas without such services or with
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inadequate service. Its passage was a surprise to the Eisenhower administration and the Office of Education was unprepared to administer it and uncommitted to its purposes.

Between 1956 and 1968 the rural library service program was extended to urban areas and expanded to include funds for library construction, interlibrary cooperation, institutional library services and library services to the handicapped. During the same period the federal commitment to libraries blossomed to substantial proportions. Federal financial assistance to libraries was provided for in the following examples of substantive legislation:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act
- Title II—School library resources and materials
- Title III—Supplementary educational services and centers
- Title IV—Cooperative research

Higher Education Act
- Title II-A—College library resources
- II-B—Library training and research
- II-C—Library of Congress National Program for Acquisition and Cataloging
- Title IV-B—Workshops and institutes

National Defense Education Act
- Title III—Instructional materials
- Title XI—Institutes

Appalachian Regional Development Act

State Technical Services Act

Higher Education Facilities Act

Despite the flowering of library assistance programs, the garden had never been systematically planned, graded, or even landscaped. Library titles were tacked on here and there, now and then, and rode the coattails of the education landslide in the middle and late 1960s. There was not then, and there is not now, a clear, rational articulation of the functions of libraries in the achievement of national goals. The resultant national policy with respect to libraries was, therefore, an almost accidental and largely unnoticed by-product of the massive priority then being given to education. Nobody, least of all the Office of Education, saw the opportunity and the necessity of evaluating the aggregate concept, impact or effectiveness of these scattered efforts. The high-water mark, to date at least, for planning, research and evaluation capacity within the Office of Education came when administration of most library legislation was elevated to bureau status.
This reorganization offered the potential for creating a coherent federal library policy but, alas, the moment was allowed to pass, the administration changed, and a subsequent reorganization left libraries back at square one—within the Office of Education.

Thus far, comments on the federal role in library development have dealt only with substantive legislation: the several laws affecting libraries which contain the purposes of the act, the methods of allocating funds, eligibility, controls, scope of regulations, administrative delegation, authorization of appropriations, etc. Two other documents, which are uniquely political in nature, are powerful statements of policy: one is the proposed budget of the administration, the other is the appropriations act as passed by Congress. Every President has used his annual budget message to implement his political priorities; Mr. Nixon was only a hyperactive example. Increased or reduced funding requests; elimination of programs; reorganization, decentralization, or consolidation of programs can all be accomplished by the way in which the federal budget is put together.

Further, when the budget is submitted to Congress it is reviewed by the respective appropriations committees, not by the substantive committees which originate legislation. In drafting an appropriations act, both Houses have the opportunity to respond to the President with congressional priorities. These decisions have enormous impact on the American society. Quantitatively, approximately 20 percent of the gross national product is now involved—one-fifth of the value of everything the nation produces. Qualitatively, the proportional allocations among defense, social and educational programs, energy and the physical environment, health services, mass transit, etc., shape the quality of life for all of us. The main point is that these shifts can and do take place within the provisions of existing legislation and can enhance, modify or abolish the original purposes of any one legislative program.

The size and complexity of the budget, the diffuse decision-making authority in the various congressional committees, and the excesses of the President in using it as a political instrument have led to a serious, basic review of congressional budget responsibility. Both the House and Senate have passed bills designed to give Congress more direct comprehensive control over total federal spending levels. However, there are substantial differences in the two measures which must be reconciled by the joint conference committee.

Both bills provide for changing the beginning of the federal fiscal year from July 1 to October 1 to allow more time for congressional
review. The Senate bill provides for a joint resolution each May setting both spending and revenue estimates and establishing ceilings for major program areas. Both bills establish separate House and Senate budget committees with necessary staff support. Differences in the bills involve administrative impoundment of appropriated funds, elimination of "back door" spending which by-passes normal appropriations procedures, and the scheduling of the several steps in the total budgeting process. In addition to systematizing congressional budget participation, the bills also attempt to redress the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches.

These measures are undeniably desirable and, to the extent they accomplish the intended purposes, very helpful. But the federal budget is big and getting bigger, complex but getting more complicated, so the concept has yet to be tested. If it works it may provide library and other interests with a better opportunity to relate library services to other governmental programs and to increase the proportion of attention given nationally to libraries. There has been notable neglect in recognizing the collateral importance of books and other library materials, and of library services, in reaching the targeted program objectives both within and outside the U.S. Office of Education. A clearer, fuller review of federal spending may provide greater visibility for the horizontal presence of libraries across a wider program spectrum than ever before, including such obvious educational areas as career education, adult basic education, mid-career retraining, reading and literacy efforts, drug abuse and sex education, etc. Of potentially greater significance are the similar opportunities which may well be available in less obviously, but equally important, library-related national purposes as urban planning and development, environmental planning, consumer-interest programs including family assistance plans, manpower and economic policies, agricultural extension, etc.

Whatever general agreement exists on desirable national goals which the federal government can help greatly to achieve would surely include at least three, identified in the Brookings Institution as the following: "reducing poverty and inequality, both in income and in access to essential public and private services; improving the effectiveness of public services; creating a cleaner, more attractive physical environment."

With more sophisticated and more direct control of the federal budget by Congress, librarians have a more clearly defined path to follow in showing the relevance and value of library services to
reaching national goals no matter how the emphasis therein may shift from time to time.

The second opportunity which improved federal budget policy presents is not programmatic but fiscal. Using the modified procedures as a base, the library (and education) community can initiate a useful dialog on the proportional share of library support which can realistically be allocated to federal revenue resources. It has long been recognized that the local real property tax has borne a disproportionate burden of the total costs of education and of libraries. These taxes are inherently unfair and infirm. For example, in fiscal year 1971, $1 of tax per $100 of assessed value of property in the Beverley Hills (California) School District produced $914.94 per elementary pupil. The same tax in nearby Baldwin Park produced only $53.96. Similar inequities can be found in local revenues allocated to libraries. Office of Education data for fiscal year 1972 showed that total education expenditures were allocated as follows: 9.1 percent from federal sources and 90.9 percent from state and local sources. Sources of operating funds for public libraries in selected states serving at least 25,000 persons, in fiscal year 1968, were distributed among the levels of government as shown in Table 1.

Despite the almost unanimous agreement that these data show clear inequities in matching expenditures with revenue resources, there is no consensus concerning a “fair-share” formula that would allocate

### TABLE 1

**Operating Funds for Public Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate U.S.</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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responsibility for library funding among state, local and federal governments. Having a new forum in which to discuss federal budget programs will not solve this problem. Only the library profession can construct a justifiable rationale for such an allocation, and this task is "unfinished business" of urgent and important dimensions. (A more comprehensive review and analysis of this topic may be found in a paper commissioned by the Office of Education, "Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services," by Rodney Lane.³

In discussing the "fair-share" concept as it currently applies to public elementary and secondary education, Congressman Albert H. Quie, ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, said that "One of the goals that seems to have been almost universally adopted by the major education groups is that the Federal Government should pay one-third of the cost of educating young people. . . . I believe that we can achieve a Federal participation rate of 25 percent. But I cannot see us achieving any major increase unless the Federal role becomes better defined. . . . A fair formula for responding to genuine educational needs require better information."⁴

It would be challenging to the ALA to find a higher priority than the satisfactory resolution of this "fair-share" dilemma. But the responsibility is not theirs alone. The Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science share an organizational commitment to the issue. Beyond them, everyone interested in libraries or having a professional stake in improved library services needs to make their voices heard if libraries are to become more than vestigial appendages to the social and educational fabric of American life.

However, the determination of an appropriate and effective allocation of library support from the several governmental revenue sources must be rationally and objectively defensible. It can be derived only when a sizable number of antecedent questions have been satisfactorily answered. For example, the objective, purposes and functions of the library must be formulated with sufficient precision so that its effectiveness can be measured against its costs; standards permitting uniform assessment of the degree of adequacy must be promulgated; the present pattern of financial support must be analyzed for equity and adequacy; and the relative value of library services must be established so that budget decisions can be made less subject to precedent, habit or expedient judgment. The relationship of
any one library to its immediate constituency, to the area, region or state, and to the national system of library services must also be delineated. Basic and empirical research, plus original and creative conceptualizing, should yield a framework within which the allocation of financial responsibility can be constructed.

Experience to date has taught some useful lessons and has provided some promising clues. At the very least, we now know some ways in which the federal role in library development ought not to be defined and implemented. If we now know a good deal about where we have been and a little bit about where we would like to go, then considerable effort should be made to determine how to get there. The remainder of this paper will be devoted to these three aspects of the federal library role.

First, it would probably not be difficult to get majority agreement that the narrow categorical library grants of the past are now obsolete. They worked imperfectly and were subject to various abuses. For example, the matching requirements of the Library Services and Construction Act were not widely useful. It is true that in some states the matching requirement did lead to new or increased state aid for libraries, but in others no perceptible advantages occurred. The wealthier states, already well overmatched from both state and local sources, were able to claim "fully earned federal balances" which could be expended for virtually any purpose without regard to the act or its regulations. Although I have no proof, I strongly suspect that some federal funds, earned and paid but not disbursed, were put into interest-bearing paper in clear violation of the regulations under which the act was administered.

In addition, the "demonstration" concept of the LSCA, which was an effort to avoid the unacceptable (in 1956) idea of federal operating assistance to local libraries contained a basic fallacy about the effectiveness of incentive grants. This incentive fallacy is the idea that a federally initiated innovation will, by virtue of its success, find local or state support. It just does not happen very often. For one thing, every innovation can be, honestly or not, evaluated as a "success" because the measurement is nearly always of something (with some vested interests) compared to nothing (the status quo ante). For another, the idea of stimulating nonfederal sources of support for federally initiated projects is at best unrealistic and at worst a form of political blackmail.

On this latter point, far too little attention has been given to the consequences to state and local governments of federal program
priorities and funding decisions. Whenever a federal grant program, library-related or not, is conceived, implemented, funded, unfunded, or abolished, there is a direct impact on decision-making at the state and local levels. Federal aid in many critical areas and the structure of appropriations and incentives are now more frequently a determining factor in adopting local policies. A recent deputy mayor of New York City noted that "the Federal government's role in the city's decision-making process is overwhelming. In today's world, the fact is that the Federal government does significantly alter the destiny of a city."

This student of urban affairs also cited the relatively passive role of city halls at a time when Washington policy-makers could decide to encircle a city with superhighways, change mortgage rates, alter civilian and military procurement, affect housing construction, redesign health services and their delivery, and modify real estate tax incentives. The amounts of federal funds involved are so enormous that both states and cities are in danger of becoming fiscal and program subsidiaries of the federal government.

These two arguments are persuasive, at least to some, with regard to demonstration, model or pilot federal grants. Categorical grants for libraries and other purposes must be broad enough to be applied to recognized and defined local priorities in ways which permit effective local decision-making at the same time that the purposes of the grant are fulfilled. A second weakness of the LSCA was its failure to recognize and separately provide for the essential operations of the state library agency. More than a few states were justifiably criticized for siphoning off LSCA funds for statewide or state agency purposes which, while legal and even necessary, were to some unmeasured extent contravening the purposes of the act. The fault here was not so much in the state agencies, many of which were ill-led, ill-staffed and ill-equipped, but in the act itself. Specific provision for an adequate state agency, willing and able to provide leadership, training, research and development was, and is, needed.

The role of the state in achieving national goals has been generally neglected in the pattern of federal grant programs, notably in education and social services. But in some cases these very programs have helped induce a growing shift of more direct responsibility back to the states. Wendell Pierce, executive director of the Education Commission of the States, says of this trend: "The difference in the quality of the leadership at the state level between now and, say, 1965 is amazing. These people are experts—in compensatory education, the
handicapped, early childhood, you name it. They used to be just caretakers."8 The time now seems more right than ever to effect some acceptable compromise between having Washington leave the money on a stump and run, and the too rigid, too narrow, redtape festooned categorical grants of the mid-1960s.

Insofar as libraries are concerned, the General Revenue Sharing Act was a thinly disguised effort to abolish federal funding of libraries. That this bone was tossed in the direction of libraries at the same time the administration budget for library grant programs was cut to zero was no coincidence. Experience quickly proved that libraries were badly over-matched by being in the same ring with such heavyweights as mass transit, law enforcement, highway construction and health services. Of those general revenue-sharing funds which did find their way into libraries, the vast majority were for capital, nonrecurring construction projects or were used to substitute for funds previously provided from local sources. On the other hand, the aborted proposal for special education revenue sharing was more than a contradiction in terms, it was an affront to serious educational planners all along the ideological spectrum, and at all levels of government.

The currently proposed "Information Partnership Act" is only the most recent Trojan Horse to be trundled into the library community. It is not only a transparent device to reduce federal funds for libraries, it repeats the incentive fallacy and narrowly restricts the federal responsibility to some undefined "informational services" to greater numbers of people.

Of the other library grant programs, Title II of ESEA and the construction titles in LSCA and HEA were probably the most successful in accomplishing their purposes. A number of observers feel that funds for library construction were well down the list of pressing priorities. A debate on that topic is probably desirable, but there is no doubt that federal matching funds for construction do indeed act as an effective incentive. New buildings are tangible, they are politically attractive, they aid the local job market and their cost of construction is a capital improvement. In addition, the availability of federal assistance helps control local long-term borrowing which, in any event, troubles budget officials much less than the chronic struggle with annual operating costs. If too little forethought was given to building operating expenses, maintenance, and energy consumption, it could not be blamed on LSCA.

Title II of ESEA has clearly had a generally positive effect on the collections of school library materials, particularly at the elementary
level. One weakness in its administration has been the frustrating delay and uncertainty in determining the level of funding in any one year. Passage of appropriations acts late in the fiscal year, vetoes, continuing resolutions, impoundment, all these made systematic effective disbursement virtually impossible for school library officials. A second weakness was the disproportionate emphasis on materials. The title would have been vastly more effective if it had been designed to assure across-the-board improvement in school library services by containing, in the same title, funds for personnel, training, administration, research, etc. Grants under HEA for college library resources were much needed and apparently well used, but the amounts available have been too small to make substantial and continuing improvement possible.

It seems appropriate at this point to say just a word about opportunities for federal assistance to libraries from programs not lodged in the Office of Education. Too few libraries have exercised sufficient initiative to take advantage of existing federal programs for which libraries may be eligible even though they may or may not be specifically mentioned. A few alert library leaders at both state and local levels have been able to offer new or improved service by exploiting possibilities in such disparate programs as the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the model cities program, the State Technical Assistance Act, the Social Security Act, and various programs in the departments of labor, commerce, and interior, and in the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities. Many of these opportunities continue to exist and more are surely working themselves through the legislative process. The existence of these possibilities suggests the desirability of closer monitoring by ALA, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and the Office of Education so that clear and timely information can be provided to state and local library agencies.

The proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, and the antecedent governor's conferences, present an unparalleled opportunity to examine in depth the past, present, and future of library legislation and support. Properly conceived and executed, these forums can help librarians build their case and can involve a wide range of library users to establish a genuine public interest policy with respect to library development. A statement of national policy on libraries need not, and probably will not, be lengthy or complicated. But it must be supported by a profession and a constituency united on goals, standards,
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measurements, and funding patterns. These are the heart of the matter. The state library agency occupies the crucial seat of leadership in each of these topics, with ALA and the National Commission in vital coordinating roles. The ultimate statement of national policy might even be as simple as:

The Congress declares that it is in the national interest to provide adequate library services to all.

Legislation and appropriations will be needed to implement any such statement to public policy. Much is yet to be done before specific language can be drafted, but it is possible to set down some principles and some components of what might, for our purposes, be called the "Better Libraries Act of 1976."

Scope. The act should be comprehensive, should reflect the best and most current professional judgments on interlibrary networking, and should embrace all kinds of libraries, media centers, and public information services. Specific provision for strengthening state library administrative agencies should be made. All ages, users with special needs, and the institutionalized—without limitations—should be eligible for assistance under the act.

Allotments. Allotments to states should be based on an equalization concept that takes into account the relative ability to pay, adequacy of existing services, and levels of financial effort. The "federal share" of program grants would be 100 percent with no formula matching requirement. However, the act would prohibit the substitution of federal funds for existing funds from nonfederal sources, a "floor" requirement.

Capital Financing. The act would create a federal library facilities authority which would be empowered to raise money through the issuance of bonds to capitalize those library activities which could generate offsetting revenue, e.g., library construction, technical processing, data processing and communications hardware.

Administration. It is probably desirable to continue the administration of library grant programs within the Office of Education at a level headed by an assistant commissioner for library and information services. However, it is essential that the federal government have, in addition to the grants management function, a program staff capable of planning, research and development, liaison with other government...
agencies, evaluation, and technical assistance to state and local
governments and libraries. This latter function could well be assigned
to the National Institute of Education. The National Commission on
Libraries and Information Science could, with no change in its present
mandate, act in an advisory capacity to this unit.

The state library agency would have a crucial role in effective
administration and the act should specify the components, capacity
and performance levels of the administering agency in each state.
Because of the different patterns of assigning library responsibilities at
the state level, these provisions would require careful draftsmanship to
accomplish the desired objective without requiring a uniform
organization chart or imposing a reorganization of some state library
units. State advisory committees, roughly counterpart to the National
Commission, might also be desirable in those states lacking an
equivalent group.

Appropriations. The bulk of the appropriation under the act would be
to honor the federal “fair share” as ultimately determined. These
amounts would pass through the state agency to local libraries. In
addition, earmarked allocations would be made to state agencies to
enable them to carry out their responsibilities under the act, including
state-level library services relating to statewide networks and state
institutional library functions. Further appropriation provision would
be made for a commissioner’s discretionary fund to be disbursed, on a
competitive basis, to local or state library proposals seeking special
assistance for new or experimental library activities. Research
appropriations would also be disbursed on a proposal basis, with
eligible recipients being state and local libraries, library schools,
academic institutions, public and private elementary and secondary
schools, and public and private nonprofit organizations having a
research capacity. The act would also authorize the assistant
commissioner to receive transfer funds from other governmental
agencies and from private sources to carry out library-related
programs whether or not governmental in origin. Separate
appropriate provision should be made for reimbursement by Office of
Education to federal libraries, multistate library entities and other
resource institutions for services provided on behalf of the national
goals of the act.

If the proposed policy and legislation seem too neat and too
contrived, let me say that there are no illusions about the neatness or
the potential realization of either. The U.S. system of federal political
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action being what it is, we shall probably continue to shoot at targets of opportunity with an occasional hit and a number of misses. So be it. It would appear that we shall be better prepared, and shall do a better job of carrying out any legislative mandates if we have a common rationale for library development and a unified concept of the federal role. If this paper has advanced the dialog on either topic, it will have been useful.
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Staff for Metropolitan Library Service

BILLY R. WILKINSON

The conventional professional education, experience, and skills of librarians are being tested daily in the metropolitan libraries of the United States. Indeed, the conventional education, experience, and skills of all metropolitan library staff members—librarians, other professionals, technical assistants, information assistants, clerks, and pages—are being sorely tested in today’s urban complexities. This paper will contrast the kinds of staff members found in metropolitan libraries during the past twenty years with the staff needed for the mid-1970s.

Five types of metropolitan libraries will be discussed: (1) public libraries, (2) university libraries, (3) other large research libraries, (4) college libraries, and (5) special libraries. (Although extremely important in the metropolitan library scene, elementary and secondary school libraries will be excluded.)

Importance of Staff

The first sentences of Bryan’s The Public Librarian, A Report of the Public Library Inquiry are: “The public library is no exception to the general rule that an institution is as good as its personnel. What public libraries in the United States accomplish from day to day depends largely upon the personal qualities, specialized skills, and working effectiveness of the people who operate them.” Simply substitute “metropolitan library” for “public library” and the basic assumption and underriding theme of this article is concisely expressed.

It might seem an obvious and foregone conclusion to consider personnel as a major aspect when reviewing developments in metropolitan-area library service. However, a basic metropolitan library ingredient—the staff—is often taken for granted and ignored. There are only a few paragraphs mentioning the library staff in The Public Library and the City, the published volume from the 1963 Symposium on Library Functions in the Changing Metropolis. When
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actual metropolitan libraries are carefully studied and surveyed, the staff becomes a major concern (e.g., the excellent chapter entitled “Personnel for the Future” in Lowell Martin’s Library Response to Urban Change; Study of the Chicago Public Library).

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

Before exploring the future staffing needs in metropolitan libraries, a brief summary of the findings of two major surveys of librarianship separated by two decades will give the necessary historical background. Although neither survey was restricted exclusively to metropolitan libraries (one dealt with public libraries and librarians and the other with librarians in general), it is probably safe to assume that the data gathered also apply to metropolitan librarians.

The Public Library Inquiry of the Social Science Research Council, funded by the Carnegie Corporation and directed by Robert D. Leigh, is the first survey which furnishes background data—particularly Bryan’s study of public librarians, published in 1952 and constituting a principal part of the inquiry. Bryan characterized library school students in 1948-49 as follows: (1) a large proportion of the students attending on a part-time basis along with a part-time or full-time job; (2) a predominance of women students, but a large proportion of men entering the profession in recent years, particularly men being trained for better and higher level positions (“In 1948-49 the percentage of men to women in the undergraduate schools was 12 to 88; in the postbachelor one-year program it was 22 to 78; for advanced work for the doctorate there were in 1948-49, 50 percent each of men and women.”5); and (3) “unlikely that in competition with business, politics, medicine, law, exploration, and aviation, library schools will get a proportionate share of adventurous, hard-driving, ambitious, smartly attractive persons among each year’s college graduates.”6

When Bryan surveyed and questioned 3,107 librarians in the inquiry’s sample of sixty libraries, she found that they were “recruited mainly from native American stock, from families with better-than-average formal education and occupational status, and that the librarians seek to perpetuate their educational backgrounds in their choices of husbands and wives.”7 Personality inventories completed by the librarians showed “their median scores to be somewhat below established norms for persons with comparable general education with regard to leadership and self-confidence, but with other measured qualities near the general norms.”7

In Bryan’s sample, almost one-third of the librarians holding
bachelor's degrees had majored in English; one-sixth had a social science major and one-tenth had majored in modern languages. When the undergraduate majors of administrators were compared with those of their professional assistants, the concentration upon English, the social sciences, and modern languages was only accentuated.

Looking at more recent data on library school students and librarians, the findings of the research program into manpower issues in librarianship, directed by Wasserman and Bundy, should be considered. The reports summarizing their research were submitted to the Office of Education in 1969 and 1970. Here again, we must assume that the data would generally hold true for metropolitan library staff.

White and Macklin, in one of the studies of the manpower research program, surveyed students in the forty-five ALA-accredited library schools in 1969. They found that "among the 3,516 student respondents in this study, only 16% are male" and "there is a fairly wide distribution in age in the student bodies of library schools. In fact, many of the present students are entering or re-entering the field after raising a family. Of those surveyed in this research, more than 40% are over 30 years of age." White and Macklin also found the social origins and educational experiences of library school students to be "predominately from middle class backgrounds and having fairly average academic preparation for professional study."

With regard to their undergraduate majors, White and Macklin ascertained that the large majority have liberal arts backgrounds, with English (28 percent) and history and government (17 percent) being the two largest areas of concentration, followed by education (13 percent), behavioral sciences (11 percent), languages—other than English (10 percent), physical sciences and math (5 percent), and biological sciences (2 percent). "This is not surprising, since it follows the traditional pattern of preparation for those who go into library work. However, there is also a small, but growing number who are coming from the sciences and this is likely to increase as information science gets more emphasis in the library schools."

Segal, in another of the reports in the Wasserman-Bundy manpower research program, studied a sample of 820 librarians who had worked in various kinds of libraries in seven metropolitan areas as full-time professional staff members for a minimum of two years. They were contrasted with a smaller control group of journalists and high school counselors. He found that librarians differed from the control group "in that they can be described as more submissive and more conservative in their attitudes." One of Segal's other findings was:
"Significant differences in adult personality are found when male librarians are compared to female librarians. Male librarians characterize themselves as reserved, assertive, tough-minded, suspicious, imaginative, experimenting, and undisciplined in comparison to female librarians whose scores indicate that they see themselves as warm-hearted, humble, tender-minded, trusting, practical, conservative, and controlled."\(^1\)

Wasserman and Bundy found in their study of library administrators that they were "drawn from families in which the majority of the fathers were of the white-collar class, with professional and managerial occupations predominating, with only minimal representation from blue-collar or service occupations in their lineage."\(^2\) "Another widely shared characteristic in the backgrounds of the library administrators is the predominance among them of a humanistic undergraduate preparation."\(^3\)

Other recent surveys have ascertained the number of minority students enrolled in ALA-accredited graduate library schools. The actual numbers in three recent years are given in Table 1.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Groups</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Heritage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In May 1973, ALA's Office for Library Personnel Resources also surveyed professional library employees.\(^5\) Although only 782 libraries of the survey's total population of 4,800 libraries returned usable responses (a response rate of 28.2 percent), the following data have been reported.
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TABLE 2

CULTURAL BREAKDOWN OF PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees with:</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Oriental</th>
<th>Spanish Surnamed</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some library science education</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree in library science</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree in library science</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first category (some library science education), women constituted 90.4 percent of those surveyed. Women accounted for 77.9 percent of the staff members with a master’s degree in library science, but only 27 percent of those with doctoral degrees in library science.17

THE SITUATION IN 1973

As a clue to the current staffing needs of metropolitan libraries, a very small and informal survey was conducted in January 1974. Ten metropolitan libraries were selected—two each of urban university libraries, independent research libraries, college libraries, public library systems, and special libraries. The personnel officer or chief librarian of each library was asked to name the kind of professional position which had been the most difficult to fill with a qualified person during the past year. Table 3 summarizes the responses.

TABLE 3

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY POSITIONS DIFFICULT TO FILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Metropolitan Library</th>
<th>Most Difficult Position to Fill with a Qualified Person During Past Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban University Library A</td>
<td>Positions which required a science background, e.g., Chemistry Librarians, Librarian for Geology and Psychology, and Assistant Engineering Librarian. The latter position was vacant for nine months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Metropolitan Library</th>
<th>Most Difficult Position to Fill with a Qualified Person During Past Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library B</td>
<td>Western European Bibliographer (France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal). Library advertised and would appoint at one of three ranks (Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian) depending upon appropriate combination of academic background and/or experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Research Library A</td>
<td>Most difficulty in recruiting for positions of Circulation Librarian and Acquisitions Librarian because few graduates have these areas as their first choice; also persons with strong science backgrounds and highly qualified persons in the area of systems/computers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library B</td>
<td>Librarians with science background, particularly the physical sciences, and librarians for Near and Middle Eastern materials, with languages to include Persian, Turkish, and Arabic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Library A</td>
<td>No professional vacancies since 1971 and anticipated little difficulty in filling future vacancies because of receipt of applications from highly qualified persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library B</td>
<td>During past year only one position (Head Cataloger) to fill and had no difficulty in filling it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library System A</td>
<td>Librarian IV (Children's Services)—a supervisory position in which contacts with community and cultural organizations were a significant aspect of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System B</td>
<td>Librarians with science backgrounds and librarians who speak Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Library A</td>
<td>No professional vacancies during 1973. During 1972, the most difficult was that of Senior Librarian (Head Cataloger).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Library B                   | No professional vacancies during past four years; anticipated little difficulty in filling future vacancies because of many applicants who are well qualified.
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Even from the small sample of hard-to-fill positions in metropolitan libraries in Table 3, it would seem that librarians with science backgrounds are greatly needed in urban university libraries, independent research libraries, and public library systems. Librarians who have extensive ability in foreign languages (for bibliographical work in university libraries) or who speak Spanish (for reader services in public library systems) are also being sought. Other specialities, such as children’s services with an emphasis on contact with community organizations, are in demand. The generalist librarian, on the other hand, seems to be in ample supply. The two college libraries, for example, have not had vacancies nor do they anticipate any difficulty in filling future vacancies. The two special libraries (which are special because of the kind of organization they serve) have also not had significant vacancies. Thus, the college libraries and the special libraries have a relatively good situation. One of the college librarians noted that as long as there continues to be an overabundance of librarians, he anticipated no problem in filling vacancies, especially since the college’s salary scale was above average, and many job seekers found a metropolitan area attractive.

THE FUTURE

After even casually reviewing the foregoing data on the characteristics of library school students and librarians employed in all types of libraries, this writer (who is middle-class, white, and majored in English as an undergraduate) must ask: Who needs any more like me? Are we not overstocked with the likes of me?

If metropolitan libraries are similar to other libraries (there seems to be no reason to doubt the similarity) and do not need so many middle-class, white English majors, what, then, are their staffing needs for the future? The following attempts to answer this question.

Subject and Language Specialists. A first prediction is that metropolitan libraries will have less and less need for generalists and will instead seek librarians with strong subject specialities. The second master’s degree in a subject field will be a necessity, if not a formal requirement for many positions. Libraries will be attempting to have most of their professional staff equipped with extensive knowledge of some field so that the staff member can converse intelligently with and assist the specialist reader. Subject specialists will be needed in several kinds of metropolitan libraries—the subject divisions of central libraries of public library systems, the university libraries, the other independent
research libraries, and the small special libraries which are attached to organizations with subject specialities. Perhaps the generalist librarians will only be needed in the neighborhood branches of the public library systems, the college libraries, and the special libraries attached to an organization with a general purpose (such as general magazine publishing).

Librarians with extensive knowledge of foreign languages will also be sought by metropolitan libraries. Most positions in the Research Libraries of NYPL require at least two foreign languages. In the specialized divisions, the language requirements are even more rigorous. For example, positions in the Jewish Division require knowledge of both Hebrew and Yiddish as well as at least one other European language. One of the university libraries in the informal survey noted in Table 3 cited a Western European Bibliographer as the most difficult-to-fill position. Requirements of the position were: “graduate study (M.A.-Ph.D. level) in an academic field (e.g., modern European history, romance languages and literatures)” and “a sound command of French.”

Public Services. In the future, an even larger number of professional positions will be in public service departments as contrasted with technical services. With centralized cataloging, blanket order plans, and other recent developments in the technical aspects of librarianship, individual metropolitan libraries will seek fewer catalogers, acquisitions librarians, and other technical service librarians. If one wishes to work in technical services, the available positions will more likely be those of administrator or manager.

Metropolitan libraries, particularly the public library systems, will not only be seeking librarians and other staff for public service positions, but to fill positions working with all kinds of special publics. Staff will need the necessary skills and attitudes to work effectively with the disadvantaged, the aging, the newly arrived to the metropolis, those incarcerated in prisons or other correctional institutions, the college student, the scholar, the businessman, the artist, the adult continuing his education, the child beginning his education, or any other of the myriad of diverse human beings who are or should be using libraries to obtain the information they need. The metropolitan libraries will be searching for staff members with a commitment to service for all publics.

Media Librarians. Metropolitan libraries will no longer be hiring
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librarians who are predominately or exclusively print oriented. The multimedia approach to collection development has been stressed long and loudly enough by the profession so that most libraries are finally beginning to purchase some of their information in formats other than the book or journal. The program of study at the Columbia University School of Library Service during 1973/74 for community media librarians is an example of the school's recognition of the future needs of metropolitan public libraries. The new master's program specializes in the use of media as information resources in inner-city communities. The curriculum was tailored to meet students' needs in developing knowledge and skills in indentifying the sources of vital information needed by inner-city residents and establishing linkages with such sources; producing media for community needs; analyzing the role of media in the communities, with emphasis on cable television; and helping inner-city residents to use all media to communicate their information needs and responses.18

Minorities. Metropolitan libraries in the 1970s will be actively seeking librarians and other staff members who are members of minorities. In response to the earlier rhetorical question of the need for any more middle-class, white English majors as librarians, an equally simplified-for-effect answer would be that metropolitan libraries need Spanish-speaking Black librarians with subject specialties who are familiar with all media. Library schools and libraries are now actively seeking American Indian, Asian American, Black, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican or other Latin American students and staff members. Various library schools throughout the country have recently expanded their recruitment of minority students. Individual libraries have also increased their efforts. For example, the NYPL sought and received a foundation grant to fund its Minority Intern Program. The goal of the program is, in a one-year internship, to prepare librarians who are members of minority groups for careers as supervising subject specialists in central public libraries and academic libraries. Another example of minority programs recently developed by metropolitan libraries is the Library Intern Program jointly sponsored by the Columbia University Libraries and the School of Library Service. The work-study program is designed to recruit more individuals from minority groups into academic librarianship. It provides for the completion of the master's degree in library science in two years, during which the students work 1,200 hours per year in the university libraries on a variety of assignments as they attend the
School of Library Service on a part-time basis. In addition to a monthly compensation, tuition exemption is granted for eighteen credit points for each academic year.

Both Columbia and NYPL programs are small and only a beginning. Metropolitan and other libraries need more librarians, as well as information and technical assistants, clerks, and pages, who are from minority groups. Metropolitan libraries must have bilingual staff members—Spanish-speaking for the South Bronx in New York City or for El Centro de Informacion at the Chicago Public Library, Chinese-speaking for the NYPL Chatham Square Branch or the Chinatown branch of the San Francisco Public Library, or those who are adept in whatever language is the language of the library's community. Nor should bilingual staff members be confined only to certain ethnic branches in the large urban public library systems. The central buildings of these systems may require bilingual staff, as may be true also for metropolitan research, university, and college libraries.

If the Chinatown branch of the San Francisco Public is any indication (and it is sadly suspected to be typical), metropolitan libraries have some catching up to do. It was only in 1972 that Judy Yung was appointed to head San Francisco's Chinatown Branch. "Not only the first Chinese-speaking head librarian to serve Chinatown, she was also, incredibly enough, the first person of Chinese extraction ever to hold that post."\textsuperscript{19}

Women. During the coming decade, metropolitan libraries will hopefully be in the forefront in the advancement of more women to higher level positions. Paul Wasserman has pointed out that librarianship "can only be characterized as a male-dominated female profession."\textsuperscript{20} Wasserman and Bundy, in a 1969 study of library executives, found "among the public library administrators, 55 percent of those fifty-five years and over are male, 77 percent in the forty-five to fifty-four bracket, and 88 percent of those forty-four years or younger. . . . The same characteristic is discernible among special library administrators, where 44 percent of the older, 60 percent of the middle group, and 74 percent of those in the youngest category are male."\textsuperscript{21} They also observed that the "incidence of male ascendancy is growing sharply."\textsuperscript{22}

Bryan had described the situation much earlier: "The progressive removal in the last decades of barriers to significant careers for women in many other occupations and the increasing limitation of opportunities for promotion to the top library positions plus the
inequity of salary rewards in the middle positions have created a problem both of morale and of recruiting. Our studies showed that the poorest morale among the present public library personnel is centered in the middle administrative positions, where the quite unnecessary distortion of the salary ladder aggravates the more inevitable tensions involved in the gradual shift from a woman’s occupation to a ‘coeducational’ profession.”

Here and there in metropolitan libraries, there have been some bright spots in advancement of women to senior positions. Clara S. Jones has been director of the Detroit Public Library since 1970. Four metropolitan university libraries are outstanding examples among the libraries which comprise the Association of Research Libraries. Page Ackerman at the University of California at Los Angeles, Glenora E. Rossell at the University of Pittsburgh, Virginia Whitney at Rutgers University, and Natalie Nicholson at M.I.T. are the only women directors of ARL libraries. Metropolitan libraries, however, have a long way to go before the situation becomes equitable. Extensive data on large public libraries recently gathered and analyzed by Carpenter and Shearer confirm this conclusion.

ADVICE TO LIBRARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Another way to describe future staffing patterns of metropolitan libraries is to pretend that one is hired by a library school dean to advise beginning students. What areas of librarianship would one recommend for the students’ consideration and concentration? What areas of librarianship will expand and develop in the coming decade?

In no particular order of importance, the following recommendations might be given to the beginning library school student or to the librarian who is continuing his or her education. Become expert in those areas already stressed above (public services with an emphasis on outreach; languages; subject specialization, particularly science). In addition, acquire knowledge and skills in one or more of the following areas: (1) community relations; (2) systems analysis, automation, data processing; (3) budgeting and financial control; (4) measurement and evaluation of services; (5) the fundamentals of interlibrary cooperation and of cooperation between libraries and other institutions; (6) lobbying techniques at the local, state, and federal levels of government; (7) fund raising from private and other sources; (8) preservation and conservation of library materials; (9) labor relations (negotiations, grievance procedures); and (10) staff development, personnel work in the areas of employment.
and placement, administration of fringe benefits. The curricula of library schools will not include all of these specialities; however courses in labor relations, finance, and other specialties are available to library school students and librarians through other departments and schools of the universities. These kinds of expertise will be extremely important in the future if metropolitan libraries are to survive and expand their services. These skills are sometimes possessed by librarians, but often metropolitan libraries, particularly large ones, must hire nonlibrarian professionals for these assignments. Since these kinds of expertise will only increase in importance, it is highly recommended that library school students and librarians prepare themselves for the future by concentrating on one or more of them.

Large metropolitan libraries will always employ nonlibrarian professionals when they have need of certain kinds of expertise. Community relations is, naturally, the business of each staff member working in the neighborhood branch of a public library system. However, because of the dearth of Spanish-speaking librarians, the Branch Libraries of the NYPL employed bilingual persons as community liaison assistants in its South Bronx Project. These staff members, paid at the same salary as beginning librarians, have been adjudged highly successful in accomplishing the goals of the project.

In the area of systems analysis, automation, and data processing, libraries have employed outside experts as well as set up on-the-job training programs for librarians and other present staff members. Wasserman observed in 1965 that “during recent years there has been a pronounced tendency for individuals trained in systems analysis or industrial engineering, and not in librarianship, to come to play a role of growing importance in library administration.”

With the complexities of budgets—their preparation, presentation, and justification—and the systems of financial controls often imposed by the parent or money-granting body, some libraries have hired financial experts and given them such titles as budget officer or planning and budget officer.

In contrast, few libraries have hired outside experts in the measurement and evaluation of services. Neither have libraries developed such expertise in those already on the staff. Gaines has succinctly summarized the situation: “Librarians generally are good at counting things, but not at measuring things.” Perhaps librarians should move expeditiously into this role before the budget examiner of the city government which funds the public library or some university or corporate vice president (all of whom may lack understanding of the
problem) fills the void. Possibly the budget officer and the assistant
director for public service, along with other staff members, should
develop a program of measurement and evaluation of library services.

Library school students and librarians must acquaint themselves
with cooperative systems which are now being planned throughout the
country among all types of libraries. What is really needed, more than
knowledge of present and planned cooperative ventures among
libraries and other institutions, is a positive attitude toward
cooperation—an attitude on the part of the individual which would not
emphasize the difficulties, but which would concentrate on the areas
where progress may be possible.

Too many librarians persist in thinking of lobbying at the local, state,
and federal levels of government as a dirty political business in which
no library or librarian should be engaged. However, at least one major
metropolitan library has recently employed for its staff a person with
extensive knowledge and experience in the workings of its state
legislature. In addition to other duties in the areas of fund raising,
work with foundations and special projects, the staff member carries
the library's story to individual legislators and their staff assistants and
seeks continued and increased funding for the individual library as
well as all libraries in the state. Most libraries will not be able to have
such a position on the staff. Each individual librarian must share the
responsibilities of acquainting various governmental officials with the
need for funds. Sophisticated, professional lobbying ability will have to
be developed in many librarians if their institutions are to receive
adequate funding. Fund raising ability to tap private and other sources
will also be a necessity. Large libraries may be able to have nonlibrarian
experts, but most libraries will have to rely on the abilities of their own
librarians. Librarians must get over their fear and lack of knowledge in
developing budgets and in justifying them to governmental and
private sources of funds.

Relevant to metropolitan libraries of any size is a developing area of
librarianship—the preservation and conservation of materials and
collections. The deterioration of library materials has been extensively
documented in the literature and needs no recounting here. Two brief
examples will give clues to future developments. A large metropolitan
university library recently advertised nationally for applicants for the
position of head of a new preservation department. The Research
Libraries of NYPL had previously created a conservation division in
1971 with responsibility for establishing policies and procedures
relating to the preservation of materials. The division includes the
Another area of expertise which will be increasingly sought by metropolitan libraries is in labor relations. With unionization of both clerical and professional staff members becoming more extensive, particularly in urban areas, library administrators will have need of assistants who can conduct negotiations for the first and succeeding contracts and are familiar with the complexities of labor relations. Ability and experience in bargaining, drafting the text of contracts, conducting grievance hearings, and representing the library before arbitrators are new requirements for librarians wishing to concentrate in library personnel work.

Library school students and librarians would also do well to prepare themselves for other aspects of personnel work. With a larger portion of each library's budget going to staff and staff-related costs, the importance of improved methods of recruitment and placement, strong staff development programs, and efficient administration of complex fringe benefits will become even more marked for metropolitan libraries in the future.

AUXILIARY STAFF

Paraprofessional Positions. The foregoing paragraphs attempt to predict the kinds of expertise which will be required of librarians and other professionals employed in metropolitan libraries. Another category of staff members will also be important in future staffing patterns of metropolitan libraries. The number of paraprofessional positions, such as technical assistants or information assistants, has increased during the past five years. The Branch Libraries of NYPL employs approximately seventy information assistants at its public service desks. These college graduates receive on-the-job training and are supervised by librarians. The NYPL Research Libraries currently employs over 200 technical assistants who work in both public and technical service divisions. They receive their technical training after being employed at NYPL. Various two-year colleges have also recently established programs to produce library technical assistants. For example, Manhattan Community College of the City University of New York graduated its first class of library technical assistants in 1973.²⁷ Lowell Martin recommended that the Chicago Public Library develop a technician program as a third career sequence between the clerical and the professional levels and saw the development of this intermediate group as a "key element in building the staff for the future."²⁸

A major development in the use of paraprofessionals in
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metropolitan libraries occurred on March 7, 1973 when New York City signed a contract with the Administration and Management Research Association to create a system of Citizens Urban Information Centers (CUIC) in the branches of the Brooklyn Public Library. CUIC will be "designed to establish a network of neighborhood-based community information centers to provide, across-the-board to all residents, information on available public and private resources as a means of coping with problems they encounter, particularly those problems in which agencies of government have a responsibility for providing services or assistance." The Brooklyn Public Library will recruit and train a corps of paraprofessionals to answer requests by citizens for information on governmental services. It is expected that two paraprofessionals will be placed in each of the branches of the Brooklyn system. The initial proposal was for a citywide program to include New York City's three public library systems (Brooklyn, New York, and Queens), but when funds for the entire program were unattainable, a single borough was selected as a demonstration project.

Clerical Staff. Just as the development of the CUICs at the Brooklyn Public Library may influence the future use of paraprofessionals in metropolitan libraries, other private and governmental programs may affect the spectrum of clerical staff members in metropolitan libraries. Operation Mainstream, a federally funded program to return persons who are 55 years and older to work, may increase the number of older staff members. Federal funds from the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 and the Public Employment Program have also allowed libraries to employ as clerical staff members persons who had been unable to find employment, who were underemployed, or who had previously been receiving public assistance. The Vera Institute of Justice and The New York Public Library in September 1972 began a program whereby ex-drug addicts were assigned to more than thirty clerical positions in the Mid-Manhattan Library and in the Technical Services of the Branch Libraries. Their salaries are paid by the Wildcat Service Corporation, a subsidiary of the Vera Institute, but the final selection, training, and supervision are done by the library's supervisory staff. With only these few examples as illustration it is safe to predict that the future sources of clerical staff members for metropolitan libraries will be more varied than in the past.

Security Staff. Metropolitan libraries in the future will find it necessary to increase the number of security staff in order to protect readers,
collections, staff members, and buildings. As one commentary has put it, “Libraries are faced with a problem that seems to get worse each year: library security. [During 1973] there were too many large scale thefts—successful despite elaborate and costly security precautions. There have always been losses from theft, vandalism, fires, and floods, but libraries seem to be losing more than they used to, and costs are up on replacing and repairing materials as well as on protecting them.”

FUTURE AS SEEN BY NATIONAL COMMISSION

In its draft of “A New National Program of Library and Information Service,” the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is attempting to forecast and fashion the future of American libraries. In its early deliberations, the commission focused on six facets of the problem of inefficient and wasteful usage of unorganized knowledge of resources. After reviewing the needs of users, the deficiencies of current services, the trend toward cooperative action, the financial base of libraries, and the potential of new technology, the commission focused on the staffing needs of libraries and information centers. Its summary statement on staffing holds true for metropolitan libraries as well as for American libraries in general:

The human resources required to plan, creatively manage, and operate the nation’s libraries and information centers are poorly understood analytically. An assessment of the quantity and quality of the manpower to meet future demands for information services in the U.S. has not yet been made in any depth. It is clear that new approaches to educational programs will be needed in library science and information science if library technicians, professionals, and auxiliary personnel are to learn to function in non-traditional ways.

The future staff members of metropolitan libraries cannot be conventional or “submissive and conservative in attitudes” as Segal found in his 1970 study of metropolitan librarians.

Submissiveness and conservatism represent two characteristics that would readily be gratified in a profession that is characterized as authoritarian in its internal structure and stable and unchanging in its relationship to other institutions of the society. This would seem to have been historically true for the library. As long as these characteristics allow the library to fulfill its societal role, manpower problems can be solved by searching out submissive, conservative
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individuals who are seeking a professional commitment within a stable, unchanging institution. However, manpower problems become difficult when the traditional role of the library is no longer considered capable of responding to new needs for information and new services for new populations and significant changes must occur if the library is to be responsive to the society. 32

Professional, technical, and clerical staff members must indeed begin to “function in non-traditional ways.” 31 Energetic, noncomplacent persons with questioning attitudes, equipped with one or more of the areas of expertise mentioned earlier, will be sought by metropolitan libraries in order that these libraries may survive and particularly if they are to expand to their full potential of service.
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Services to the Disadvantaged

GENEVIEVE M. CASEY

One of the most significant developments in urban public librarianship has been the library's effort to reach out to that part of the population broadly described as disadvantaged.

Data gathered by Berelson in the 1940s as a part of the Public Library Inquiry documented that the public library was serving not the whole community, but rather a narrow segment of it—about 10 percent—who were white, middle-class, economically stable but not rich, fairly well educated, but not intellectually elite. Public librarians could not deny the validity of Berelson's research, but they rejected angrily his explicit recommendation that they concentrate upon the public for whom their services were structured and revise their dreams about serving the whole community. In response to Berelson's research, efforts began in the 1940s to broaden the impact of the public library.

Within the last fifteen years, several factors have converged to cause public libraries to intensify these outreach efforts. Among them were: (1) the social climate of the 1960s which made everyone more aware of the injustices perpetrated on Blacks, Indians, Spanish-surnamed and other minorities; (2) the “war on poverty” initiated by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations with federal funds earmarked for service to the poor; and (3) a radical change in the population of the great cities. Beginning with the World War II years, there has been a continual migration of the rural southern and Puerto Rican poor, both Black and white, into the major cities and, at the same time, a movement of white, middle-class families out of the central cities and into the suburbs.

Mel Ravitz, a professor at Wayne State University's College of Lifelong Learning and for many years a member of Detroit's Common Council, observes “American cities are changing from being the centers of social, political, economic, cultural, educational life to being merely catchment areas for the old, the poor, and those nobody else
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wants or even wants to see." "The central city," he writes, "is where we plan to house the Other America, with the hope that 'out of sight is out of mind.'"2

Major urban public libraries—New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, etc.—find their traditional public seriously eroded and are thus forced to seek new users.

The extent of the library's effort to adapt to its new public is evidenced by ERIC's selective bibliography on Library Service to the Disadvantaged3 which records over 350 books, articles and reports. As recently as 1971 when Allie Beth Martin queried the libraries studied by Berelson, she found that among twelve critical problems they included "the problems of society—change—urban problems," and "failure to serve all publics (minorities, deprived . . .)."4 Although the majority of librarians feel now that the public library today is serving most effectively "the middle class general reader,"5 there is consensus that the first goal of the public library should be "to provide service to all," especially "reaching unserved."6

Who are the unserved, the unreached, the urban disadvantaged about whom public libraries are concerned? Eugene Johnson suggests five types of American citizens who are disadvantaged: (1) the young, especially school dropouts under 21 years old, (2) the old, (3) the functionally illiterate, (4) the "new immigrants" who move from rural areas into cities, and (5) the Blacks who are the majority in each of the other four groups.7 Benjamin Bloom, et al., in education define the culturally disadvantaged as the 33 percent of all high school entrants who drop out before graduation, and immigrants to the cities from Puerto Rico, Mexico and the rural South.8 Casper Jordan, in attempting to summarize various definitions of the disadvantaged, includes "those Americans who belong to sub-cultures which are different from and generally less advanced than the dominant culture." He would also accept as disadvantaged "all those Americans who belong to the lower socio-economic group and who are disadvantaged in the sense that they have fewer opportunities than the average American."9 One would need to add to the above groups the physically and mentally handicapped living in the community and in institutions, as well as alcoholics, drug addicts, the delinquent and the criminal. All of these target groups—ethnic minorities, including Blacks, Hispanos and Indians, the functionally illiterate, the recent immigrants to the city, the aged, the handicapped, the institutionalized and the shut-in—have in common that they are not the library's traditional users and that they require some restructuring of the
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It is important to realize, however, that one cannot stereotype all individuals within these target groups. Many people over 65, for example, are in no sense disadvantaged. Not all poor people are illiterate and not all holders of advanced degrees manage to succeed in the economic jungle. Although the precise extent of the civil rights thrust has not been measured, it has been estimated that about 50 percent of the Black population now falls into the middle class. Also, the various target groups tend to overlap and are, at best, only ways of thinking about an extremely complex situation. With these caveats, this paper will explore the library and information needs of two disadvantaged groups who are potential users of metropolitan libraries, what their special needs imply in terms of library service and what presently is being done to serve them. The aged and the functionally illiterate have been chosen as typical of the urban disadvantaged since they include the handicapped, the poor, and ethnic minorities. Solutions found in serving these groups are relevant to the problems of out-reach generally.

THE AGED

According to the 1970 census, there are now approximately 20 million Americans 65 years of age or older, almost two-thirds of whom live in metropolitan areas—one-third in central cities. The aging as a group are increasing faster than the general population (a 21 percent increase between 1960 and 1970, compared with a 13 percent increase in the general population). By 1985, it is estimated that there will be 25 million Americans 65 and over, and by the year 2000, 28 million. Clearly, the metropolitan public library needs to recognize the needs of the aging in present and future plans.

Although stereotypes are dangerous, there are characteristics of the aging as a group which define them as disadvantaged and which dictate special library services. The aging tend to have less formal education than the younger adult population. Approximately 60 percent of those over 65 have completed only 8 years or less of schooling, compared with about 25 percent in the 14-64 age group. One-fifth of the aging are regarded as functionally illiterate. However, as the present population of better educated individuals ages, the level of educational attainment in the 65-and-over age group will rise, although it may always lag behind the level of younger generations.

In 1969, approximately 74 percent of the men and 90 percent of the
women 65 years of age and older were not in the labor force. This fact has obvious implications for greater leisure and reduced income among the aging. The median income of the aging is significantly lower than that of the total population. Fifty percent of the households headed by aging persons have incomes of less than $5,000 (compared with 15 percent of the households headed by younger adults), and 25 percent of the aging are living below the poverty level as defined by HEW. Most aging people depend on federal and state pensions and assistance, private pensions and income from investments—relatively fixed incomes particularly vulnerable to inflation. Approximately one-fourth of the aging live alone, or with nonrelatives. Five percent live in institutions.

About 30 percent of those over 75, and 10 percent of those 65-74 suffer from long-term disabilities. A significant proportion, approximately 25 percent, of the aging are relatively immobile. Although precise statistics are not maintained, it has been estimated that more than one-half of the users of the Regional Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped are aging. Today's street crime in the big cities often makes even healthy old people prisoners in their own homes.

Within the context of the above facts, as gathered in the 1970 census, the final report of the White House Conference on Aging held in November, 1971 provides a blueprint for library planners on the needs and concerns of aging Americans as they themselves and the people who work with them perceive these needs. Survival issues—income and employment, health care, transportation, housing, nutrition—surfaced as the central concerns of the aging.

Related to the battle for physical survival, and perhaps even more crucial, is the battle old people wage for psychological survival. In a section on "retirement roles and activities," 306 delegates to the White House Conference (34 percent of whom were retired persons) pondered such questions as: Does our society need its older citizens at all? What are they good for? Do they have a right to a place in our social order? What are older people to do with the rest of their lives after they are no longer working? Does our nation have any responsibility for helping the elderly to find greater meaning and personal satisfaction in the later years? The very fact that such questions were debated reflects the psychological climate in which older people live. This group proposed fifteen recommendations including better preparation for retirement, leisure and life off the job, greater involvement of older
people in community and civic affairs and in formulating goals and policies on their own behalf, and special effort by the mass media to enhance the image of older persons.12

Against this grim picture of lonely old age, psychologist Evelyn Duval emphasized the importance to most aging people of their family relationships. The great majority of persons over 65, she told the delegates, live in families; most are married and living with their spouses; some are making homes for their adult children or elderly parents. She cited many recent studies which document a “two directional, three-generation flow of emotional and financial support common between older parents and grandparents and their grown children.” Disengagement, Duval asserted, “tends to be into rather than out of the family.”13

Throughout the discussions on major physical and psychological survival issues at the White House Conference were recommendations of great relevance for libraries about the need for (1) information about and referral to community resources; (2) information about how to minimize the difficulties of old age and maximize its opportunities, to the aging themselves and their families; (3) information about the special needs of the aging in the areas of housing, income, employment, health care, nutrition, etc. to citizens responsible for planning, policy making, appropriation, legislation, etc.; (4) pre-retirement preparation, including education on creative use of leisure, and how to plan for life on a reduced income addressed to middle aged people; and (5) education toward more constructive attitudes about aging as a part of life to be respected and enjoyed, to people of all ages.

The discussions at the White House Conference most immediately relevant to libraries, however, were those about the educational needs of the aging. Despite the fact that, in general, older persons did not perceive education as having any direct relevance for their interests and needs, delegates to the education section stressed the importance of lifelong learning directed toward an acceptance of the dignity and worth of nonwork pursuits, the development of leisure skills, maximum use of community resources, more successful adjustment to aging and training for political action. They recommended that the elderly should be involved in the planning of educational programs and that special effort be made to reach those who because of low income, poor health, foreign language or illiteracy are “less likely to respond voluntarily.” Although the delegates favored programs in which the young and the old learned together, they affirmed that “alternatives must be provided which emphasize the felt needs of the aged at their particular stage in the life cycle.”14
Among the twenty-three recommendations about education adopted by the conference were two that refer specifically to public libraries. Recommendation VII: *Public Libraries, A Community Learning Resource*, states: "Public libraries serve to support the cultural, informational and recreational aspirations of all residents at many community levels. Since older adults are increasingly advocating and participating in lifetime education, we recommend that the public library, because of its nearby neighborhood character, be strengthened and used as a primary community resource. Adequate and specific funding for this purpose must be forthcoming from all levels of government and, most important, from private philanthropy." Recommen
dation VIII proposes that a title be added to the Library Services and Construction Act to provide library services for older adults. This recommendation has now been adopted, although as of June 1974 funding was not yet available.

How well are urban libraries today meeting the needs of the aging so clearly defined at the White House Conference? An inventory of special services to the aging offered by all public libraries serving 25,000 people or more was completed in November 1972 by Booz, Allen, & Hamilton under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education. The inventory defined a program or service to the aging as "any library program or service (1) which is offered specifically for the aging or (2) in which 50 percent of the participants are 65 years of age or older." The study thus did not attempt to gather data on routine services to individual library patrons who happened to be aging.

About 80 percent of the responding libraries reported some special service to the aging. Most of this service (61.7 percent) was to the handicapped, homebound or institutionalized—a group who constitute about 25 percent of the aging. Services include delivery of books by mail or in person, and deposit collections in nursing homes, residences for older people and service centers. Slightly less than one-half of the libraries conducted some special group programs for the aging either in the library or in some other center. Seventy-four percent of the libraries provided special materials for the aging, usually books in large print and/or talking books. Outstanding among the nation's libraries offering services to the aging are Cleveland Public Library with its shut-in service which began in 1941 and its "live long and like it" group for the well aged; Boston Public Library which conducts a similar informal education program at both main library and branches; and Detroit Public Library with its recently acquired "mainstream" bookmobile serving residences for the aged. St. Louis
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and Milwaukee Public libraries also offer comprehensive programs for the aging.

Funds budgeted annually by the responding libraries, specifically for services to the aged, amounted to $1,448,000—slightly over 1 percent of their total budget. Most of this, $969,000, came from sources other than local operating budgets (usually grants from LSCA or other federal programs).

The total number of aging reached by all these services was only 204,541, or less than 2 percent of the aging in the reporting libraries’ service areas. Even granting that the inventory does not reflect the libraries’ primary service to individual users, the record is deplorable. The libraries admitted that they now give service to the aging the lowest priority among the five age groups in the population (preschool, children, young adults, adults (21-64) and aging (65 and over). They anticipate, however, that service to the aging within the next five years will be ranked on a par with that to children and young people, after service to adults 21-64.

Insufficient funds were cited by the libraries as their chief constraint in serving the aging. Other constraints were difficulty of access to the library caused by architectural barriers and transportation problems, inadequate coordination between all community agencies serving the aging, lack of staff and difficulty in identifying the aging.

As a nontraditional educational agency dealing with individuals in an informal mode, the urban public library could play a central role in the education of the aging. The content, the manner, the level and the mode of delivery are all clearly indicated by data in the census and in the White House Conference final report. The following conclusions seem almost too obvious. Public libraries must:

1. Plan library services with aging users and potential users;
2. Concentrate upon information/referral services which will aid the aging and their families to cope with survival problems—housing, income, health care, safety, nutrition, etc.;
3. Present a more positive image of aging as a part of life by creative promotion of materials and services;
4. Bring aging people together with others of their own age, and with younger people in programs designed for cultural enrichment and lifetime learning;
5. Emphasize adult basic education, reading, computing, coping skills;
6. Deliver library materials, services and programs to the aging where they are—to their homes, to senior citizen residences and centers;
7. Provide transportation to bring the aging to the library for individual reader guidance and group stimulation;
8. Exploit the potential of nonprint media for the benefit of the functionally illiterate and poor reader; and
9. Present educational experiences in an uncompetitive, nonthreatening, informal manner.

THE FUNCTIONALLY ILLITERATE ADULT

The functionally illiterate adult may be defined as a man or woman, 16 years of age or older, who cannot read, write and compute well enough to perform as an independent adult. Before the experience with literacy training which received a major thrust in the mid-1960s, the functional illiterate had been defined as a person with less than 5 years of schooling. The last ten years have convinced adult educators that the fifth-grade reading level as measured by most standardized tests simply is not adequate for accomplishing the functions of an independent adult in today's world, and that it cannot be assumed that years of schooling equate with reading level. Armed Forces experience confirmed that frequently young recruits were reading from three to four grade levels below their number of years of schooling. In April 1970, therefore, when the Adult Education Act of 1966 was amended, the definition of functional illiteracy was changed to mean less than high school completion. The 1970 census identified 57 million Americans with less than high school education, the majority of them living in metropolitan areas.

In general, most adult basic education experts agree now that the persons who can read and compute at the 10 to 10.5 level as measured on a standardized test such as the California Test of Adult Basic Education or the Iowa Test of Educational Development are less likely to suffer severe hardship from specific illiteracies in terms of the functions they must perform, because their skills will be advanced enough to allow for flexibility. In 1970, Louis Harris and Associates conducted a study of the literacy level of Americans for the National Reading Center in which they defined literacy in terms of probability of survival in society. For testing they used tasks such as following directions for direct distance dialing or reading newspaper ads for jobs or housing. This study
concluded that 13 percent of the population who were over 15 years of age (or 18.5 million) were at the marginal survival level, and 3 percent (or 4.3 million) were at low survival probability.\textsuperscript{21}

Who are the functionally illiterate, where are they, in what ways are they similar to literate adults, and in what ways do they differ in their needs, values and abilities? Research has documented that the functional illiterate usually belongs to a minority culture—Black, Appalachian white, American Indian or Spanish-surnamed. He/she is most often poor (the 13 million employed adults in the United States with less than high school education account for 35 percent of the work force, but 62.3 percent of workers with annual income below $3,000).\textsuperscript{22} People with little schooling also account for a disproportionate percentage of welfare recipients.

Whether he lives down a dry creek bed or in a crowded urban slum, the functional illiterate is isolated. He moves from place to place frequently within a small neighborhood. Because he is poor, he usually lives in crowded, dangerous, cold, unsanitary quarters. In metropolitan areas, he is more likely to live in the inner-city than in the suburbs.

The functionally illiterate adult has all the normal adult roles to play—parent, spouse, church member, worker, friend, student, voter, etc. When and if he reads, he is interested in the same content areas as most adults—medicine (health), psychology, economics, religion, sociology, history, and civics, in approximately that order.\textsuperscript{23} In many ways, his learning patterns are like those of all adults. He is reluctant to take risks, especially risks which may lead him to look foolish, and this reluctance increases with age. As he gets older he experiences greater difficulty in switching his attention. This can mean that the overdue gas bill or the delinquent child or wandering spouse is likely to block out interest in reading or in any other kind of information-seeking behavior for a time. Like all adults, he learns slowly at first, but this initial plateau is more likely to cause the adult illiterate to panic and to drop out of educational programs.

The functionally illiterate adult differs from other adults in that he needs more repetition, prompting and trials in order to learn; is slower to respond and to reach mastery; tends to be poor in both cognitive and motor or manipulative tasks; and learns more easily from listening than from seeing.

He is probably a person with some rather well organized defenses, expressed in apathy, hostility, or almost pathological attachment to his family, his ethnic group, or his religious convictions. These defenses
may be very necessary to him to separate him from chaos, and must therefore be tolerated and respected.

Although the illiterate adult plays all the usual adult roles, he tends to be socially off-time. As Troll and Schlossberg point out, middle-class professional people (including librarians) need to guard against making unconscious judgements about the 15-year-old mother and the 50-year-old beginning reader.24

The Appalachian Adult Education Center (AAEC), after seven years of intensive research and demonstration with illiterate adults, has defined four service groups among the 57 million adults in the United States with less than a high school education.25 Group one includes "those individuals who are economically and personally secure and believe there is a beneficial return from involvement in education, library and other services." This group is relatively easy to reach and serve, can profit from group activities and can be recruited through the mass media—television, radio, newspapers, etc. They tend to be registered library borrowers. Group two includes those who have suffered some disadvantage from undereducation such as continuous underemployment. They, too, are relatively easy to reach and serve and often show dramatic changes in economic levels and lifestyle as a result of education/library services. The chief adjustment many libraries need to make in service to this group is an extension of hours to accommodate to their long working hours. Group three includes those who are a long way from mastery in terms of both the reading and computation skills needed for high school equivalency and a living wage. If they are employed, it is in low-paying, dead-end and short-term jobs. However, they still believe that there is a return to be realized from involvement with public services. They require one-to-one recruitment and one-to-one services, although well-designed media campaigns do fortify personal recruiters. Group four is the smallest group, highest in priority on a need index. This group is unemployed, and unemployable and fatalistic. The AAEC refers to them as "the stationary poor." They must be approached in their homes, individually, if services are to be available to them. These four groups could provide library planners with a useful model in thinking about services for the disadvantaged.

What are libraries doing to serve the functionally illiterate adult? An American Library Association survey conducted in 1969 revealed that 99 percent of all public libraries serving over 500,000 people were conducting some programs to serve the poor.26 Federal funds—LSCA and others—were almost overwhelmingly the principal source of
funding for these projects. The largest number of personnel hired to carry out programs to the disadvantaged were paraprofessional, indigenous personnel. One wonders how many of these programs will survive the demise of interest and funding at the federal level, how many will become institutionalized within local operating budgets. The 99 percent statistic must not be interpreted to mean that metropolitan public libraries have achieved an adequate, let alone superior level of service to the adult illiterate. In fact, after a study of services to the disadvantaged in fifteen major libraries, Claire Lipsman concluded in 1972: "In the communities in which libraries would most wish to penetrate, where the general level of education and literacy is low, the library service is least successful—the presence of adult users, who constitute roughly half of the libraries' clientele in middle class neighborhoods, decreases, in some black hard-core poverty areas to less than 10 percent."

In 1963, the Adult Services Division of ALA established a standing Committee on Reading Improvement for Adults with the charge "to stimulate librarians to realize their responsibilities and their role in an all-out effort to combat illiteracy; to survey existing library programs for undereducated adults; to furnish information in support of legislation and cooperative action to extend adult literacy; to survey existing materials which meet the interests and needs of the undereducated adult, reinforce his skills and establish habits of continuing reading; to document the great need for more and better instructional and supplementary reading materials for the adult just learning to read." The following year, the committee obtained a small grant from the J. Morris Jones World Book Award fund to conduct a study of normative public library services to the illiterate adult leading to recommendations for their extension and improvement. Bernice MacDonald visited fifteen metropolitan libraries between November 1964 and March 1965 to obtain facts on current programs of service to adult illiterates. She found that all of these libraries were engaged in active planning with a wide variety of community agencies working to teach adults to read. She found that the librarians she visited were aware of the increasing opportunities for illiterate adults to learn and were seeking ways to participate, and that they were unclear about the library's role. Among the library programs she identified were an experimental project in basic research in literacy education at Cleveland Public Library, an adult reading center at Kalamazoo Public Library which not only acquired and commissioned a comprehensive collection of materials but also served as a catalyst bringing volunteer
teacher and adult nonreader together. She also found literacy classes promoted by the Cumberland County Public Library in North Carolina and increased work with publishers by New York, Brooklyn and Philadelphia Public Libraries. She questioned the future of library services to illiterates because librarians generally were "hampered by the fundamental lack of knowledge, skills and ideas in doing so." 

Most librarians would agree that, in cooperation with adult basic education programs conducted by the schools or other agencies, the most obvious contribution of the library is the identification and provision of materials. Research by the AAEC and by Helen Lyman at the University of Wisconsin on the reading interests of the adult new reader now are available to librarians. As more easy reading materials on an adult level become available, Lyman's model on how to evaluate them becomes increasingly valuable.

Since libraries as a first step must coordinate their efforts with the schools and other agencies involved in adult basic education, the experiment-demonstration on Interrelating Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults, begun in 1972 by the Appalachian Adult Education Center in Morehead, Kentucky, is of great relevance. The project is a demonstration of four alternative working models for Adult Basic Education-Library cooperation, two of them involving metropolitan public libraries in Birmingham, Alabama and Columbia, South Carolina. Experience thus far in the project indicates that a cooperative approach can result in better service to the adult illiterate, that joint effort is not easy for a variety of administrative and philosophical reasons and that obstacles can be identified and overcome. Simply as a reflection of how the library profession looks to a sympathetic "outsider" from another discipline, the two-volume 1973 annual report of the project should be required reading for all librarians.

Given Lipsman's finding that a major obstacle to better library services to the nonreading adult is the common lack of knowledge and skills in this speciality on the part of most public librarians, it would seem essential that there be more preservice and continuing education in this area. At a Seminar on Service to the Adult Illiterate held at Wayne State University in 1972, and attended by both library science students and practicing librarians, the participants reached consensus on the following guidelines for public library planning:

1) The Public Library should place high priority on developing services for the functionally illiterate adult.
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2) The Public Library should not offer direct instruction in reading but rather should provide a linkage between the functionally illiterate adult and existing reader development programs.

3) The public library should assume a catalytic role in encouraging the establishment of Adult Basic Education programs in the community if they do not already exist.

4) The public library should support adult basic education programs with materials and special services.

5) Librarians serving functionally illiterate adults should be “people-oriented,” and have personal qualities of patience, sensitivity, flexibility.

6) The library staff should reflect the ethnic composition of the community it serves.

7) Librarians should have a thorough knowledge of the community and its resources and a professional knowledge of all available materials in all media.

8) Library staff should be able to communicate with the functionally illiterate client in such a way as to give him confidence in using the library.

9) The library should offer in-service training to the staff to give them awareness of the needs of the functionally illiterate adult.

10) The library should hire or develop a reading specialist to seek out suitable materials and to promote programs and services for the functionally illiterate adult.

11) The library should give high priority to determining the reading interests and reading levels of its actual and potential users.

12) The library should provide materials for the illiterate adult which reflect his contemporary problems and life style.

13) The library should provide materials in audio and visual form as well as print.

14) The library should acquire bibliographies of material recommended for the functionally illiterate adult and conduct a continuous evaluation and review of the collection.

15) To inform functionally illiterate adults of public library services, the library should use a one-to-one personal approach as well as announcements in the mass media.

16) The library should maintain a two-way communication with adult basic education agencies in the community, becoming acquainted with their programs, goals and objectives.
17) The library should offer workshops on how to use the library for staff and clients of adult basic education programs.
18) The library should aid adult basic education agencies in evaluating materials.
19) The library should deposit materials in adult basic education agencies as well as make them available in the library itself.33
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Emerging Programs of Cooperation

RUSSELL SHANK

Metropolitan library cooperation is a subject which has received little special attention. Although library service in metropolitan areas has been rather thoroughly studied, most documentation has paid only scant attention to cooperation in the metropolitan environment. There is also considerable literature on cooperation among libraries, but it lacks delineation of developments and issues that relate specifically to the metropolitan environment. Furthermore, there is no thorough inventory of cooperative ventures from which one might derive general observations or draw a sample for systematic study. This paper is an attempt to provide a brief overview of elements that seem to juxtapose metropolitan librarianship and library cooperation. In its preparation, I have relied not only on the published literature, but I have also received valuable assistance from extended personal conversations with leaders in planning and administration of metropolitan libraries and library cooperation.

Metropolitan regions have characteristics that contain both opportunities and constraints for cooperative activities. The metropolitan region is typically rich in library resources and hence is a seemingly fertile area for cooperation. This richness is at times almost outlandish. Woods noted in 1965 that 3,768, or more than 44 percent, of the nation's special libraries were in only 9 standard metropolitan areas. In describing cooperation in New York City Cory noted that the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO) had 50 members in 1968 with 400 library outlets and nearly 25,000,000 volumes in cataloged collections. Metropolitan libraries are also diverse in subject orientation and heterogeneous in type.

The opportunity for cooperation among metropolitan libraries is both heightened and constrained by other environmental conditions. The typical metropolitan area contains a number of different political jurisdictions, which often include portions of several states. In addition
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metropolitan areas sustain a larger user population which may approach libraries in a variety of roles. For example, a faculty member of a college may also be a consultant to a local business firm and a citizen concerned about community affairs. A library user does not always discriminate among libraries with different missions, and often seeks assistance from a library whose resources are inappropriate to his needs. Furthermore, there is a growing sentiment that each citizen should have access to resources of the community regardless of agency mission.

Rich resources, complex political configurations, diverse libraries, and large and varied user populations provide urgent demand for mechanisms to bring users and resources together, opportunities for developing powerful information and library services, and constraints to easy solutions to problems of cooperation.

Blasingame and DeProspo note that “it is difficult to distinguish one library system from another in terms of purpose alone; rather, one is forced to describe each in terms of its constituency and organizational pattern.” This observation is valid for the study of library cooperative ventures of all kinds. The focus of this article is on programs for metropolitan constituencies and the organizational structures created for library cooperation. Major categories of library cooperative endeavors are delineated, and some of the special characteristics and problems that seem to derive from the metropolitan milieu are described.

**METROPOLITAN LIBRARY COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES**

Metropolitan library cooperative activities may be categorized into three groups according to constituency and goals: those organized to offer standard public library service to all citizens of a region; those organized to improve total community resources and services beyond the standard; and those organized to offer improved services to special categories of the population.

*Standard Service to All Residents.* For a number of years one of the key features of the American library movement has been the extension of basic library services to all citizens. The recent impetus for this work has been in state and federal subsidy programs, particularly the Library Services and Construction Act. In many metropolitan areas, and particularly in the suburbs, extension has been brought about through the formation of cooperative systems of public libraries.
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such systems each library maintains its separate identity, but is encouraged to share resources and services with nearby communities. Membership in such cooperatives is voluntary, but only members receive the benefits of subsidies from the state. Separate regional system headquarters agencies may be established to coordinate system activities and to operate such special services as centralized acquisitions and cataloging and advanced reference work. In the past, large urban main libraries and their systems of branches have frequently been omitted from such cooperative ventures because they already offer basic library services to their constituents. In some areas, however, urban main libraries serve as the headquarters for library systems. Some urban libraries offer various centralized services under contract to libraries and library systems in outlying metropolitan and rural areas. There is a tendency for urban main libraries to serve as resource libraries for statewide networks to sustain local system services. It is also not uncommon for city and county libraries to cooperate and even be combined. Combination results in a single library system, and thus ceases to be a cooperative activity.

Cooperative technical service activities have been popular and successful ventures for many of the nation's public library systems for many years. Hiatt's excellent analysis describes both early and recent examples of centralized processing for some technical processing routines in public libraries. The Georgia State Department of Education began a catalog card distribution service in 1944 for books purchased with state funds. The service itself is supported by state aid funds to public libraries. The first system established by the New York State Library (in Watertown) in 1948 included centralized processing for its members. By 1966, sixty-three cooperative processing centers had been identified, many covering metropolitan area public libraries. The phenomenon was not universal in 1966: nineteen states did not have any center, and although approximately 2,000 independent libraries were members of regional processing centers, additional thousands were not.

Only a smattering of other interlibrary cooperation in technical service functions has been reported. The Nassau (N.Y.) Library System catalogs books under contract for four New Jersey libraries, and for a few others, including a high school library elsewhere in New York. The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee has also contracted to provide cataloging information for the S.C. Johnson Company Library in a nearby city. The Ohio College Library Center cataloging system is making incursions into both public and academic libraries in a few
metropolitan areas outside of Ohio. These include Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., among others, and soon will include several locations of the campuses of the State University of New York. There is a possibility that the automated cataloging system of the New York Public Library will be extended to provide service to other New York area libraries. Cooperative computerized cataloging is less than a trend, and certainly cannot yet be evaluated even where it has occurred. Given the current success of several of the large automated cataloging systems, this mode of operation may contribute to the solution of the problems of the maintenance and use of regional union catalogs.

Cooperative programs designed to assure that the public has access to at least a basic public library service do little or nothing to open access to specialized research material or to offer services beyond the public's general cultural interest. Nor do the programs offer any support to the many libraries other than those that serve the common public need. Hence another category of cooperative operation has been developing.

**Extended and Advanced Service to All Residents.** Faced with serious operational problems, poor financing, and strong pressures for information from various groups, metropolitan area libraries are increasingly involved in community-wide groups or councils. These groups have the major purpose of expanding library services to fill library and information needs not met by the basic public library service.

Generally, all libraries in a region may be involved in this activity. The New York State program to strengthen reference and research library resources under state aegis (the 3 Rs program) is often cited as a model for such an effort. This program provides state charters to local groups of citizens and librarians to improve library resources and services in support of advanced reference and research needs. Each regional group is governed by a locally selected board of trustees, and recruits local libraries as members. The state offers a subsidy to each region through the State Library. Because of official sponsorship and subsidy from the state, libraries of commercial agencies and libraries from nearby states are eligible for only a limited membership. They may participate fully in the work of the regional agency, and receive full service benefits, except subvention.10

The movement to bring the community's total library population together into a concerted planning and service effort is spreading.11 Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana and Arizona, for example, have formed area
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library councils or service authorities. In Arizona, the Library Reference and Service Systems are based on the governor's planning regions for other citizens' services. This is also happening on an interstate basis: the Council of Governments of the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan area, which includes the District of Columbia and parts of Virginia and Maryland, has long had a Librarian's Technical Committee. A new group has recently been formed around Cincinnati, involving libraries from Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana.12

Local area librarians have taken the lead in forming metropolitan library councils where this movement has not been undertaken by state governments. This has occurred recently in San Diego13 and Milwaukee.14 As in New York, it is not unusual to have a number of counties involved: the Illinois Regional Library Council covers five northern Illinois counties, including Cook County.15 Some of these locally formed units are supported by small grants from the states' Library Services and Construction Act funds, which support many cooperative activities.

Membership in cooperatives tends to be voluntary, and in most instances is open to libraries of all types. No typical project or program of activity seems to be foreclosed. Frequently an early project of cooperatives is the inventorying of the resources and services of regional libraries. The purpose of such inventories is to improve the reference librarian's ability to locate materials or refer users to appropriate sources for help. At times, a published directory is produced. Sometimes more formal referral services are offered. The Central Access and Referral Service of the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO)16 and Information Passport (INFOPASS) of the Illinois Regional Library Council15 are examples of efforts to increase the efficiency of use of the region's resources, and thereby to increase the probability of user satisfaction.

Research on community library problems is another project often undertaken by cooperative groups. The negotiation of universal borrowing privileges is also not uncommon. Other examples of cooperative projects include the shared acquisitions program for expensive materials operated by METRO. This is funded by a levy on member libraries that is related to their book budgets. Since METRO does not operate a library, the materials are located in an appropriate system member's collection. METRO also has been designated as a clearinghouse for government documents, provides consultation services for its members, has offered in-service training courses for
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librarians via the city university television system and holds seminars on current library problems. The Washington, D. C. Librarian's Technical Committee operates a telephone hotline to advertise library vacancies, and the Chicago groups are planning a clearinghouse for employment. Other proposed activities include such things as 24-hour-a-day “last-resort” reference service, guides to continuing educational opportunities for librarians, and union lists and surveys of collections of all kinds.

A more recent approach to the extension and advancement of services to all residents has been the development of the idea of the public library as a community information resource center. Five public library systems—Atlanta, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston and Queens Borough—are cooperating in the Neighborhood Information Centers Project, funded by HEW in 1972. The headquarters office for the project is in Cleveland, and participants from all five cities meet together. A report from the Langston Hughes Branch in Cleveland summarized the mission of the project as providing to the public information about the more than forty agencies in the neighborhood which offer social services.

In general, activities directed toward developing the public library as a community information resource involve cooperation, not with other libraries, but with those agencies which provide such citizen services as employment, mental health, welfare, housing and legal aid. Frequently a product of such cooperative efforts is the publication of a handbook or directory which the librarians can use to direct inquiries to appropriate sources. In Rhode Island the reverse has occurred. The referral agency which handles United Fund inquiries not only supplied Rhode Island libraries with copies of the agencies’ brochures, but also conducted a personal briefing in order to acquaint librarians with the various agencies and their activities. A unique approach to familiarizing social service agencies and librarians with each other’s activities has taken place in Bridgeport, Connecticut. Funded under the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Bridgeport Public Library has sponsored a number of workshops and visits by library staff to a variety of community agencies. The purpose of the visits is to improve communication and understanding between librarians and community agencies.

In an era of increasing commitments to the idea of citizen participation in community decision-making and of increased citizen awareness of the need for information about matters which affect their lives, the movement toward the public library as a community
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information resource is perhaps overdue. Several years ago New York City advanced an ambitious plan; it now appears that a program will shortly be underway in Brooklyn. The ALA seems to be moving in the direction of endorsing the concept of the public library as a community information center. If citizens are to be served with relevant and timely information, it seems that public libraries must increase their cooperative activities with those agencies which serve the public. The agencies in turn must be made aware of the potential of the library to act as an information center. Finally, the public must be made aware of the expanded role of the public library.

Areawide cooperatives, even for the provision of advance services and resource development cannot generally address themselves to problems of libraries which serve special clientele. Metropolitan areas, therefore, contain a third kind of cooperative activity for this function.

Service to Special Groups. Groups are frequently formed among libraries of similar types or serving similar clientele. Through cooperative agreement they seek to extend their resources for users with common interests and needs. Many consortia existed before more general cooperative efforts began, and these special groups continue to exist, either separately or as special projects within the more general cooperatives.

Academic library consortia are the most visible and seemingly numerous special groups. Of the nearly 200 arrangements listed in the Directory of Academic Library Consortia, thirty-five are located in metropolitan areas. Some are simple two-library agreements which are perhaps limited to sharing information about expensive acquisitions, or offering special borrowing privileges to each other's students. Others are large, and may be bound together by formal agreements. These agreements are often simply statements of intent to cooperate for some purposes, and are intellectual commitments among chief campus officers to the notion of sharing resources to economize on library expenditures.

 Consortia of special libraries in industry are limited in number. Proprietary concerns and the limited funding of special libraries have tended to prevent these libraries from cooperating openly and vigorously. It is not unusual, however, for a group of special libraries in a limited geographic area to develop a union list of serials. Woods notes this activity is particularly useful to those libraries that rely heavily on journals but are so limited in space that they cannot maintain very large collections. Often union lists are developed by the local
chapters of the Special Libraries Association. On occasion special libraries do establish more formal groups, although their participation might be limited to a few simple activities. Such groups have existed in San Diego and Minneapolis, for example. Often they are joined by special subject branches of nearby universities. Special library managers, however, are frequently constrained by the profit motive of their corporations. They must justify the costs of participation in programs of cooperation in terms of measurable and direct contribution to the interests of their corporations.

One of the noteworthy, and perhaps unique, cooperative programs among special libraries is the Regional Medical Library system, established by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and funded by the Medical Library Assistance Act. While this is not exclusively a metropolitan area library program, each of the eleven regional medical libraries that serve as nodes in the national network is located in a major library in a metropolitan area (Washington, Detroit, Cambridge, Atlanta, New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, Seattle, Dallas and Lincoln). The NLM program encourages libraries to operate at the local level. Some regional groups may contain up to 100 members (usually hospital libraries) in a single metropolitan area. It is difficult to conceive of another subject that could command the massive funding required to create both intellectual and physical access to information in so efficient and effective a manner. The model, however, is there for others to follow.

The potential for cooperation between public and school libraries has long intrigued various government and library officials. The issue has special importance in metropolitan areas where school populations are large and libraries that serve students are numerous. This has led to speculation that the large investment in metropolitan regions for both public and school library facilities might have more effective outcomes if the two seemingly complementary agents cooperated more, and perhaps even changed their traditional missions.

Proposals for cooperation at the elementary and secondary educational level usually call for the school library system to serve all the needs of children. Schools, it is argued, are better equipped to deal with children; interact more with teacher, parent and child; have greater political power; and hence can get more funds more readily than can public libraries. In 1970, after a study by a special committee of the Commissioner of Education, the Regents of the University of the State of New York issued a position paper with recommendations that comprehended library service through a wide array of kinds of
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libraries for students at all levels. The paper called for cooperation between school and public libraries for service to secondary school students. It proposed, however, that the library needs of children from preschool age through the sixth grade be filled by the school library.

School librarians endorsed the proposal, but the public library community, in a nationally prominent campaign, strongly refuted the rationale for the plan. The public library, it was argued, should serve the “whole person” at all ages. The curriculum orientation of schools was cited as compulsive—an adverse influence compared to the permissiveness of public libraries. Furthermore, the school system’s facilities are generally available only 180 days of the 365-day year. The Regents’ proposal was never adopted.

School and public library cooperation throughout the nation has remained sporadic and weak. A recent spate of developments however, suggests that it still is a viable issue. The Estes Park Public Library recently received the loan of 1,000 children’s books for a summer. The Lancaster Public Library held a workshop to familiarize local school librarians with resources. Some large metropolitan area library plans (e.g., Milwaukee) are open to participation by school and academic libraries. The subsidy to the Denver Public Library’s film lending service was assumed by the state library when federal funding failed. The Minneapolis Public Library once contracted with the board of education for a junior high school to provide year-round public service.

Even if the ideological conflicts could be resolved, operational problems would remain. For example, the New Haven proposal for the creation of school-community libraries has for a number of years faltered over such matters as varying pay scales for school and public librarians, what items the school and the library authorities should pay for, how to administer jointly the physical facilities, and the location of facilities that are accessible and attractive to adults.

Metropolitan public libraries have long been attractive to students in urban universities. In the past it has not been unusual for these libraries to close their facilities to students to insure access for the general public. Similarly, academic libraries in metropolitan areas often must restrict access to secondary school students. Urban university libraries also tend to limit the use of their facilities by students who live nearby but commute to distant universities in the city.

Several proposals for cooperation in New York City epitomize potential solutions to this problem. At one time it was proposed that five new public library units be created, one in each borough, especially
stocked to augment the many college libraries in that city. More recently, it was proposed that one strong, existing library in each borough be subsidized to augment its resources in order to assume the public burden of serving students. Three public and two academic libraries were proposed for this function. In neither case has the recommendation been effected. The Mid-Manhattan Library, a separate unit of the New York Public Library, however, was established and serves as an adjunct to higher education in the area. In addition, the city government has subsidized the private research component of the New York Public Library because of its heavy service to graduate students of the city university system. Similar arrangements have been undertaken in a few other cities.

The anticipated increase in opportunities for nontraditional studies and lifelong learning endorsed by the Commission on Non-Traditional Studies will give added opportunity for metropolitan area libraries, particularly the public and museum libraries, to cooperate in serving an educational mission. As a follow-up activity to the commission's study, the College Entrance Examination Board is conducting a special program to develop and demonstrate public library service to nontraditional study activities now underway in several communities. While this emphasis is on a single agency—the public library—it is likely that the resources of other libraries will be required for adequate support of this style of education.

The element of cooperation in metropolitan area library service has been little studied and poorly documented; it is therefore difficult, in conclusion, to identify and describe emerging trends. The characteristics of metropolitan communities do not appear to be related to organizational or service arrangements among cooperating libraries. Several features of metropolitan library cooperation do, however, stand out. These include the recognition of the need for areawide planning, the importance of outside funding, the complexity of organizational arrangements and the lack of evaluation.

Increasing attention is being given in more metropolitan areas to the creation of organizations of libraries concerned with areawide development and utilization of resources to meet the fullest demands of all citizens. Planning seems to be a primary focus of such cooperative arrangements, and will be more prevalent in the future if the federal government succeeds in developing its proposed Information Partnership Act, which will encourage the pooling of efforts of a community's total information resources.

Another feature is the dependence on outside sources of funding to
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sustain cooperative activities. In his study of public libraries in the urban metropolitan setting throughout the world Campbell concluded that the lack of permanency and insufficient funding were the principal problems of cooperation. \(^{36}\) Cooperation, he found, seems to work better for small libraries faced with limited demands. It is clear that in the American experience money and formal organization are still essential ingredients for successful cooperation. It is difficult for libraries already in financial trouble to sustain a contribution to programs of cooperation that increase demand without securing additional funds.

Federal funds, chiefly Library Services and Construction Act, Title I and Title III funds, have been vitally important to cooperative programs. Where they have been withdrawn, or reductions threatened, systems in metropolitan areas have been placed in jeopardy. This seems to have been one of the chief causes, for example, of the disbanding of New York's statewide technical services organization, the Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services. \(^{37}\) Though judged to be well-designed, and appealing as a replacement for some of the local public library system technical service centers, the subsidy required to sustain it until it could be self-supporting was too large for the state to undertake when federal funding was threatened. The North Bay Cooperative Library System in California was similarly troubled. By contracting its service to local libraries, it is attempting to offset the budget crisis it faced by the loss of federal subsidy. \(^{38}\)

The various potential sources of funds for metropolitan area library cooperative services seem ample in number, including government subsidies, service charges or users' fees, library system membership fees, local taxing powers, contributions from foundations and local corporations, sales of publications and others. Nevertheless, general economic conditions tend to limit the purchasing power of all these sources.

Several organizational features must be noted. As stated earlier many metropolitan areas cross state lines, sometimes encompassing more than two states. Areawide planners must, therefore, be sensitive to the legal problems involved in creating an administrative and funding structure for interstate ventures. The operation of simple voluntary programs across state lines may not be troublesome. Little difficulty is encountered, for example, in creating a union list of serials and arranging interlibrary loans among college or industrial libraries in several states. It is more difficult, however, when state subsidies or
formal governmental commitments to permanent service operations are required for successful cooperative programs.

The problems and prospects of interaction among more than two states have been under study in recent months by Harry Martin, Assistant Law Librarian of the University of Texas at Austin. Martin identifies at least five mechanisms for establishing formal, legal cooperative ventures in this multijurisdictional environment: interstate compact, library authority, exercise of joint powers, federation, and contract. Martin concludes that the interstate compact is the most appropriate mechanism for a viable multistate cooperative activity. A compact permits the creation of an administrative board with representative powers, and the budgeting of state funds for the cooperative programs. The Council of State Governments has produced a Model Interstate Library Compact, but it is faulty in several respects for a multistate operation. Interstate compacts are not simple to create. Among other things, an interstate compact must be approved by the United States Congress, and Congress must be one of the signatories of the compact.

The creation of a regional library authority has often been proposed as a solution to the problem of intergovernmental organization for library service. The key elements of a regional authority are that a charter is developed to provide service and the authority to use all kinds of library units to carry out its mandate. Funding is also provided, either through direct state support or through taxing powers of its own, to apply to both the public and the private sector of libraries for service offerings. Given the strength of the argument for "home rule" and the power of the notion of self-sufficiency for such political units as cities and counties, it is unlikely that many regional authorities will be created in the foreseeable future. In some areas too many separate political units already exist. An attempt to establish an Urban Services Authority for various community services in the Denver area failed in a public vote in 1973. While library service was not among these included in the proposed service plan, it was assumed that library service would follow. Interestingly, the proposition carried in Denver, but failed in the surrounding area where the service needs are presumably higher. Still, the concept persists, and it does function in many areas for transportation, fire, waste disposal, and other community service. There has been a call for the creation of a library authority for Chicago and surrounding counties. This region recently voted the establishment of a regional transportation authority; the
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time may be right for another vote for the same mode of development of library service.41

As cooperatives or consortia grow in number, the probability increases that there will be overlap of several systems or networks within a given region. This might complicate organizational and political problems. On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence that cooperative systems can co-exist and indeed work together to suggest that the problem of overlap is not insurmountable. There is need for clearer specification of the mission and boundaries of cooperatives. Local effort with full participation of every library whose resources will be needed or whose clientele will be affected is essential. New York offers an excellent example for such a local operation. Its 3-Rs program to improve reference and research library resources is state sponsored, but local citizens must organize and apply for a charter for recognized status as a region in the system. Its bylaws must provide for representation from the entire community. And while a 3-Rs region will perform overlap and may contain more than one of the public library systems already in existence in its area, it must not cut through any such system. Thus no public library system will find its members in more than one 3-Rs region. This rule simplifies decisions and prevents disruptive competition in the distribution of services in various parts of the system. Furthermore, each 3-Rs region must set its own goals and plans, and develop its own projects and programs of service. This insures local responsiveness.10

Many libraries now find themselves members of more than one system or network. It has been pointed out that a single academic library might belong to as many as fifteen networks.42 The potential administrative overload and dilution of its resources are apparent as is the potential for conflict in rules and protocols for access to resources and services. These may be dysfunctional to the user and to the viability of one or more of the systems.

On the other hand, metropolitan area libraries, particularly the large ones, may be involved in cooperative activities that are not essentially designed for metropolitan area service. Hierarchical state systems to extend basic library service may reach into a metropolitan area to tap large libraries as regional nodes or system back-up libraries. The Chicago Public Library serves as one of four reference and resource libraries in the Illinois library statewide service network. The New York Public Library serves as a resource library in the New York State Interlibrary Loan system (NYSILL). In another mode of operation, a
strong metropolitan area library might form the hub of a network that reaches out to serve less populated areas, as for example do the regional medical libraries in the NLM network. This places a burden on the large library that might weaken its contribution to the goals of metropolitan library service. Subsidies to the large library for remote services, however, might also strengthen its local services.

Although the typical metropolitan areas' library resources may be rich, they may still be insufficient to serve some advanced or esoteric subject information needs even through cooperation. Some libraries have found that they must interact with libraries in other regions. Metropolitan public libraries within a state may, of course, be linked together through a statewide network for standard public services. In such an arrangement they interact chiefly in a hierarchical structure through a state library.

More often, however, consortia of this type are created by direct interaction of libraries of similar types or with similar needs, without participation in local or state programs of cooperation. Many examples of cooperatives among libraries in different metropolitan areas exist. Libraries do not form these groups particularly because they are in metropolitan areas, or because they serve a metropolitan constituency. To the extent that they are able to strengthen service to their own primary clientele, however, they add to the quality of library service in the area. Many examples of such cooperatives exist. The cooperative group recently created by Harvard, Yale, Columbia and the New York Public Library indicates that even the richest of resources cannot alone sustain the service expected of it.

In the future, interregional networking may be a phenomenon of some strength and importance. Discussions of national plans for library service frequently refer to the desirability of creating a national network of libraries and information centers by linking local, regional and state systems. The recommendations of the ALA Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks, for example, called for a national general-purpose network of libraries and information centers, and stated that the network “should not be a monolithic structure but instead, a series of networks organized to meet local information needs.” It was assumed that local library and information networks would continue to develop, and that national policy should address the process of evolution of these networks “to become a part of a coordinated set of interconnecting knowledge centers available to all disciplines at all levels of society and in every
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geographic region." National planning effort has recently emerged from the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Its draft statement of a program for national library service calls for strong support for many elements of network development, including the establishment of technical standards to insure compatibility for interconnection of local networks, the provision of adequate funding, and the establishment of policy, goals and responsibilities by various segments of government with regard to library service.

Cooperative activities are seldom adequately evaluated. The performance of a few library systems have been examined, as for example Warner's study of interlibrary lending in Maryland, the Ellis, et al. study of the performance of NYSILL and Casey's analysis of the Oklahoma teletype network. It is impossible to generalize from so many varied studies. It is also difficult to utilize the results of these evaluations in systems design elsewhere. The studies suggest that cooperation frequently fails to achieve goals of better service and indicate factors that might be examined for cause. In New York State it was found that poor searching and referral techniques and restrictive lending policies contributed to the problem of unfilled requests in NYSILL. Among a few cooperative ventures studied by Slanker, cooperation did not seem to improve service as well as consolidation of library agencies. In Illinois, Stenstrom noted that the fear of loss of local autonomy and control was the most commonly expressed concern of librarians and trustees with regard to joining systems. Blasingame and Deproso speculate that "the failure of leadership to think through what implications system has is reflected in rather poor decisions in the utilization of resources." They argue that the failure may be due to the absence of a general theory of system as guide to implementation. Criteria for evaluation of cooperation have been suggested (a more effective organizational pattern; more effective staff functioning; improved access to materials; revision of collection and service policies; streamlining of library procedures; staff retraining; costs stabilized or reduced; and new services introduced or existing ones expanded), but they have not yet been applied in a systematic way to any significant study of metropolitan library cooperation.

Several years ago, a survey of library and information networks concluded that we had only partial knowledge for the design of network configurations and for determining why a library or information center should join a network. The survey noted that "no recognized focal point for professional leadership and planning—for
developing the general knowledge needed to design, manage, and assess networks—has emerged.\textsuperscript{53} This condition unfortunately has not yet improved.

In addition to those persons to whom specific comments are attributed in the references, I wish to acknowledge general contributions from the following persons: William Budington, John Crerar Library; Walter Curley, formerly Cleveland Public Library; Carolyn Forsman, District of Columbia Public Library; Marilyn Gell, District of Columbia Council of Governments; Robert McClarren, North Suburban Library System, Morton Grove, Illinois; Vern Pings, Wayne State University; and Elaine Sloan, Smithsonian Institution.
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Extension of New Services and the Role of Technology

HUGH C. ATKINSON

One could sometimes wish that the phrase “new technologies” had never been invented. It seems to promise the heavenly kingdom toward which we poor pilgrims progress—a celestial city with computers and television and as yet undreamed of devices to make life more interesting and pleasurable. The new technology is one of those phrases which seems to embody some instinctive belief that science will somehow make better things for better living, and, if only libraries latch onto them, the problems and crises constantly faced will somehow be dealt with magically. Even a librarian as clear-thinking as John Humphry, who usually applies straightforward commonsense to his writing and thinking about libraries, talks of communication devices and systems, or automated and computerized services, without really defining them. Many of us fall into this tempting hyperbole. When the new technologies finally do arrive, they are not wholly new, and they seldom seem to provide totally new services. There has not been a radical change in library activity with the advent of microfilm, or motion picture film, or phonodiscs, or color slides. What almost all of these devices have done is either to provide a new item to be circulated, viewed, borrowed, or read, or through some technological process enabled a large body of information to be stored. This body of information gets relatively little use item for item and piece by piece; what use it does get is of the same nature as those pieces of information collected before the advent of the technology. In addition, one of the greatest impacts any technology has had on libraries is the increasing cost of equipment. That is not only a nonservice; it may, in fact, impede the provision of service. More importantly libraries are pressured to look inward to their own procedures, personnel and problems, rather than outward to the use which people make of these devices and technologies. Rather than
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reviewing the impact of motion pictures, color slides, or microfilm as an effect of the new technologies, it seems preferable to view the most likely effects on library services of cable television, cassette television, and computer-based activity—three technologies which are still being explored. Their development and resulting services are not indigenous to metropolitan libraries. Yet their opportunities and (not least) their financing seem likely to be enhanced in the urban rather than the rural setting.

One must remember that many of the attempts to provide "new services" have been failures. No matter how glowing the prospect or the progress report, new and seemingly exciting dimensions of library service have often been rejected by the public they are intended to serve. This has occurred not because there might not have been a need for such a service or because the project was insufficiently funded or did not last long enough, but often because the library in the private visions of its patrons is assigned a particular role in the society and has a series of publics which define themselves. Libraries and librarians can modify such images, can develop new publics, and can sometimes cast out old images and publics. But they cannot by some executive fiat or administrative regulation change the role that libraries have been assigned by the public. The tolerance for change is, in fact, relatively narrow. The commitment to and belief in library systems in the United States is obviously very deep and very ingrown. That people do believe that libraries provide a unique and valuable service to their communities, both academic and public, is without question. However, changing these deep-rooted beliefs about libraries and their proper functions is not a task which is liable to quick success or dramatic turns.

The habits of the various library publics are in fact the motivating forces which set the policies and procedures for many or most of these same libraries. Changes in library users' habits, if directed changes, are to evolve. Changes which are intrinsic to the service or to the kind of material inevitably result in a questioning of the usefulness of the new service itself. Even new services which have a clearly useful purpose are often modified and in some senses subverted by the habits of the users. Most new services tend to be refinements of the old, or if they are dramatic changes, tend to have a clear and obvious good so overwhelming that all agree on the viability.
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With the advent of Federal Communications Commission regulations governing the provision of cable television services, there arise both opportunity and availability of the media for development in a technology which can affect some of the services of public libraries. The FCC has ruled that, in the top 100 market areas, three channels are to be reserved: one for public use, one for education, and one for local government. While one of them is for citizen use, the other two can provide a medium which is available to libraries. There have been some glowing accounts in the library press, dwelling on expectations of the effect such an opportunity will have on educational and outreach services of libraries. Some of those commenting seem to imply that such a service will, at the very least, reach many of those people who are now unreached by the traditional services of public libraries. One gets the impression that they are envisioning masses of the disadvantaged, watching a great deal of television, and being particularly affected by library presentations over municipal and public use channels. It seems more probable, according to those who are seriously studying the effects of such new services, that the most likely users of cable television will be the very individuals now being served by public libraries. The poor, the disaffiliated, and the disadvantaged probably will not pay the rental charges or service charges of the cable television industry; that industry is unlikely to make much of an effort to extend its cable and services to the rural and urban poor.

We know much about the interests and demands of the middle-class, white, American, suburban library user. Translating that knowledge into their probable demands of cable television, one comes up with the rather depressing thought that there is a 50/50 chance that such a public will prefer reruns of “Leave It to Beaver,” “Father Knows Best,” and “Gilligan’s Island,” to the classics, library lectures, book reviews, and drama of the better sort. However, there is an opportunity to provide a host of new services—if not those services which will appeal to all segments of the community, at least the utilization of valuable data hitherto not easily accessible. These data are now found in libraries, but are hard to get at and often mixed with other information in such a way that it takes a reference librarian to sort them out and bring them to the attention of the patron. For instance, consumer data in planned and prepackaged segments which would be of interest and value to the whole community could be provided. Certain types of
census data, *Congressional Quarterly* consumer data and the like, might be intriguing even to a public which is accustomed to seeing the episodes of "Green Acres" over and over again. The materials now housed in libraries contain the raw content for almost unlimited presentations of information which can substantially improve and affect the lives of many citizens. It is, basically, reference service; but it is a changed reference service, which identifies a need and answers that need before the question is asked, rather than offering service after the request is made.

Television programming now and in the foreseeable future will demand a rather set presentation. There can even be call-in shows, and audience response programs; but we are not yet at the stage where a patron at home can instantly query the library and have his question answered, with the response sent to him on his home television. There is a mass of raw data which can be assembled by reference librarians, and is now so assembled in the answering of questions on a daily basis, in the traditional form of reference service. This assembly of data can be somewhat modified and presented in an attractive, informative way. Guides to political activity, biographies of candidates, cost-of-living figures, presentations on the economy and various other facets of society, reviews of material available on the Montessori educational theory—such assemblages of data can be presented effectively. Cable television may be the ideal medium for the presentation of color slides, the standard format for the teaching of art in most institutions of higher education. The opportunity to show the many films collected and available in libraries may be the first and easiest step in providing new services through the new technologies.

It is still well to remember that, in a democratic society in which public policy is passively accepted and passively stated by the electorate, the library services and policies are to a large extent determined by those who use them. Those who will be using cable television services will be mainly the middle class, the suburban, and the intellectual and social leaders of the community. It will be their interests and their needs which will be most likely effectively spoken to by library activity in cable television.

**CASSETTE TELEVISION**

One of the most promising of the new technologies is video cassette—an easily handled, relatively inexpensive, short segment of videotape which is displayed on a cassette viewer. Cassette viewers are now available for attachment to the standard home television set.
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Television stations themselves may well market certain high-use or very popular cassettes and, of course, the library is one market for such a cassette. It is quite likely that football games and other sports events will be available in the near future. Perhaps transcriptions on cassette of daily news broadcasts will be produced. However, the use of materials which have gone out over the public air is at present very uncertain legally, especially as it pertains to property rights and ownership. In the recent controversy between the Columbia Broadcasting System and Vanderbilt University, we can easily recognize the many unanswered questions of property rights, authorship, who owns what and who can copy what. In whatever way the legal battles are settled, the video cassette is the most likely medium for capturing the up-to-now uncaptured—the momentary event, the classroom in action, the public speech, the activities of the city council, proceedings at the United Nations, events at the federal level, and drama appearing in the various centers of theatrical production: New York, London, Paris, Moscow. The most likely first experiments will be sporting events; moving then to the elaborately produced specials on commercial television, and thence to the news and quasi-documentary programs.

Another important undertaking amenable to capture on video cassette is the continuing education lecture or course. Many universities are now offering courses such as elementary mathematics which are recorded on video cassettes for later use by students who missed the lecture or who want to review what has taken place in the classroom. Provision of such direct instruction is a natural endeavor for the library which is likely to grow rapidly. It is not at all inconceivable that libraries will become the centers of university and college extension and continuing education. The supplemental reading materials are there, the hours of opening are there, and a staff who could assist those participating in the program is already being provided by libraries.

The kinds of service demands that the video cassette will place on libraries will probably not be radically different from book lending service, when the cassettes are taken from television productions or are copies of dramatic and visual productions not available locally. Such services are likely to be very expensive since the provision of these cassettes may well make serious inroads into their paying audiences which are now either directly or indirectly providing the economic base for the productions. However, the educational, and perhaps the news and documentary programs are quite likely to require additional
reference services; these may range from the rather simple requests for aid in exploring further a subject noted in a documentary or news story, to quite complex assistance needed by those engaged in continuing education.

The teaching role of the library will become quite explicit when and if libraries become centers and outposts of continuing adult education. The materials for such activities will be less expensive. Subscriptions to cassettes of commercially produced entertainment, on the other hand, will probably be beyond the reach of the individual citizen; he will look to the library, as he does now for expensive books and journals, to provide access.

COMPUTER SERVICES

It is the computer (if it is not television) that most persons think of when the phrase “new technologies” is used. Computers are not especially new in libraries; they have been used not as a service in themselves, but as support for the real library services. Typically, they are used as administrative aids, bookkeeping devices, tools for keeping circulation records, for making union lists of serials, for payment processing, and for other tasks which involve the handling of library records.

The new services will quite naturally fall into two categories: bibliographic services, and services concerned with aggregate and raw data. There is a possibility that a third category may arise: the provision of direct access to computing facilities. The latter is unlikely, but I believe it to be dependent upon the habits being inculcated in the high schools in the course of the normal curriculum. If the school systems produce a generation of graduates who are accustomed to having access to computing facilities and, as is most probable, such facilities are not available for home subscription, it is quite likely that some municipal or other public agency will be required to provide them. In this event the public library may well be the agency selected. However, that possibility is not yet a probability.

The service most likely to come to early prominence is even now being seen in the provision of current awareness services and catalog and index searching, using bibliographic data stored in computers, sorted and manipulated to produce individual packages of citations, abstracts, reviews, and the like. The handling of raw aggregate and numerical data has lagged somewhat behind since it demands a different approach. Examples of these services are tapes of the U.S. census, voting records, economic statistics, etc. These large files—and
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they are typically very large files—demand individual searches for each query which do not lend themselves to economies of scale, as does the provision of current awareness searches.

One of the hallmarks of all computer data systems is that data and information can be processed with enormous speed; sorting and manipulation can be done many more times faster than any human can handle the same data. Thus, responses, while not exactly instantaneous, are well within the allowable framework for human absorption and use. The most effective library computer systems will probably support those services enabling the library to take fuller advantage of its human resources in terms of librarians, and providing more humanly responsive results in terms of the patron interaction with the libraries' collections. We all recognize that there are large numbers of unserved people who remain unserved because the devices of getting at the information that they desire are difficult to use or are slow and cumbersome. The card catalog, the printed index, and the abstracting service all demand knowledge and skill that may not be available on the part of most of the patrons, and the libraries cannot afford to provide the numbers and quality of reference librarians to meet these needs. If through the use of computer terminals (whether operated by the library staff or by the patrons themselves), we can provide an effective means of searching large indexes or catalogs with a minimum of effort, we will have opened the resources now present in libraries to an extremely large, hitherto unserved, body of the public.

Another type of computer service which will be available for libraries to provide their patrons is computer-assisted instruction. Computer-assisted instruction (CAI) may well supplant the many how-to-do-it books found now on all of our shelves. Whether the library be an academic research library, a large urban public library, or a small public library, the tasks of formal and informal instruction of adults, and instruction in those fields not served traditionally by the public school systems, have fallen to the library. The CAI program may provide a locus for continuing education in a way that The Great Books Program once was to do. Throughout the library world, we now see the mini-course, the adult education program, the Wednesday night lecture series—all attempting to meet the need for continuing education.

The CAI technique is probably limited only by the number of terminals the library can afford, since it is a way of providing remote access to stored programs. It has proved itself to be remarkably effective in teaching skills and in training, if one makes a distinction
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between training and education. It is very effective in language teaching, mathematics and science. It does not prove as effective when dealing with abstract principles and concepts. However the higher education system has taken as its purview the conceptual and abstract education. The demands for continuing education—at least those that are placed on the libraries—do seem to fall in those fields served best by CAI.

When libraries move into manipulation of aggregate and numerical data, they will discover that the per search costs are much higher than for any other kind of reference service they have provided. Since such a databank does not lend itself well to preplanned strategies of search and retrieval, it is quite likely that a search program will have to be written for each query. These queries are probably most expeditiously handled off-line rather than on-line. If the library chooses to provide such services, a new level of library employee will be required—more expensive than technicians and highly professional, but with a different professional background from the librarian of the past. The personnel structure and its management in libraries promises to become evermore complex as new qualifications and expertise are required in changing staff patterns.

Some Characteristics of the New Technologies

There is at least one “new” technology which is no longer new at all, but which has reprogrammed the expectations of all library patrons, whenever they see what seems to them other than the traditional library activity. Most of our patrons have accepted the various rates of library response. That is, they know about how long it takes to find a book; how long it takes their library to order and get on the shelves a new book; the time spent on waiting lists to get the latest novels and best sellers; how long it takes the library to respond with an overdue notice; how long they are willing to wait for a reference librarian to finish serving the previous patron, how long it takes in the periodical room to find the issue they are looking for. They are willing to accept all of these things because, in fact, they are judging libraries and have accepted them on the basis of past experience. Having no other yardstick, they complain only slightly when service is slow, since it is slow everywhere. However, when a patron encounters a nontraditional activity, he is likely to judge it against other nontraditional, mechanical, and technical devices. His expectations of response rates and completeness will be much different.
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The not-so-new device, which has preprogrammed us for at least one kind of response, is the telephone, which may be the earliest symbol of a "new technology." The telephone companies bombard us with the idea that this is perpetually the latest and the most modern device. The response rate to which the telephone companies have programmed their patrons is the length of time it takes to get a dial tone, and the length of time it takes from dialing the first digit until the first ring. These response times are extremely fast, somewhere between three and eleven seconds. When libraries move into other new technologies, expectations will be of the same order. Patrons will expect computers to be fast; they will expect television programs to come on on time; and they will expect CAI programs to be quick and accurate.

This new element of speed may carry over into changed expectations of the other library activities. If a computer will do a catalog search in a minute or two and will respond with the first card or bibliographic citation in a few seconds, won't the library have to respond as quickly with the actual availability of the item? If the library, through its automatic current awareness service, provides prompt citation to new books, it will probably have to provide access to those books almost as quickly. The very speed of new library services may thus affect the degree of satisfaction with the response speed of other services.

One of the other hallmarks of computer services, in fact of the whole new technology, is that they are fundamentally decentralized. One does not have to be next to the computer to get the computer to work for him. One does not have to be next to the television station to have cable television. One does not have to be next to the producer of a cassette television to use it. It is this decentralization which will probably most profoundly affect library procedures and services. The present technology for building library collections, for cataloging and indexing them, and for providing access to them presupposes a single physical copy of the book in a single physical location, a location which is near the access point. Most card catalogs are only produced in one copy. The retrieval systems for books from bookstacks are usually set up to be effective only when one is near the bookstacks.

The advent of the new technologies—with their ability of remote query to find out if a book is available, and to charge materials located in the central library from a terminal in a branch library—will affect most profoundly the geographic placement of libraries and the concepts of "main" and "branch" services. The electronics—the cable itself—provides an electronic centralization, and the physical
centralization no longer has to follow. It makes no difference where a book is located, if the knowledge of and access to a book is possible at any location. If the cable television or computer output is everywhere there is a television set or a remote terminal, there is no particular advantage to having one's reference librarians centrally located if they have access to the necessary devices and materials. The location of the patron, rather than the location of the collection, will no doubt be the primary factor in the organization of most library services.

The administration of decentralized systems will be much different than the present mode. The interaction of patrons and library staff will have to take new forms, if the levels of satisfaction with the techniques and systems built by the new technology are to be effective. How, in fact, does one respond to a CAI course when the response made is outside the parameters of the course itself? Who do you see to complain, or to compliment? As the Fourth Revolution becomes a reality and the effects of the new instructional technology become the standard effect, when the media revolution is no longer a revolution but standard operating procedure—a time fast approaching—the expectations of children of this generation of a library with new technologies and new response times are of the same high order as were expectations of children of a previous technology: the ball game, however, will be wholly changed.

In conclusion, the most probable new services will be in the realm of cable television, with provision of consumer information and other programmed reference services packed in video cassettes, capturing the live action or projected images and sound of our present television, in a form that is lendable and handable. These are forms which have the capability of being indexed and cataloged, but will probably demand new rules of entry and forms of indexing other than those which we now use. The computer itself will provide such services as current awareness services, on-line searching of indexes and catalogs, CAI for continuing education, the ability to search aggregate data, and perhaps some combination of video cassette and computer-searching of the indexing to that cassette. Such services are very likely to be provided first to the same publics which now use the public and academic libraries. The new technologies are no magic passport to the realm of the unserved; the human problems will be here then as they are here now. The book will not be displaced, but will only be supplanted in those areas where it does not do a good job—most likely as indexes to large files, perhaps with collections of color slides for art, and other specialized uses. The book is still unsurpassed as a
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compendium of fact, as an easily used device for the storage of numeric
data which does not have to be manipulated, but simply referred to; it is
an item that can be shared in a way that many of the technologies can
not. The television program, once it is done, is done. A book, however,
can be read by one person, returned and read by another. The
response from the computer is made and is over with, and awaits
another response. A printed index retains the image.

Economically the book is still a very, very cheap way of recording
information and ideas and distributing them to large audiences. It is
not such a good device for distribution to very small audiences. The
costs of the new technologies are decreasing at a very rapid rate, and
the economic questions may well solve themselves in such a way that the
provision of the services noted above will not be outside the economic
constraints of most libraries.

One final effect of computers and cable television on library activities
should be mentioned. Use of both of these devices, the computer and
cable television, seem to imply that the library must join with other
libraries or with other information agencies to provide the services
needed by the public. With the advent of decentralization, together
with shared resources in common electronic data, the necessities for
group activity become obvious, whether on a national, state, regional or
local level.14

The individual identity of libraries within such cooperative groups is
quite likely to be decreased. The CAI program that is useful in Piqua,
Ohio, is probably the same program that is useful in Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania, in Huntington, West Virginia, or in Atlanta, Georgia.
The economies of scale have such force behind them that it is quite
likely that the only decision to be made by an individual library is which
network it joins; and that decision will be one that the economics forces
upon it. When multiple access to the same shared electronic data base is
clearly the cheapest thing to do, one gives up some autonomy. It is
simply not worth it to do it alone when the commonality of the service is
so great. The very existence of computers and cable presupposes a
volume of activity so much greater at the present that the network or
cooperative group or consortium becomes inevitable. We no longer
print our own books—at least not very often. We seldom publish our
own journals, and the individual selection and production of many of
the technical services implicit in the new technology will also have to be
given up. The competition between the various libraries will certainly
become open in shared activities. Who does a better job of book
reviewing? New York Public Library or Chicago Public Library? Is the
indexing and cataloging done at Stanford better than that done at the Folger Library? The ability to see and compare will be there. A system for truly rational choice and for cooperative redeployment of resources available to libraries will have to be evolved.
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