



Library Service To College Students

FRITZ VEIT

WITHIN THE SPAN of approximately one hundred years, library service to college students has undergone marked changes. These changes will become apparent when some of the major elements affecting library service are individually examined. Major factors which have had an impact, and which we will analyze briefly, are: composition of student body, character of the collection, teaching methods and educational philosophies, cooperative efforts to extend local resources, hours of service, aid to users, instruction in the use of the library, and establishment of certain library units such as reserve rooms, browsing rooms and undergraduate libraries.

This study emphasizes service to the college-level (undergraduate) student; other contributors to this issue deal with various aspects of service to the graduate student.

STUDENTS AND TEACHING METHODS

Around the turn of the century, college students formed quite a homogeneous group. Even as college enrollments grew spectacularly during the first decade of the twentieth century, the student bodies themselves remained rather homogeneous.¹

Teaching methods were homogeneous, too. Textbook learning with recitation sessions as its corollary was the rule. However, under the influence of German university teaching methods, use of the lecture was introduced by many American colleges and universities. Also following German practices, the rigid curriculum which had characterized American higher education was abandoned in favor of the elective system. In Germany the freedom granted to students to select their courses and to pursue their studies nearly without supervision generally showed good results. However, this method was less successful when transplanted to the American scene, since many American students restricted their choices to the less difficult and

Fritz Veit is Director of Libraries Emeritus, Chicago State University.

often unrelated courses. Methods were consequently advocated which would assure strong curricula whose components were interdependent. Within this framework, independent study was furthered by various devices such as tutorials and honors courses. These, however, were designed principally for superior students.

The increase in the number of college students during the past one hundred years has been almost continuous, except for times of crisis and war. The end of World War II brought a particularly large influx of students, many being aided by the GI Bill. To absorb this increase many higher education institutions were enlarged in size and scope, new institutions were established, and teachers' colleges were transformed into general colleges or universities. In some universities the growth was extensive on both the graduate and undergraduate levels. As curricula and student bodies increased, libraries of many universities grew correspondingly. To give the undergraduates easier access to materials of particular interest to them, separate undergraduate libraries were created in a number of universities.

Junior colleges, which for many years had to fight for their existence, became the fastest growing segment of higher education. A Carnegie Commission report predicts that by 1980 between 35 percent and 40 percent of all undergraduates can be accommodated by the community colleges.² Unhampered by tradition, many community colleges have experimented with newer theories of education and librarianship. The publicly supported, two-year post-secondary institutions have adopted a broad perspective by including in their curricula not only college-parallel education but also vocational/technical education, career education, general education, guidance, and community services. Such diversified offerings have brought to the community college conventional college students as well as many other learners who feel they can profit from study beyond the high school level. To accommodate such diverse student groups, community colleges generally offer individualized instruction which requires a wide range of materials—by type (book and nonbook), by subject, and by level of difficulty.³

Similar flexible arrangements have also become necessary for students who enter college via "open-education" channels.⁴ Many of the open-education programs permit the student to acquire knowledge in an informal fashion at a location he chooses and at a pace which suits his ability and temperament. Only a large variety of freely accessible learning materials can satisfy the diverse requirements of these students.

Service to College Students

Practices and procedures which have proven effective in the community college have been incorporated at the senior college and even at university levels. The result has been that in an increasing number of senior institutions, admission policies have become less restrictive, and their libraries have accepted responsibility for many types of media.

COLLECTION

In 1876 the editors of the chapter concerning college libraries in the landmark library report issued by the Bureau of Education commented on the typical book collection:

Few colleges have possessed funds to build up libraries on a scientific plan. Their collections consist largely of the voluntary gifts of many individuals, and hence are usually of a miscellaneous character. Comparatively few of the patrons of our colleges in the past have appreciated the essential importance of ample and well selected libraries. Recently, however, more liberal views have prevailed in this respect. This, with fewer restrictions as to expenditure, will enable college officers to select with greater discrimination and more definite purpose.⁵

In a study published about fifteen years later, Lodilla Ambrose describes the small college library:

It consists of from six to twenty thousand volumes. It is composed in part of the libraries of deceased clergymen which have been contributed to the institution in bulk. To these are added the encyclopaedias and books of reference of the edition before the last and a miscellaneous assortment of all the most obvious books in the ordinary branches of science, literature, and art. . . . The ideas of those who use it are generally bounded, not by the horizon of the subject which they are considering but by the literature which is accessible.⁶

Drawing on the 1888-89 report of the Commissioner of Education, Ambrose found the following situation regarding the size of the collections: of 456 colleges and college-type institutions which submitted data, 44 had fewer than 1,000 volumes, 57 had at least 1,000 but fewer than 2,000; in all, 253 (or 55 percent of the total group) had fewer than 5,000 volumes. Only four had more than 100,000 volumes.⁷

A significant, if small, group of librarians felt that students should have at their disposal the kind of books which would support their studies or which could contribute to their general cultural improvement. Since books had become more plentiful and less expensive, most libraries could enlarge their collections considerably; many doubled or even tripled their holdings between 1876 and 1900.⁸ The trend toward increasing the holdings has continued. George Works observed that between 1900 and 1925, there was a marked expansion of the resources of the college and university libraries, a rate of increase that was more rapid than that of the student body. In other words, libraries had more books per student in 1925 than in 1900.⁹

To assist college libraries in their task of selecting suitable books, booklists were compiled both for four-year and two-year colleges. Louis R. Wilson believed that these tools would materially improve the quality of the collections. He felt that henceforth the book shower, which yielded indiscriminate accessions, could no longer be used as an appropriate means of acquiring books to meet the quantitative holdings requirements.¹⁰ *A List of Books for College Libraries*, by Charles Shaw,¹¹ and *A List of Books for Junior College Libraries*, by Foster Mohrhardt,¹² are the best known early efforts, although they were preceded by others such as Eugene Hilton's¹³ and Edna Hester's¹⁴ lists. The Shaw and Mohrhardt lists are especially important because they were not only tools designed to help the librarian select proper materials, but were also the yardsticks applied by the Carnegie Corporation in evaluating the libraries considered for grants designed to upgrade their collections and make them more vital to the undergraduates' interests. Librarians welcomed these book selection aids. Responding to the favorable reception by practicing librarians, lists are still being published. Since modern teaching methods, as well as the more recent standards, require extensive holdings, the lists have grown larger and librarians have a wider field to choose from for their growing collections. In addition to booklists covering the traditional college subjects, there are now also lists for the technical/vocational fields. Some of the recent lists include both book and nonbook media.¹⁵

It has been the prevailing view for many decades that the library should be more than a collection of curriculum-related materials: "it should provide, and make easily accessible for both students and faculty, standard cultural and recreative reading wholly apart from the fixed curriculum."¹⁶ College library authorities, expressing their views in articles, textbooks, standards¹⁷ and guidelines,¹⁸ stress that the

Service to College Students

college library should be the place where a student can satisfy both his curricular and his extra-curricular reading requirements. Authorities have also continuously stressed that the college library should not be concerned with size *per se*, but should contain only material which the student is likely to find helpful. Librarians are advised to keep their collections alive and give as much attention to the matter of discarding materials no longer useful as they give to the acquisition of new materials. This view is clearly stated in the 1972 guidelines¹⁹ and the 1975 college library standards.²⁰

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

As the library was increasingly used for collateral reading and independent study, it became evident that no one library, even a large one, could acquire all titles a student or researcher might wish to consult. To enlarge the pool of available materials, interlibrary lending was suggested. Samuel S. Green, the librarian of the Worcester Public Library, advocated such a course as early as 1876 in a letter to the editor of the *Library Journal*.²¹ Green was certain that such a service would be helpful to many types of readers—i.e., to the researcher as well as to the student and to the general reader. This idea gained proponents among college and university librarians. For instance, the University of California, under the leadership of Joseph Rowell, adopted a plan for interlibrary loans and invited other libraries to participate.²²

Interlibrary loan increasingly interested the profession and became a much-discussed issue. The culmination of these early efforts was the Interlibrary Loan Code of 1919.²³ This code allowed the borrowing of books for both the scholar and the general user. Usually the condition was stipulated that the books were to be used on the borrowing library's premises. The 1919 code had a restrictive influence even though its framers had hoped that the code would extend the scope of former practices. As a result of dissatisfaction with the 1919 code, work was undertaken on a new code, and a new document was adopted in 1940. However, this code, which was meant to eliminate obstacles to interlibrary lending, proved even more limiting. The 1940 code provided interlibrary loans only to researchers whose objective was to advance the frontiers of knowledge. Since this code, too, failed to accomplish the desired objectives, it underwent a revision which resulted in the General Interlibrary Loan Code of 1952. This code no longer excluded any specific group of readers. In practice, however, libraries restricted borrowing and lending for

undergraduates much more than for graduate students. In a 1963-64 study it was found that of eight libraries included in a sample, only three routinely lent to undergraduates.²⁴ Many libraries did not strictly observe the provisions of the 1952 code, just as some libraries had in the past disregarded the restrictive provisions of the 1919 and 1940 codes.

Since the 1952 code was not fully in harmony with the increasing emphasis on interdependence and mutual help, a new code was prepared—the 1968 National Interlibrary Loan Code. This code introduced a distinction between lending on the national level and lending on the local level. The 1968 code provides for nationwide lending to faculty and staff engaged in research, and to graduate students working on the theses and dissertations. The interests of undergraduates are recognized in the Model Interlibrary Loan Code for Regional, State, Local, or other Special Groups of Libraries. The provisions of the Model Code are intended at one and the same time to lighten the burden of the large academic and research libraries and to increase the accessibility of materials to the nonresearcher from local and regional resources. The local code views all kinds of library materials—book and nonbook—as suitable items for interlibrary loan transactions. Items may be requested for purposes of study, instruction, information or research.²⁵

The creation of networks and consortia has further augmented the opportunities of students—graduate and undergraduate—to obtain library materials their own institutions do not possess. In fact, the principal objective of some consortia is to give access to materials which libraries would not make available to outsiders under the Interlibrary Loan Code. While interlibrary loan presupposes a library as an intermediary, local or regional agreements now often provide that a user who is attached to a participating institution may borrow directly from any other member institution.

HOURS OF SERVICE

Most libraries were open only a few hours a day well into the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century. However, longer hours of service were gradually instituted. For instance, the Columbia College Library, which had been open only ten hours per week until 1878, increased its hours to 8:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m. after a main library was built and after Dewey had made changes designed to bring about more intensive use of the library.²⁶

Service to College Students

Apprehension that artificial lighting would cause fires prevented many libraries from being open during evenings and during other periods when there was not sufficient natural light for reading.²⁷ In spite of occasional setbacks, however, the general tendency was to extend the hours during which the library was accessible. George Works, who analyzed the fifty-year span from 1875 to 1925, found that all libraries (except one) included in his sample showed a continuing extension of the hours during which the library was open. The library at Oberlin College, which had the largest percentage increase, was open twenty-four hours per week in 1875 and eighty-seven hours in 1925.²⁸ The trend to keep the library open as many hours as the budget permits has continued to the present. Restrictions imposed by war and other periods of emergency have been viewed as temporary expediency. It is the prevailing opinion today that the college student should have access to the library whenever he needs to consult its resources. The 1975 college library standards clearly reflects this sentiment by stating that even "around-the-clock access to the library's collections and/or facilities may in some cases be warranted."²⁹

RESERVES

The provision of reserve books started at Harvard, when graduate students enrolled in seminars and undergraduates enrolled in pro-seminars were assigned collateral readings. To make books equitably available, Henry Adams introduced a method that came to be known as The Harvard Reserved Book Program. By 1878-79, thirty-four instructors had books placed on reserve, and by 1887 there were sixty who availed themselves of this service.³⁰ Dewey introduced the reserve system at Columbia, calling the books selected for this purpose "restricted reference books." He explained that this measure became necessary because immediately after assignments were made, a number of the students went to the shelves and checked out the items to which the class had been referred, and in this way many students were left without any collateral reading materials. Dewey decided to put these books behind the loan desk from which they were issued on call.³¹

The practices at Harvard and Columbia remained exceptional for a considerable time, since at most other institutions the textbook method was still in vogue. The custom of supplementing the textbook and the lecture by assigned readings became more common in the twentieth century.³² A separate reading room, the reserve reading

room, was often created. If the institution was small, a section behind or near the circulation desk was given over to reserve readings.

By the 1930s, placing material on reserve had become an almost universal procedure. There were great variations among the institutions in length of loan periods, justification for placing material on reserve, and amount of duplication of reserved items. Policies also differed as to whether reserves should be open (accessible to the student without any barriers) or closed (held behind a desk or an enclosure and available only by request).³³

While there has been practically universal agreement that it would be most desirable not to have any materials on reserve and to permit all books to be freely withdrawn, it has also been generally recognized that reserves are indispensable to ensure equitable availability of curriculum-related items.³⁴ If an institution of higher learning has both a main library and an undergraduate library, reserve materials for undergraduate courses are usually administered by the undergraduate library.³⁵

REFERENCE

Collection building was the principal concern of librarians, faculty members and administrators during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and well into the third decade of this century. There was not enough interest in, nor enough staff for, service activities.³⁶ While it is true that throughout the history of libraries, there have been librarians who have been known for their general helpfulness to the user, by the beginning of the twentieth century, organized assistance to the college library user had not been extensively developed, nor was it generally considered necessary to make any staff time specifically available for aid to the reader. Several outstanding exceptions to this prevailing attitude can, however, be noted.

Aid to the reader was strongly advocated by a number of leading public librarians such as Samuel S. Green, who urged personal contact between reader and librarian as early as 1876. It was Green's conviction that the librarian must make himself accessible.³⁷ While he spoke from the vantage point of a public librarian, his views were deemed applicable to the college scene by such outstanding college librarians and educational leaders as Otis Robinson of the University of Rochester, Reuben Guild of Brown University, and particularly Justin Winsor of Harvard. Most of the early college librarians did not have comprehensive assistance in mind. Their goals were to provide

Service to College Students

help in the use of the catalog, to further the students' comprehension of reading materials, and to give them general familiarity with the collection. Justin Winsor, however, offered services which are aspects of reference work; for example, he prepared a system of "notes and queries" and lists of references in anticipation of users' requests. Winsor also advocated instruction in the use of books. Many of these measures were primarily designed to help library users in groups rather than to provide help in individualized form, although such help could also be obtained. Melvil Dewey, who was thoroughly familiar with public library work, applied to the college situation the forms of individualized assistance so well received by users of the public library. In an address delivered in 1885, he said, "We are trying to work out the modern library idea in a university library."³⁸ As Rothstein emphasized, Dewey made reference service central rather than peripheral.³⁹ Dewey gave "aid to readers" the same status as was generally accorded to acquisition and cataloging. He assigned two full-time staff members to assist library users. Originally, the kind of assistance provided by Dewey was simply called "aid to readers," but from the 1890s on the term "reference" became the more common designation.

Dewey's example was followed by some other institutions, but the majority of college and university libraries were slow to accord reference the same standing as technical service functions. Even large universities were hesitant about assigning staff specifically to reference functions. On the college level where collections were generally small and staffs limited, full-time employees could seldom be spared, even if their libraries accepted the proposition that providing assistance to the individual user is a legitimate library function. One factor which militated against the appointment of full-time reference librarians was the conviction held by many that a well-developed, carefully planned analytical catalog would provide the answer to practically any question an individual might have.

A survey undertaken by Dorothy Fenton⁴⁰ showed that by 1938, only 38 of 380 libraries in colleges of liberal arts had full-time reference librarians. In assessing this situation, it should be kept in mind that many of these libraries were very small and that some had only one full-time professional staff member to handle the total library operation.

As teaching approaches changed from exclusive use of textbooks to the utilization of collateral materials, and as wide reading in general was stressed, students needed more urgently than before assistance in

the exploitation of the library's resources. Acquisition of materials and their cataloging and classification remained important library functions, but emphasis on reference has gained steadily through the years. Mainly to have more time for public service activities, some libraries turned to commercial cataloging, thereby freeing staff for assistance to the user. Service to the user was also enhanced by the democratization of education which became especially pronounced after World War II. The admissions policies of many institutions, especially of community colleges, were made increasingly flexible. Students who were provided with all kinds of learning materials often required and received assistance in selecting the media which would be most helpful in their learning efforts.

Over the years there has not been unanimity among librarians as to the depth and extent to which assistance should be rendered to the student.⁴¹ Some have advocated mere guidance to the sources—the conservative position. Others have advocated that the librarian not only find the information but also vouch for its accuracy—the liberal position. Still others have taken a stand between these two extremes. Quite apart from the fact that the reference staffs of the college and university libraries would not be large enough to render service in the liberal mode, most librarians and instructors believe that such help could be undesirable in the many instances in which the process of finding the information is an essential part of the student's learning experience. If the method of discovery is an integral element of an assignment, the librarian would generally not provide the needed information, but would rather lead the student toward finding it for himself. The librarian would keep in mind that the same inquiry may require different handling, depending on the status (undergraduate, graduate, faculty) or level of academic competence of the inquirer.

In both theory and practice there is no longer any doubt that reference service is one of the most important activities a library can perform. This service is now placed on such a comprehensive and inclusive basis that the term *information service* might better describe the wide range of activities college libraries are expected to assume today on behalf of faculty and students. Assistance to the individual user, as well as group instruction in the use of the library, has been given due consideration in the 1972 guidelines and in the 1975 college library standards. The responsibility of institutions of higher education to provide a full range of information services is unequivocally established in the document entitled "A Commitment to Information Services: Developmental Guidelines."⁴²

LIBRARY ORIENTATION AND INSTRUCTION

It seems unusual that in 1876, Professor Robinson held the view that the librarian might perhaps be better qualified and be more successful than the teacher in developing in students an understanding of books and reading. Robinson urged that librarians openly offer systematic instruction in the use of the library, a task until then performed only in a "loose and irregular way."⁴³ Included in the kind of lectures advocated by Robinson was information on how to get books, how to keep them, how to use them, how to read (when to skip and when to go through a work thoroughly), and how to judge the reputation of an author and his place among other writers.

Gradually, some libraries, especially those serving institutions which encouraged collateral reading, began to offer instruction in the use of the library. However, even in the 1920s there were few who presented comprehensive programs of library instruction. Lack of staff, time, funds and space were reasons given by institutions who failed to give instruction or who offered merely one or two lectures during orientation week.⁴⁴

In 1913, the Bureau of Education distributed questionnaires which dealt with various aspects of library economy (including "any instruction in the management of libraries,") to 596 institutions of higher learning and to 284 normal schools.⁴⁵ Normal schools will be omitted from our consideration since at these institutions library instruction was part of the professional training. Replies were received from 446 of the 596 institutions. Of these, only seven required courses with credit toward graduation. Elective courses with credit were offered by another nineteen colleges.

In 1936, in a review of surveys undertaken in the preceding twenty-year period, Evelyn Little found that library instruction varied widely among various institutions.⁴⁶ Up to 50 percent of the participants included in some of the surveys did not have any library instruction at all, not even brief library orientation. The methods of instructing students in library use were of varying scope, depth and intensity: one or two orientation lectures explaining the layout of the facilities, instruction consisting of five to six lectures (usually without credit), library instruction integrated with a subject course such as English, and independent courses consisting of fourteen to sixteen lectures (usually elective and for credit). Among the approximately 200 colleges William Randall surveyed, one or two library lectures during orientation was the most usual offering.⁴⁷ Randall observed

that students were deficient in the use of bibliographic aids other than the catalog and he was convinced that they would benefit greatly from taking courses in bibliography and bibliographical methods. This attitude is also evident in item 27 of the Carnegie standards issued in 1932: "Formal instruction in the use of the library and in the use of bibliographical aids should be given by the librarian or other competent instructor, and required of all students."⁴⁸ Subsequent practices of libraries have nevertheless continued to vary, still ranging from those giving library orientation in one or two lectures to those offering full-semester courses.

The controversy over whether library instruction should be integrated with a subject course or whether it should be independent also persists. In recent years some institutions have utilized films, filmstrips, slides and other nonbook media as devices of instruction. In some institutions these materials can be consulted at any time and at various locations on campus. They are frequently intended to replace actual walk-through tours. The 1959 "Standards for College Libraries" and the 1960 "Standards for Junior College Libraries" assert that instruction in the use of the library greatly facilitates student learning.⁴⁹ The former document states: "The effectiveness of instruction in the use of the library given by the staff will be reflected in how well the students avail themselves of the library resources";⁵⁰ wording in the 1960 standards is similar. The 1972 guidelines note that the learning resources program should provide services which include assistance to faculty and students with the use of learning resources.⁵¹ The 1975 college library standards are more specific and stipulate that proper services shall include "the provision of continuing instruction to patrons in the effective exploitation of libraries; the guidance of patrons to the library materials they need."⁵² Library instruction today must sensitize the student to the shift in the bibliographical scene, a shift which has made available increasingly varied bibliographies by modern, computer-based retrieval methods. The obligation to provide bibliographic instruction is now clearly established in the document entitled "Toward Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries."⁵³

INDEPENDENT STUDY

Usually reserves constitute only a small portion of the total library collection. Since many students do not consult any materials but those placed on reserve, various measures have been employed to draw

Service to College Students

students to the rich, full resources of the whole collection. For instance, books of general appeal were taken out of the stacks and shelved in attractive, inviting browsing rooms. It was doubted by some, however, whether it would be justifiable to spend so much money and energy on work which is extracurricular. These critics felt that the efforts should be directed to a deeper involvement of students in curriculum-related reading.⁵⁴ Gradually most browsing rooms were discontinued, although some of their features were incorporated into the library's whole operation. In newer buildings, efforts have been directed toward making the whole library a pleasant, comfortable place in which both curricular and noncurricular learning can be pursued.

Other elements which increased general library use were tutorial programs, honors courses, and senior theses. As mentioned earlier, such programs favoring independent study and use of many materials were designed for the superior learner. More recent instructional developments have extended individualization of teaching and learning to the entire student body. This is especially true for community colleges—the “open-door” colleges—which usually have a heterogeneous student body for whom the library must provide various kinds of learning materials of varying levels of difficulty. As already noted, similar provisions must also be made for the students who enter college by enrolling in open-education programs.

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY AND OTHER UNDERGRADUATE PLANS

When a library serves several levels of students there is a tendency to favor those who are advanced. Graduate students are thus frequently given more consideration than undergraduates. Even if there should be completely equal treatment of all students, the beginner might find it awkward and confusing to make his way through a very large collection, for most of which he has no use.

Awareness of the special needs of the undergraduate is not new. Records of Harvard dating back to 1765 stipulate that a part of the library shall be “kept distinct from the rest as a smaller Library for the more common use of the College.”⁵⁵ A definite proposal for the establishment of an undergraduate library at Harvard was submitted by Andrews Norton as early as 1815;⁵⁶ however, the Lamont Library was not completed until 1945. Harvard undergraduates worked for this goal for many years. They complained about Widener, the main library, as being a cold, business-like place “which only the skilled

graduate can rightly use."⁵⁷ The situation at Harvard was not unique; similar situations had developed at other universities. As graduate enrollments grew and as the libraries became larger, various measures were taken by some universities to provide services tailored to the needs of undergraduates.⁵⁸

An important device was the establishment of undergraduate collections; these were usually (but not necessarily) housed in the main library. The University of Chicago and Columbia University, for example, had such collections. Many other institutions had less comprehensive plans designed to help the undergraduate library user. Most of these "undergraduate plans" provided for one or two floors, or if the institution was smaller, for one or two rooms. The undergraduate collections were of various kinds and varying degrees of inclusiveness: amplified reserve collections, browsing collections with fiction and non-course-related items, and collections of only course-connected materials.

The collections housed in the main library, while providing some help to the bewildered undergraduate, were insufficient. Separate undergraduate libraries were subsequently established. They are distinguished by an inviting, informal setting and are easily accessible, providing most of the books to which the undergraduate should be exposed, items required for his course work, and general cultural material. The undergraduate library has often adopted a broad concept of library service, assuming the responsibility for supplying films, filmstrips, records, tapes and other types of media which are usually not found in the university's main library. Service to the student is the main concern and extraordinary efforts are often made to satisfy the many diverse expectations and needs of the students by providing a very wide range of services and facilities. Norah Jones, recounting the experiences at UCLA, cites measures used to interest the undergraduates in their library, such as: (1) inviting faculty members to discuss their specialties; (2) making the library the crisis information center which handles inquiries on current political matters; and (3) introducing library games for disadvantaged minority students based on data relating to their ethnic background.⁵⁹

The several elements affecting library service which were considered in the preceding discussion demonstrate very similar tendencies i.e., evolving from a book-centered toward a user-centered library. A library policy which was mainly aimed at enlargement and preserva-

Service to College Students

tion of the collection, regardless of its suitability for the student, was gradually replaced by a policy taking fully into account the needs of the user. The resources have not only been enlarged, but also enriched in quality, and amplified by newer media. Reader services have been expanded and individualized, all aimed toward establishing and improving contact between the student and his library.

Organizational changes, such as the establishment of undergraduate libraries, have been undertaken to create attractive and functionally effective units in which the student finds most of the materials he may wish to consult. No efforts are being spared to make the library a true instrument of teaching and learning. The modern college library permits the application of new concepts of teaching, and it can be said that the library "now serves also as a complementary academic capability which affords to students the opportunity to augment their classroom experience with an independent avenue for learning beyond the course offerings of the institution."⁶⁰

References

1. For more detailed background information see Govan, James F. "Collegiate Education: Past and Present," *Library Trends* 18:13-28, July 1969.
2. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1970, pp. 51-52.
3. Medsker, Leland L., and Tillery, Dale. *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971, pp. 53-73.
4. Veit, Fritz. *The Community College Library*. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1975, pp. 212-15.
5. U. S. Bureau of Education. *Public Libraries in the United States of America. Special Report. Part I*. Washington, D.C. U.S.G.P.O., 1876, p. 62.
6. Ambrose, Lodilla. "A Study of College Libraries," *Library Journal* 18:114, April 1893.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 113-14.
8. Harwell, Richard. "College Libraries." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 5. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1971, p. 273.
9. Works, George A. *College and University Library Problems*. Chicago, ALA, 1927, p. 12.
10. Wilson, Louis R. "The Emergence of the College Library," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 25:442, Sept. 1931.
11. Shaw, Charles B. *A List of Books for College Libraries*. Chicago, ALA, 1931; and *A List of Books for College Libraries, 1931-1938*. Chicago, ALA, 1940.
12. Mohrhardt, Foster E., comp. *A List of Books for Junior College Libraries*. Chicago, ALA, 1937.
13. Hilton, Eugene. *Junior College Book List* (University of California

Publications in Education, vol. 1, no. 1). Berkeley, University of California Press, 1930.

14. Hester, Edna A. *Books for Junior Colleges*. Chicago, ALA, 1931.

15. For examples see Veit, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-86.

16. Wyer, James I., Jr. *The College and University Library*. Chicago, ALA, 1911, p. 1.

17. Carnegie Corporation of New York. Advisory Group on College Libraries. *College Library Standards*. New York, Carnegie Corporation, 1932, p. 11. (Also in William M. Randall, *The College Library*. Chicago, ALA and University of Chicago Press, 1932, p. 142.)

18. American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries, et al. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs," *College and Research Libraries News* 11:314, Dec. 1972.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 314-15.

20. Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries News* 36:290, Oct. 1975.

21. Green, Samuel S. "The Lending of Books to One Another by Libraries," *Library Journal* 1:15-16, Sept. 1876.

22. "Inter-library Loans," *Library Journal* 23:104, March 1898.

23. For a discussion relating to this and subsequent interlibrary loan codes see King, Geraldine, and Johnson, Herbert F. "Interlibrary Loan (ILL)." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 12. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1974, pp. 196-211.

24. Thomson, Sara K. *Interlibrary Loan Involving Academic Libraries* (ACRL Monograph No. 32). Chicago, ALA, 1970, p. 12.

25. Both the National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1968, Annotated, and the Model Interlibrary Loan Code for Regional, State, Local, or Other Special Groups of Libraries, Annotated, are reprinted in Sara K. Thomson. *Interlibrary Loan Procedure Manual*. Chicago, ALA, 1970, pp. 1-17.

26. Brough, Kenneth J. *Scholar's Workshop: Evolving Concepts of Library Service*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1953, p. 112; and Columbia College. Library and School of Library Economy. "Circular of Information, 1884."

27. Brough, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-15.

28. Works, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-50.

29. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 293.

30. Brough, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

31. Dewey, Melvil. "Restricted Reference Books," *Library Notes* 2:216-18, Dec. 1887.

32. Brown, Charles H., and Bousfield, H. G. *Circulation Work in College and University Libraries*. Chicago, ALA, 1933, pp. 80-83.

33. Koch, Theodore W. "A Symposium on the Reserve Book System." In A.F. Kuhlman, ed. *College and University Library Service*. Chicago, ALA, 1938, pp. 74-78.

34. Lyle, Guy R. *The Administration of the College Library*. 4th ed. New York, H.W. Wilson, 1974, pp. 81-83.

35. Braden, Irene A. *The Undergraduate Library* (ACRL Monograph No. 31). Chicago, ALA, 1970, p. 3.

Service to College Students

36. The development of reference services has been traced and thoroughly documented in Samuel Rothstein. *The Development of Reference Services Through Academic Traditions, Public Library Practice and Special Librarianship* (ACRL Monograph No. 14). Chicago, Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1955, especially pp. 24-48, 75-79, and 100-110.
37. Green, Samuel S. "Personal Relations Between Librarians and Readers," *Library Journal* 1:74-81, Oct. 1876.
38. Brooklyn Library. *The Twenty-Seventh Annual Report . . . Presented March 26, 1885*. Brooklyn, 1885, p. 10.
39. Rothstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.
40. Fenton, Dorothy M. "The Reference Librarian," *Journal of Higher Education* 9:153-56, March 1938.
41. Rothstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43, 74-83.
42. American Library Association. Reference and Adult Services Division. Standards Committee. "A Commitment to Information Services: Developmental Guidelines," *RQ* 14:24-26, Fall 1974. With addenda in Dennis Ribbens. "Editorial Comments," *RQ* 14:101, Winter 1974.
43. Robinson, Otis H. "College Library Administration." In U.S. Bureau of Education, *op. cit.*, p. 521.
44. Little, Evelyn S. "Instruction in the Use of Books and Libraries in Colleges and Universities." Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Library, 1936, p. 18 (processed); and Brown and Bousfield, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
45. Evans, Henry R. *Library Instruction in Universities, Colleges and Normal Schools* (U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1914, no. 34. Whole no. 608). Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1914, pp.4-5.
46. Little, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-23.
47. Randall, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-18.
48. Carnegie Corporation. . . , as reproduced in Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 142. (Expanded as compared to Carnegie Standards, item 21, p. 11.)
49. Association of College and Research Libraries. Committee on Standards. "Standards for College Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 20:279, July 1959; and ————. "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 21:205, May 1960.
50. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for College Libraries (1959)," *op. cit.*, p. 279.
51. American Library Association, "Guidelines. . . ," *op. cit.*, p. 308.
52. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for College Libraries (1975)," *op. cit.*, p. 292.
53. Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Task Force. "Toward Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," *College and Research Libraries News* 36:137-39+, May 1975.
54. See, for example, Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries*. Chicago, Association of American Colleges and ALA, 1940, pp. 116-18.
55. Metcalf, Keyes D. "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1765-1877," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 1:29, Winter 1947.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
57. Lovett, Robert W. "The Undergraduate and the Harvard Library, 1877-1937," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 1:234, Spring 1947.

FRITZ VEIT

58. Braden, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.
59. Jones, Norah E. "The UCLA Experience: An Undergraduate Library—for Undergraduates!" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 45:584-90, Feb. 1971.
60. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for College Libraries (1975)," *op. cit.*, p. 278. *See also* American Library Association, "Guidelines. . .," *op. cit.*, IA2, p. 308.