

72-10,058

MILLER, Laurence Alan, 1940-
CHANGING PATTERNS OF CIRCULATION SERVICES IN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES.

The Florida State University, Ph.D., 1971
Library Science

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1971

LAURENCE ALAN MILLER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

CHANGING PATTERNS OF CIRCULATION SERVICES
IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

By
Laurence Miller

A Dissertation submitted to
the School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Copyright © 1971
by Laurence Miller.
All rights reserved.

August, 1971

John M. Howie
Professor directing Dissertation

Paul H. Rockwood

W. Hugh Stickler

Howard Golden

Dean, School of Library Science

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some Pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.**

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

CHANGING PATTERNS OF CIRCULATION SERVICES
IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

(Publication No.)

Laurence Miller, Ph. D.
The Florida State University, 1971

Major Professor: John Goudeau

The study traces, through the historical and survey methods, the evolution in function and staff of the university library circulation department in this century. It ascertains its current status and examines a number of potentially causal factors in this transformation.

As recently as the mid-1920's, there was very little administrative or functional distinction between the circulation and reference departments. Often, both services were provided from the same desk and frequently from within the same department. With the demand for increasingly specialized information service and the geometric increase in book circulation, these two departments tended to become separate. Nevertheless, a notable ambiguity in function remained, especially in the information service area.

Early job analyses and classifications reveal a number of reader service functions within the circulation department: interlibrary loan, assistance to readers in the use of the card catalog, library instruction, and others. Highly professional qualifications were specified for circulation personnel.

Through the years, a number of functions formerly allocated to the circulation department have been rationalized into separate departments. The study examines managerial and organizational explanations for this phenomenon in the context of management theory. Related literature of library management is also examined.

The dearth of recent research concerning the evolution with which the study is concerned made necessary a survey for empirical validation of the departmental evolution. A questionnaire was sent to principal libraries in 126 institutions graduating thirty or more Ph.D's per year. It sought to ascertain which functions were allocated to the circulation department; staffing patterns; the influence of automation, systems analysis, open/closed stacks, and architectural considerations; and it surveyed management attitudes toward the role of the department. A 90.5% return was achieved.

An analysis of returns revealed that the typical circulation department in the major university library embraces the following functions: reserve books, the handling of directional and incidental information inquiries, shelving, and stack maintenance. The department is also importantly involved in policy formation. On the other hand, gone are such activities as reference service, interlibrary loans, library instruction/orientation, assistance to readers at the card catalog, and any special role in book selection. Aside from the policy formation function (which need not take place within the department), most activities remaining are technical in nature.

While most professional functions have been taken from circulation services, professional librarians are still widely employed in this department. Roughly two-thirds of the units included in the study are headed by professional librarians. An equal number of professional staff are employed in subordinate roles. In many cases, several professionals are assigned in the complete absence of professional functions. This raises serious questions regarding the need for their presence and, in a broader context, it raises a number of questions for the library profession concerning the impact of using professionals in this manner.

A number of potentially causal elements are examined in relation to the functional evolution of the circulation department. Discounted as significant influences are automation and/or systems analysis, the presence or absence of a reader services division pattern of organization, and, to some extent, the presence or absence of open stacks. Library architecture poses no significant restraining influence on the evolution of this department.

In the absence of these elements as significant causal factors, the most likely alternative explanation is the growth of libraries as organizations and the dynamics that become operative under these circumstances. The change in the nature of parent institutions, and the growth of demand for library services, are part of this. This embryonic theory finds broad support in the writings of management theorists and among many who have written in the area of organizational dynamics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express gratitude for the contributions that a number of people have made to this study. These especially include Dr. John Goudeau, major professor, whose encouragement led me to undertake this study; and Dr. Harold Goldstein, Dr. Ruth Rockwood, and Dr. Hugh Stickler who, with Dr. Goudeau, have rendered valuable criticism and advice at every stage of the project.

A large number of people, including students, faculty, and librarians, assisted with the design and testing of the questionnaire. These notably included Dr. Douglas Zahn, statistical consultant, Dr. Gerald Jahoda, Mr. James Schmidt, Mr. Walter Wicker, and many others.

Finally, I am especially grateful to the many librarians who, in a climate of general hostility to questionnaires, took the time to complete the eight-page form sent to them. That it is still possible to get in excess of a 90% response when this is the only way of obtaining the information is a tribute to the patience, generosity, and professionalism of those who contributed their time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Part 1. CIRCULATION SERVICES IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AS REFLECTED IN LIBRARY LITERATURE	
	3
Chapter	
I. Circulation Services Function and Staffing Patterns: a Review of the Literature	4
II. Circulation Staff, Function, and the Literature of Library Job Classification and Analysis	30
III. Summary and Trends as Indicated in the Literature of Circulation Services	48
Part 2. CIRCULATION SERVICES IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES: MANAGERIAL ISSUES	
	53
IV. An Analysis of General Management Principles	54
V. Principles of Organization and Staffing Patterns as Defined by Librarians	65
VI. Summary of Related Management Issues	76
Part 3. CURRENT THOUGHT AND PRACTICE IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CIRCULATION SERVICES	
	79
VII. The Problem and Methodology	80
VIII. Functions and Functional Patterns in Circulation Services	87
IX. Staff Employment and Utilization in Circulation Services	110

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

Part 3 - Continued

X. The Evolution of Circulation Function and Staff: an Analysis of Some Related Factors	121
XI. Management Attitudes Toward the Role of Circulation Services	134
Part 4. TOWARD A THEORY OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CIRCULATION SERVICE	140
Appendix	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE	156
B. PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY	167
VITA	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. The Professional Classification of Work and the Assignment of Duties in One College Library Circulation Department -- as Represented in Both the First and the Second Edition of Lyle's <u>The Administration of the College Library</u>	22
2. The Professional Classification of Work and the Assignment of Duties in One College Library Circulation Department -- as Represented in the Third Edition of Lyle's <u>The Administration of the College Library</u>	24
3. Characteristics of Institutions and Libraries Included in Study (1970)	83
4. Survey Response by Data Group	85
5. Quick Information Service as a Circulation Department Function: by Size of Library	91
6. Interlibrary Loan Service as a Circulation Department Function: an Analysis by Size of Library	93
7. Library Instruction and/or Orientation as a Circulation Function: an Analysis by Student and Library Category	94
8. Assistance of Readers in the Use of the Card Catalog as a Circulation Function: an Analysis by Library Size	96
9. Circulation Department Participation in Policy Formation: an Analysis by Library Size	102
10. Patterns in Two Types of Professional Functions in Circulation Services: an Analysis by Size of Library	107
11. Highest Degree Held by Chief of Circulation Services	112
12. Highest Degree Held by Supportive Staff in Circulation Services	113

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

Table

13. Staffing of Specialized Positions Within the Circulation Department	115
14. Professional Staff Assignments in Relation to Two Types of Professional Functions	118
15. Effect of Automation and Systems Analysis on Functions and Staff in Circulation Services	125
16. Percentage of Libraries and Circulation Departments Undertaking Automation in Relation to Library Size Group Populations	126
17. Average Number of Professional Functions and Professional Staff in Automated and Non-Automated Circulation Departments	127
18. Mean Number of Functions in Circulation Departments that Have/Have Not Undergone Systems Analysis	128
19. Number of Professional Functions Present in Circulation Departments of Open Stack and Restricted Access Libraries	131
20. Patterns of Professional Function Allocation to Circulation Departments Within and Outside of Formal Reader Service Divisions	132
21. Management Attitudes Toward Information Service Provided in the Circulation Department	135
22. Management Attitudes Toward the Appropriateness of Including Various Functions Within Circulation Services	136
23. Management Attitudes Toward Information Service Provided in the Circulation Department and Toward the Appropriateness of Including Various Other Functions Within Circulation Service: in Libraries Where the Circulation Department Has Been Subjected to Systems Analysis	137

INTRODUCTION

Since late in the last century, the scope of activities embraced within the university library circulation department and the place of this department in fulfilling library objectives have undergone substantive transformations. These changes have paralleled and been a part of the evolution of the university library itself. In the beginning there was the one-man library; then the small library with cataloging and perhaps administration separated from the loan desk; and finally the multiversity library with rationalized organization where the circulation department is often one limited and largely technical component. Accompanying this transformation has been a change in the role of the librarian: from that as custodian of books to the professional and specialist contributing directly to the achievement of the primary objectives of the university: teaching, research, and service.

In general terms, the purpose of this study is to examine the evolution of function and staffing patterns in circulation services, ascertain its current status, and provide an interpretation of it in a managerial and a library context.

In order to accomplish this, the inquiry will be divided into four major parts: (1) a general review and interpretation of library literature relating to circulation services in academic libraries,

(2) an examination of relevant literature in the field of general management, and of the literature of library management related to the area of the study, (3) a survey of current thought and practice regarding function and staffing patterns in circulation services and an examination of some causal factors, and (4) a theoretical interpretation of the impact of the study.

Although the survey relates primarily to the university library, both colleges and universities are considered in studying the evolution of the circulation department, particularly in the historical sections. The reason for this is that many of the major universities that fall within the confines of the universe under consideration have evolved from 'college' status since the turn of the century. Thus, one must consider practices and thinking relating to both types of institution in viewing the evolution with which this study is concerned.

In order to make this overview as complete and as generalizable as possible, ~~it is confined strictly to its focal points --~~ functions and staffing patterns from 1900 to the present. Through exercising this kind of limitation, it is hoped that the study will be as exhaustive and comprehensive as possible within its stated area of concern.

PART 1

CIRCULATION SERVICES IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

AS REFLECTED IN LIBRARY LITERATURE

I. CIRCULATION SERVICES FUNCTION AND STAFFING PATTERNS:

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The study of library literature specifically relating to circulation services in university libraries began with a survey of relevant sections of Cannon's Bibliography of Library Economy¹ embracing the period from 1900 to 1920. The writer encountered no significant discussion of circulation function and staffing patterns in academic libraries among the articles indexed. Under the heading "Special Libraries - College and University Libraries - United States" there was not one article specifically relating to the broad aspects of circulation services of interest here.² A review of the section "Loan Work Lending Department" [sic], indexing articles relating to all types of libraries, was no more illuminating. The primary concern of the articles listed was with such matters as charging systems, registration of borrowers, forms, fines, and overdues.³ It is indicative of the interest centering on circulation services in all types of libraries that for the entire period covered by the bibliography two pages are devoted to the general aspects of circulation

¹H. G. T. Cannon (Chicago: American Library Association, 1927).

²Ibid., pp. 81-85.

³Ibid., pp. 489-502.

work while roughly ten concern technical and highly specialized matters including and similar to those mentioned above. Of twenty articles in this section during the period under study, six appeared to be of potential interest. On examination, however, all pertained to public libraries.¹

A number of articles relating to general library organization and administration and to the question of open stacks were examined. The issues of function allocation and circulation staffing were not treated with sufficient specificity to draw generalizations on contemporary thought in this area.

To the extent that the above literature reflects professional thinking then current, it is evident that functions and staffing patterns were taken for granted and considered to be of primarily individual concern. One might reason that in view of the primitive state of managerial theory prevailing in the first two decades of this century, it is expecting too much that anything like a unified body of thought relating to circulation function and staff would have evolved. Yet the writings of Bostwick, Crunden, and Austin had introduced the concept of scientific management to the library profession in some breadth beginning as early as 1887.² It is evident,

¹Ibid., p. 158.

²E. G. A. E. Bostwick, "Conflicts of Jurisdiction in Library Systems," Library Journal, Vol. 45 (August, 1914), pp. 588-591; Frederick H. Crunden, "Business Methods in Library Management," Library Journal, Vol. 12 (September, 1887), pp. 335-338, 435-436; Willard Austin, "Efficiency in Library Management," Library Journal Vol. 36 (November, 1911), pp. 566-569.

however, that the writings of these individuals provoked no major formulation of library organizational and staffing theory up to and including the period of World War I.

The earliest objective indication of circulation functions and services³ in academic libraries is contained in the American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States, published in 1926.¹ Among the survey findings were those yielding the following generalizations:

In most college and university libraries both the circulation department and the reference department, whether considered in their location, their organization, or their work, are less easily defined than are the same departments in public libraries. Although many libraries report that the two departments are separate in location, in most cases they are very closely connected and in many cases they are combined in the same room or under joint supervision in adjoining rooms. A large part of the work of the circulation department is closely associated with the use of the library for purposes of study or research. The reference service, in the larger libraries, is usually centralized only to a slight extent.²

.....

The duties that are considered part of the circulation department's work usually include stack service at the loan desk, if not complete supervision of the stacks, and often, also, work connected with reserve reading, in addition to the clerical work involved in circulation and the necessary assistance to readers. As is indicated in several of the reports cited . . . student assistants are employed in many libraries for shelving and page service, for clerical or routine work at the loan desk, or for evening service in the reading room.³

¹(Chicago: American Library Association).

²Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 153.

³Ibid., p. 158.

The survey described configurations in individual institutions. Lack of uniformity in reporting data, however, makes generalization difficult. In general, the connection between the circulation and reference departments was a very intimate one and differentiation of a separate reference department and/or staff, while it had definitely begun, had not proceeded very far.

George Alan Works' 1927 study, College and University Library Problems, prepared for the American Association of Universities, emphasized the need for more highly trained personnel.¹ He stated that both reference and circulation work, among other areas, required persons "of superior ability who possess a high type of professional education."² He did acknowledge the problem of separating clerical and professional responsibilities in his chapter concerning the status of professional staff. He also noted that

too many faculty members and administrative officers are prone to think of the library staff, aside from the titular librarian and one or two of his assistants, as persons who are discharging responsibility essentially clerical in nature.³

However, the tone of his study, above all, expressed concern for the additional professional staff that he felt to be essential.

The earliest primer on circulation work encountered by the writer was that written by Carl Vitz of the Toledo Public Library.

¹(Chicago: American Library Association, 1927).

²Ibid., p. 80.

³Ibid.

and published by the American Library Association in 1927.¹ The forty-page booklet, though nominally concerned with circulation service in all types of libraries, was written from the standpoint that in an academic library, circulation "is much overshadowed by the more important reference and technical departments . . ." but that in the public library "circulation work reaches its full development . . ." as "a very important part of the library's work, by far the most important if measured quantitatively."² The book was therefore most concerned with public library circulation service and, within this orientation, mostly with the routine and technical aspects.

In 1927 there appeared Flexner's book, Circulation Work in Public Libraries.³ This is of interest to this study only inasmuch as it advanced -- for the first time in such complete detail -- the comprehensive view of circulation work as more or less synonymous with reader services. This view was to be amplified considerably by later writers.

Five years later, McHale included the following as professional duties in the university library circulation department: organization of departmental activities, hiring and training of student assistants,

¹Circulation Work (rev. ed.; Chicago).

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Jennie M. Flexner (Chicago: American Library Association).

readers' advisor, miscellaneous dealings with faculty, interlibrary loan, measuring use of the collection, and dealing with other departments in the library.¹ He stated that while these were looked upon as frills in some libraries,

these activities by their absence or presence mark the difference between a circulation department that merely fetches and carries and one that does instructive work in facilitating the use of the library. A few of them belong to the head of the department; most are participated in by other members of the professional grade.²

In 1933 there appeared the classic work in the area of academic library circulation service, Brown and Bousfield's Circulation Work in College and University Libraries.³ This was the academic library counterpart of Flexner's work on public library circulation service. The view of the circulation role to a large extent followed the broad pattern set in the earlier book.

The authors viewed the role of the circulation department in consideration of not only the library but of the entire institution. Although the pattern of circulation service advocated was challenged almost immediately, the treatment itself was thoroughly professional. One can admire the wisdom of the authors in the sphere of academic library management even while rejecting many of their assumptions regarding the circulation role per se. If the view of the departmental

¹Cecil J. McHale, "Professional Duties in the University Library Circulation Department," Wilson Bulletin, Vol. 6 (January, 1932), pp. 359-360.

²Ibid., p. 359.

³Charles Harvey Brown and H. G. Bousfield (Chicago: American Library Association).

function was comprehensive even by the standards of the time, it could be regarded as different only in degree from the pattern of functions and services widely acknowledged as the concern of the circulation department in the interwar period.

The authors outlined the functions of the circulation department as follows:

- (a) To deliver promptly every book needed and requested by a patron.
- (b) To assist each patron through personal assistance to find material in the catalog quickly.
- (c) To enable each patron through personal assistance to locate material which may be found quickly through periodical indexes, bibliographies or reference books. (If the inquiry cannot be answered quickly, it is referred to the reference department.)
- (d) To develop in each student through instruction and training the ability to use effectively the catalog and the more important reference books.
- (e) To afford opportunity to any patron to discuss book needs and to obtain at the library adequate suggestions for reading.
- (f) To bring about an understanding by each faculty member of the assistance a library can render in instructional work.
- (g) To supply information and service that will enable the individual student to realize the aid to his educational development obtainable through books and libraries. This objective implies a realization of the value of both general and professional reading.¹

The authors listed the following specific duties and places where they were to be undertaken:

- (a) The loan desk.
- (b) The assigned reading desk.

¹Ibid., p. 34.

- (c) The periodical desk.
- (d) The service desk of departmental libraries (excluding such work as does not involve contact with the public).
- (e) The browsing room.
- (f) Service over the telephone.
- (g) Aid in the use of the catalog.
- (h) Quick information service.
- (i) Instruction in the use of books and libraries.
- (j) Advice to students on general readings.
- (k) Interviews with members of the faculty on the use of books.
- (l) Addresses at faculty and departmental meetings.
- (m) Publicity in regard to books and the place of reading in the college curriculum.¹

The authors further stated that the specific assignment of duties to the loan department will depend on the following factors:

- (a) The type of institution which the library is serving and the size of the book collection.
- (b) The number of students.
- (c) The personality and qualifications of the loan and reference librarians.
- (d) The interests of the librarian.
- (e) The arrangement of the building.²

One can accept the fact that in practice these factors loom large even today. Present-day managerial practice, however, would

¹Ibid., p. 36.

²Ibid., p. 37.

probably dictate first choosing the functions that it is desirable to concentrate in the circulation department (as compared with other locations) and then planning staff appointments and patterns accordingly.

In the area of personnel, the authors stated:

Even in the smallest colleges it is doubtful whether the library can function properly if the loan department is in charge of a clerical assistant or if contact with patrons is left chiefly to student attendants. The employment of at least two trained assistants, one for cataloging and one for service to readers, is recommended.¹

The authors pointed out that the above statement was in harmony with the recommendations of the American Library Association Committee on Classification of Library Personnel for libraries of Class Four.² For loan departments in major university libraries, Brown and Bousfield made the following recommendations regarding composition of staff:

- (a) The loan librarian and first assistant, whose duties are to supervise the work at the desk and to act as "contact" assistants. In larger libraries a second assistant will be needed in order to relieve the loan librarian of the work of supervision in order that he may devote more of his time to administration. In a few libraries the chief of the readers' department acts as loan librarian.
- (b) Several accurate assistants for the routine work of filing cards, charging and discharging books. (Clerical or sub-professional assistants).
- (c) Student Assistants . . . [as desk clerks and stack pages.]

¹Ibid., pp. 40-41.

²Ibid., p. 41.

- (d) An assistant who possesses the ability to teach, to take charge of the instruction in the use of the library. This duty may be assigned to a member of another department or to the librarian.
- (e) Assistants to serve as information assistants, or readers' advisors, at the information desk.
- (f) Two assistants with executive ability to take charge of the two shifts in the assigned reading room.
- (g) Student attendants and clerical workers in the assigned reading room.¹

It can be seen that the Brown and Bousfield book represents a comprehensive treatment of circulation services, one in which professional and general organizational issues receive significant consideration.

The writer examined reviews of the Brown and Bousfield book for indications of professional reaction to the broad and comprehensive view of circulation work expounded by the authors. Helen M. Smith, Head of the Circulation Department in the University of Minnesota, accepted and approved of the assumptions and recommendations made.² In very notable contrast, Donald Coney, writing in Library Quarterly and expressing a broader managerial viewpoint, noted that the book was "founded on a definition that extends college circulation work beyond the limits usually understood."³ Summarizing the general groupings of activities included by Brown and Bousfield within the

¹Ibid., p. 42.

²Review of Brown and Bousfield's Circulation Work . . . , Library Journal, Vol. 58 (June 1, 1933), pp. 494-495.

³Review of Brown and Bousfield's Circulation Work . . . , Vol. 3 (October, 1933), p. 432.

sphere of circulation work as book delivery service, information service, instruction, and advisory and promotional work, Coney added:

This 'broad conception of the work of the loan department' is used as a basis for discussion 'because it is believed that the various services mentioned should be performed by some department of the library and because in some libraries they are assigned to the loan department.'

This reason for adopting such a conception of circulation work leaves room for suspicion that other assignments of work might be equally if not more preferable. Organization is most efficient when similar jobs are combined. Certainly there is little homogeneity among the simple and often arduous routines of book delivery and the kind of work embodied in giving instruction. Information and advice about books and libraries and the promotion of their use call for different skills and knowledge from those required for the delivery of books. Informational, advisory, and promotional work might be thought to be more akin to that of the reference department than the too often beleaguered circulation desk. It is so thought by J. I. Wyer in his Reference Work where he discusses these functions of the library as parts of the reference service.

The proposal to include these various services under the head of circulation work in college libraries is not new; the formal inclusion of them in the first textbook on the subject makes them eligible for careful examination. . . . it appears that because of the increasing size of book collections and card catalogues, and an increasing need for material on the part of students, information and advice must precede requests for books. This change is consonant with recent changes in educational technique where assignment by topic tends to replace assignment to specific books. . . . Perhaps a better way to meet the new demands on college and university libraries is by the establishment midway between circulation and reference, physically as well as functionally, of an advisory service through which all requests will be sifted.¹

This review represents the earliest major challenge to the then-rapidly developing broad concept of circulation services

¹Ibid., pp. 432-433.

that the writer has encountered in the course of this study. Until this review, the broad conception referred to had to a large extent been accepted without having been thoroughly articulated or placed under critical scrutiny.

A second analysis of the information function in the context of the circulation department was provided by Ethel M. Fair in an article entitled "Horseshoe or Millstone?"¹ In it she acknowledged the department's unofficial status as the 'Heart of the Library' and then challenged its suitability for the role of information center. Fair stated that as it had become the chief link between library materials and the user, it had also evolved into an architectural and psychological barrier between the reader and library resources. The article further stated:

From the time when 'the librarian' was in actual fact the person carrying out all the duties connected with the circulation of books to the present complex organization of even medium sized . . . libraries, the duties of the book expert and the clerical assistant have become disastrously combined in the work which is carried out behind the desk. Disastrously, in that the clerical work crowds out the exchange of ideas on books.

It seems clear . . . that satisfactory organization, free from the objections mentioned above, can never be attained in a busy circulating department as long as this piece of furniture [the conventional circulation desk] is allowed to occupy the place into which it has grown in the architectural scheme, as long as it continues to be a barrier to the book collection, an area for conflicting duties of the staff and a false symbol of authority. The services which the wooden horseshoe has housed must be differentiated as records and as book selecting which must be located and housed as befits each service.²

¹Library Journal, Vol. 59 (May 15, 1934), pp. 429-430.

²Ibid., p. 429.

Fair urged that reader service be provided from a separate desk in order to facilitate communication and service.¹

In spite of the then-innovative thinking of Coney and Fair, two years later a textbook, Principles Of College Library Administration by Randall and Goodrich, appeared in which the authors made the statement that it was a risk to delegate even book charging to students. The treatment supported the concept of the circulation desk as an information center. In the small library, the authors stated, the circulation librarian would ordinarily be the most experienced member of the staff.²

C. J. McHale delivered a paper to the Lending Section of the American Library Association at the 1940 Cincinnati Convention.³ In a statement that some of his colleagues must have regarded as downright imperialistic, he said, "The lending staff may be divided into three parts: those who man the desk and carry on the traditional business of circulation; those who cover the floor in general reading rooms and open-shelf collections, advising and guiding readers; and those who in the course of business contact the world outside."⁴

¹Ibid., p. 430.

²William M. Randall and Francis L. D. Goodrich (Chicago: American Library Association, 1936).

³"Lending Personnel," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 34 (August, 1940), pp. 139-143.

⁴Ibid., p. 139.

In 1943 Williams published an organization chart of the Harvard University Library showing a unified reference and circulation department directly under the library director.¹

Bousfield restated his philosophy of circulation service in 1944, reaffirming its function in the broad area of reader services. He stated that the circulation department is charged with the responsibility of seeing that students use the library, expressed concern regarding adequate separation of professional and clerical duties in the department, and admonished the circulation librarian in the small library, and his assistant in the larger institution, "to come out from behind the loan desk and meet the student, anticipate his difficulties, and help him."² He urged a strict separation of clerical and service duties -- physically as well as in personnel assignment -- to allow reader service to be rendered without distraction in order that the circulation department might be styled the 'public service' or 'public relations' department.³

He further stated that the activity of the circulation department need not conflict with that of the reference department, that

¹Edwin E. Williams, "The Administrative Organization of the Harvard University Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (June, 1943), pp. 218-227.

²H. G. Bousfield, "Circulation Department: Organization and Personnel," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 6 (December, 1944), p. 49.

³Ibid., p. 50.

the latter would "perform its usual function of aiding persons who apply for information but would not project itself into teaching departments or school activities."¹ Readers' advisory service could be under either organization. He appeared to reserve the active service role for the circulation department, relegating reference to the question-answering function and related activities not extending beyond the walls of the library.

In studying the evolution in circulation function and staffing it is interesting to discover the extent to which this transformation is reflected in successive editions of standard textbooks in the area of academic library administration. The two most widely-used textbooks in this category have undoubtedly been Lyle's The Administration of the College Library, the first edition of which appeared in 1944,² and Wilson and Tauber's The University Library which initially appeared the following year.³ The latter's treatment of circulation is from the general managerial viewpoint, while the circulation section of the Lyle book was written by a circulation librarian. For this reason the contrast emerges more clearly in Wilson and Tauber and therefore it will be examined first.

Two editions of Wilson and Tauber have been published, the second in 1956. A few quotations will serve to point out the contrast

¹Ibid., p. 49.

²Guy R. Lyle (New York: Wilson).

³Louis Round Wilson and Maurice F. Tauber (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945).

between the two versions in their approach to circulation services.

The section describing functions in both editions began with the statement, "The primary function of the circulation department is to get materials to the reader expeditiously."¹ In elaboration of this, the 1946 edition stated:

Because of the multitude of tasks that require prompt and efficient performance, it is relatively easy for librarians to consider such activities as speedy circulation as the only objective of the loan department rather than as a means for achieving the main purpose of the university library.²

In the 1956 edition, the comparable sentence reads:

Because of the many tasks that require prompt and efficient performance, librarians may consider such activity as speedy circulation to be the major objective of the loan department rather than a means for achieving the main purpose of the university library, namely, the promotion of the instructional and research program of the university.³

The earlier edition, developing its theme, continued:

Brown and Bousfield in their careful study of circulation work in college and university libraries, point out that the work of the circulation department is not restricted to quick delivery of reading matter to the library clientele.⁴

The later edition makes no mention of Brown and Bousfield except for a

¹Wilson and Tauber (1st ed.), p. 202; ibid. (2d ed.), p. 221.

²Ibid. (1st ed.), p. 202.

³Ibid. (2d ed.), p. 221.

⁴Ibid., (1st ed.), p. 202.

general reference in the bibliography. The authors still maintained in the later edition that "loan assistants may give help and instruction in the use of the card catalog and reference works, aid students in selecting books, and stimulate individual reading interests."¹ However, a general shift in emphasis may be detected considering the circulation section as a whole in spite of statements in the second edition that professionals are required for faculty contacts, supervision of personnel, and activities mentioned in the last quotation.

Of interest to this study is the fact that the first edition provided a listing of professional and non-professional duties in four California university libraries. One of the four, Stanford, employed only clerks and students in the circulation department the year of the survey, 1933.²

In contrast to the viewpoint expressed in Wilson and Tauber, in all three versions of Lyle the circulation section is written by a circulation librarian. A comparison of all three editions, however, does indicate an evolution even if this change is not as pronounced as that embraced in the two editions of Wilson and Tauber. The three editions of Lyle appeared in 1944, 1949, and 1961. In the earlier two the generalized role of the circulation librarian was seen as follows:

- (1) To secure promptly all books requested by readers.
- (2) To substitute when possible suitable and adequate material if the desired book or books are not available or charged out.
- (3) To assist students in using the card catalog and to impress upon them the importance of the catalog as a key to the resources of the library.

¹Ibid., (2d ed.), p. 222.

²Ibid. (1st ed.), p. 205.

- (4) To help readers in finding information through general reference books, such as encyclopedias and statistical handbooks.
- (5) To become acquainted with students - their interests, library problems, and capacities.
- (6) To direct students in the selection of books for general reading through personal guidance and planned exhibits.
- (7) To interpret the library through friendly and efficient service to all its users.¹

In some contrast was the briefer statement of departmental responsibilities given in the 1961 edition:

- (1) To make books easily accessible to all readers.
- (2) To supply other pertinent material when the desired book is not available in the library or is charged out.
- (3) To give instruction in the use of the card catalog and point out its use as the key to the resources of the library.
- (4) To interpret the library through friendly and efficient service to all readers.²

All three editions, however, followed the list of functions with the following statement:

Even in the larger libraries where certain of these functions may be delegated to the reference department, the reader generally receives his first introduction to the library at the loan desk. Failure at this point to provide helpful, friendly direction and guidance in reading and in the use of the library may have a damaging effect on the prestige of the library. The circulation staff provides liason between readers and books. Success in carrying out this work will depend upon an understanding of the educational function of the college library, careful planning and organization of circulation duties, genuine interest in all types of readers, and a familiarity with books in a variety of subject fields.²

¹Lyle (1st ed.), pp. 127-128.

²Ibid. (3d ed.), p. 96.

³Ibid. (1st ed.), p. 128; Ibid. (2d. ed.), p. 128; Ibid., pp. 96-97.

In the 1944 and 1949 editions, a list of sixteen professional duties was given as necessary for fulfilling departmental functions.¹ In the 1961 edition, this list is reduced to nine.² These lists are reproduced in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. Both were represented in the book as "The classification of work and the assignment of duties in one college library" ³

TABLE 1

THE PROFESSIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF WORK AND THE ASSIGNMENT OF DUTIES IN ONE COLLEGE LIBRARY CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT -- AS REPRESENTED IN BOTH THE FIRST AND THE SECOND EDITION OF LYLE'S THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

Professional Duties	Member of Staff Responsible
1. Decisions on matters of policy	Head of circulation department in consultation with the librarian.
2. Instructional relationships with students: Assistance in using the card catalog Guidance in the selection of books Quick reference service Conferences with students	Head of circulation department, circulation assistant, reserve librarian, and readers' advisor
3. Instructional relationships with faculty: Conferences on individual student needs Consultation on book replacement and duplication Location of material	Head of circulation department, reserve librarian, and readers' advisor

¹ Ibid. (1st ed.), pp. 132-133; Ibid. (2d ed.), pp. 132-133.

² Ibid. (3d ed.), p. 99.

³ Ibid.

TABLE 1 - Continued

Professional Duties	Member of Staff Responsible
4. Selection of student assistants	Head of the circulation department
5. Training and supervision of student help	Head of circulation department, reserve librarian, and readers' advisor
6. Preparation of student schedules	Head of circulation department, reserve librarian, and readers' advisor
7. Supervision of the loan desk	Head of circulation department and circulation assistant
8. Reserve room supervision	Reserve librarian
9. Care of book collection	Head of the circulation department and Reserve librarian
10. Supervision of fines and overdues	Circulation assistant
11. Keeping records and statistics on library use	Circulation assistant
12. Supervision of stacks	Head of circulation department
13. Sending out books on inter-library loan	Circulation assistant
14. Preparation of annual and special reports of the department	Head of circulation department
15. Studying the need for equipment and supplies and making recommendations for purchase	Head of circulation department
16. Preparing book exhibits and displays	Readers' advisor

Source: Lyle. (1st ed.), pp. 132-133; ibid. (2d ed.), pp. 132-133.

TABLE 2

THE PROFESSIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF WORK AND THE ASSIGNMENT OF DUTIES
IN ONE COLLEGE LIBRARY CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT -- AS REPRESENTED IN
THE THIRD EDITION OF LYLE'S THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

Professional Duties	Member of Staff Responsible
1. Establishing policies and procedures	Professional
2. Selecting and training personnel	Professional
3. Organizing and directing work of the department	Professional
4. Compiling reading lists	Professional
5. Developing and maintaining good relations with other departments in the library and with members of the faculty	Professional and non-professional
6. Interpreting rules and regulations to students	Professional and non-professional
7. Guiding students in the selection of library materials	Professional and non-professional
8. Interpreting the card catalog to students	Professional and non-professional
9. Planning book exhibits and informal book displays	Professional and non-professional

Source: Lyle, 3d ed., p. 99.

The department used as an example in the first two editions of Kyle had a staff of four full-time professional assistants and twenty part-time students; that used in the third edition had two full-time and one part-time professional assistants, three full-time non-professionals, and twenty-five part-time students.¹

The contributor in all three versions stated that in some libraries the loan desk was manned exclusively by clerks, but that the staffing pattern in an individual library would depend on the following factors: (1) the curriculum, (2) the extent to which students use the library for individual investigation, (3) the number of students, (4) the size of the staff, and (5) the value attached by the librarian to circulation work.²

While the attitude of the chapter contributor had evidently evolved in a number of respects from one edition to another, the 1961 revision recommends the four-year liberal arts degree even for non-professionals.³

McDiarmid, speaking at a 1948 University of Chicago conference concerning education for librarianship, made a substantive statement in the area of concern:

It is in the field of circulation, reference, and contact with users that there are the greatest differences of opinion with regard to clerical and professional distinctions. Certainly, most people would agree that except for what librarians call guidance, most of the routine recordings of circulation

¹Ibid. (1st ed.), p. 132; Ibid. (2d ed.), p. 132; Ibid. (3d ed.), p. 99.

²Ibid. (1st ed.), p. 134; Ibid. (2d ed.), p. 134; Ibid. (3d ed.), p. 100.

³Ibid. (3d ed.), p. 101.

(overdues, reserves, etc.) can be handled by the clerical staff. There is great difference of opinion, however, with respect to the positions or tasks requiring contact with users.

I for one would not attempt to lay down hard-and-fast rules at this point; but from all statistics that are available, it is quite apparent that much of the contact with users in libraries could be successfully performed by clerical people who (1) know the location of various units in the library; (2) understand the mechanics of the card catalog; and (3) know library rules and regulations. We must give up the attempt to have the patron meet first the most highly qualified professional person he will ever need, and concentrate instead on providing well-informed, well-trained assistants who will be able to answer simple questions, who will know when to call someone else for assistance, and who, above all, will know how to treat the individual with courtesy and friendliness.¹

Hamlin, describing reader services at the University of Pennsylvania in 1950, indicated regarding the information role of the circulation department that "matters requiring professional knowledge are always sent to the reference desk."² Of six professional librarians employed in reader services, one was assigned to circulation.³

The next major treatment of the aspects of academic library circulation services was that contained in the special issue of Library Trends in July, 1957. The lack of any theoretical consensus regarding circulation function among the contributors is very apparent. The general pattern, to the extent that one exists, is illustrated in the quotations which follow.

¹E. W. McDiarmid, "Training of Clerical and Sub-professional Workers," in Education for Librarianship, ed. by Bernard Berelson (Chicago: American Library Association, 1949), p. 236.

²Arthur T. Hamlin, "Service Report from Pennsylvania," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 11 (January, 1950), p. 67.

³Ibid., p. 66.

What principle can today's circulation process contribute in its turn? The writer suggests that a fresh conception which accepts clerical records and machines as essential, but which is distinguished by a primary concern with the borrower and his reactions to the library's books, could be this contribution.¹

How do we know that the library materials made accessible to users actually do make a desirable impact on the user? We don't know, and one of the many reasons is that most of the reader service has been eliminated from the circulation function without compensating for the lost services in other ways.²

It is in the peripheral areas of circulation work that professional training and experience may be needed.³

Another writer quotes Justin Winsor concerning the importance of "... inducing an improvement in the kind of reading."⁴

From these and other articles one finishes reading this collection without either a clear conception of what circulation services is supposed to be or any significant new insights into the exercise of this function.

Waldron, two years later, spoke somewhat prematurely of the elimination of the circulation complex in favor of a machine.⁵

Neal Harlow, in a 1965 article entitled "Misused Librarians," stated:

¹Margery Closey Quigley, "A Reporter at Large," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), p. 7.

²Wayne S. Yenawine, Introduction to special issue, Ibid., pp. 4-5.

³Ralph E. McCoy, "Personnel in Circulation Service," Ibid., p. 42.

⁴Philip J. McNiff, "Administration of Circulation Services," Ibid., p. 18.

⁵Rodney K. Waldron, "Will Circulation Librarians Become Obsolete?", Library Journal, Vol. 84 (February 1, 1959), pp. 386-388.

On a loan desk, concerned with the husbandry of books, their condition, loan, and prompt return, providing a front line of general and directional information, and assuring the satisfaction of users, professional personnel are not required.¹

In a 1969 survey embracing all Virginia college libraries (ten in junior colleges, twenty-two in senior colleges, and sixteen special libraries), forty-eight per cent of the institutions replying (seventy-five per cent response) had professional circulation librarians, defined as a librarian possessing a Master's Degree in library science.²

Finally, Wasserman and Bundy in their 1970 study of the academic library administrator, made the following statement relating to the 161 academic libraries (eight-one per cent) responding to a questionnaire:

One personnel factor was examined particularly -- the use of technicians and subprofessionals. Of the respondents, 64% reported using technicians and/or subprofessionals in their libraries. Of this number, the highest proportion are employed in subsidiary positions in routine areas of Technical Services or in office work, and the next largest number are manning the Circulation Desk. However, approximately one-third of these respondents indicate that technicians or subprofessionals are serving as "Head," "Manager," or "Director" of one or another unit (primarily circulation) or in positions defined as "Supervisory."³ [Writer's underline]

¹Library Journal, Vol. 90 (April 1, 1965), p. 1598.

²Sam Clay, "College and University Library Circulation Systems: Time for a Change?" Virginia Librarian, Vol. 16 (Summer, 1969), pp. 14-17.

³Mary Lee Bundy and Paul Wasserman, The Academic Library Administrator and His Situation (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research), p. 49.

Summary

Examining the sources discussed in this chapter, one can discern a trend from the broad to the narrow conception of circulation service, the latter centered on the distribution and control of the library's collections. The development of this trend, as reflected here, has been far from uniform. This renders impossible the synthesis of a viable theory from these sources alone. An additional reason for difficulty is the lack of substantive recent attention in this area. In an era when libraries and collections have been growing geometrically, and as profound changes in library services have taken place, published viewpoints regarding circulation role and staff in the university library have been very rare. It is necessary, therefore, to go beyond the sources heretofore cited in order to gain an insight into contemporary thought and practice.

II. CIRCULATION STAFF, FUNCTION, AND THE LITERATURE OF LIBRARY JOB CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

It is perhaps best to begin by defining several very closely related terms in this area, namely 'job analysis,' 'job classification,' and 'job specification.' The following definitions are taken from

Dictionary of Management Terms:

Job Analysis: . . . an overall study of a job to determine its exact content in terms of duties, operations, and requirements such as skills, education, physical and mental demands, working conditions, etc. This procedure is also known as job description.

Job classification: . . . a grouping of jobs on some specified basis such as kind of work or pay. It can refer to a grouping by any selected characteristic but probably is used most often in connection with pay and job evaluation.

Job specification: . . . a statement of the minimum acceptable human qualities which are required to perform properly a job. It will usually include a detailed outline of the duties and responsibilities of the job and many also include other requirements such as education, appearance, physical requirements, age, and skill. The job specification notes all circumstances of special significance in finding appropriate manpower for the job and is designed especially to facilitate selection and placement.

A number of efforts have been made at job analysis and other related processes in librarianship and most have combined the above three operations. These studies have been initiated by a number of organizations, but many of the most impressive have been executed within the American Library Association, notably in the years prior to 1950.

¹A. J. Linderman et al (Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1966), pp. 40-42.

There is reason to believe that these efforts as a group have provided the most reliable evidence of professional attitudes toward practices in the area of university library function and staffing patterns that is available on this ex post facto basis. For the most part, these classifications have represented prolonged consideration by a group of practitioners and academicians leading to formal adoption. As a rule, these projects have been more comprehensive and systematic than the writings of individuals. Most often, such classifications have been intended to represent current practice, though occasionally they are planned to set standards -- not inherently the purpose of job classification as an instrument. Taking all the above into consideration, it is of great interest to this study to see how the circulation department has been represented in classifications constructed at various times during the evolution which concerns us.

An early attempt at job and salary classification/specification was Brief and Specifications for Library Service in the Federal Government, produced by the District of Columbia Library Association in 1923.¹ This grew out of a request from the Acting Director of the Board of Personnel Classification of the Federal Government for information helpful in classifying library positions, addressed to the D. C. Library Association's Committee on Professional Problems. There followed the formation of the Government Librarians Committee on

¹(Washington, D. C.: The Association).

Reclassification. The resulting class specifications, representing the government librarians' point of view, were primarily aimed at defending the professional nature of library work and were intended for all types of libraries. The position of circulation librarian was not emphasized, possibly for two reasons: first, few federal libraries at that time were large enough to warrant fully-developed circulation departments and second, the case for the professionalism of librarianship was better made in positions such as reference librarian, bibliographer, and administrator. Nevertheless, within the class specifications the duties of circulation librarian were delineated under both professional and sub-professional categories. Supervisory duties were presented in the former category,¹ while clerical routines were included in the latter.²

The earliest full-scale attempt to formulate a classification for virtually all areas of librarianship was the joint effort of the American Library Association Committee on the Classification of Library Personnel and the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration. Published in 1927, the report was entitled Proposed Classification and Compensation Plans for Library Positions, to become perhaps better-known as the Telford Report after the Director of the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration.³ In the 'Statement of Fundamental Policies'

¹Ibid., p. 30.

²Ibid., pp. 38, 40-42.

³(Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Public Personnel Administration).

accompanying the proposed classification its basis was summarized as follows: "Positions as they exist and not as they might be or ought to be are to be classified and as far as possible classes are to be set up to which all existing positions can be allocated."¹ This approach makes the book especially valuable as a mirror of contemporary practice. In this particular instance, information regarding 6,000 positions in about 150 libraries was used to construct the classification; twenty-three academic libraries were among them.²

Duties of the Chief of Circulation Department, Grade I, were enumerated as follows:

Under the direction of the Chief Librarian or the Assistant Librarian, to have supervision over a circulation department with a staff equivalent in size to two to four full-time assistants in a library where there is a relatively fine division of labor and considerable specialization; and to perform other work as required.

Examples of typical tasks: Laying out the work for members of the staff and seeing that all are effectively employed; giving directions and suggestions to members of the staff and aiding them with difficult problems; helping readers on the floor; adjusting complaints; interviewing and instructing new appointees; making working schedules for members of the staff; conducting staff meetings; handling correspondence; preparing reports and memorandums; conferring with the heads of other departments; reading and reviewing books and making suggestions with regard to the selection and purchase of books.³

Qualifications specified were flexible but included either the B. A. degree and one year of library school or five years of experience to substitute for some but not all of the library education.

Specifications for other grades were not listed "owing to the limits of space" but were advertised as available on application.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 23.

³Ibid., p. 125.

²Ibid., pp. 27, 83-85.

⁴Ibid., pp. 197-198.

The position of Assistant Chief of Circulation Department was specified for larger libraries. The list of duties paralleled and was supportive to those indicated for the Chief of Circulation Department, quoted above. Among the options for qualifications were those of a professional nature.

In 1929 there appeared Budgets, Classification, and Compensation Plans for University and College Libraries: Report of the Committee on Classification of Library Personnel of the American Library Association.¹

It was intended to supplement the Telford Report and to replace "all schedules for university and college library positions given in the 1927 publication."² The report provided classifications for eight categories of academic libraries classified by total library budget. While it is not totally clear whether the classification is based on contemporary practice or is intended to set standards, the wording of the introduction seems to suggest that these are standards based on the practices of stronger institutions:

It is realized that the libraries of many institutions will not and cannot meet these specifications at present and that the funds available are not sufficient to bring such libraries immediately up to the minimum allotment believed necessary for efficient library service Without wishing to dictate in any way, but with a desire to aid in the improvement of college and university library service, the committee hopes that the following specifications may assist such administrators in obtaining for their libraries more adequate funds, either from state legislatures or by additions to endowment.

¹American Library Association (Chicago: the Association).

²Ibid., p. 1.

.....
 The specifications will indicate, according to the belief of the committee, the amount of library expenditures needed for a given institution for fairly satisfactory library service¹

The report included budget data from one hundred colleges and universities.

Although over-all ranking was by total library budget, other attributes were included within each category. In the two smallest groupings, library class #3 (at least \$10,000 in library budget, no more than 400 students) and class #4 (\$15,000; not more than 600 students), no separate position was specified for circulation librarian. Rather, "taking charge of the loan desk" was one of the duties of the Senior Assistant Librarian.³ In class #3, necessary qualifications for the Senior Assistant were those established by the individual college or university for the instructorship, including one year at an accredited library school; or alternately, a college education embracing a year of library science.⁴ In class #4, a one-year experience requirement was added for this position.⁵

For libraries in class #5 (\$20-30,000 library expenditure), class #6 (\$30-50,000), and class #7 (\$50-75,000), a joint position of Reference and Loan Librarian was specified. Specifications for educational

¹Ibid., pp. 4-5.

⁴Ibid., p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 4.

⁵Ibid., p. 22.

³Ibid., pp. 16, 21.

requirements embraced those for the position of Senior Assistant in classes #3-4 but added to them a further experience requirement and graduate study. For class #5, this supplementary requirement amounted to an additional year of experience under specified conditions and two additional years of successful experience in lieu of instructorship requirements (or an additional year of graduate work could be substituted for one of the years of experience).¹ For class #7, additional requirements included experience equivalent to that specified by the institution for the instructorship; or, alternatively, and in addition to the requirement laid down for classes #3-4, a total of three years of successful experience. Additional graduate study could be substituted for some of the experience requirement.²

Typical duties, of course, embraced both reference and loan functions.

Beginning with class #8 (\$75-100,000), the separate position of Librarian in Charge of Circulation was specified, carrying with it the rank of Assistant Professor. The over-all requirements for the position included those maintained by the college or university for the Assistant Professorship; or alternately, a four-year college or university education with three or four years of experience gained

¹Ibid., p. 29.

²Ibid., pp. 38-39.

under specified conditions. The actual length of experience required for individuals with graduate work beyond the single year was less, although it took an additional year of graduate study to waive one year of the experience requirement.¹

"Typical tasks" for the Librarian in Charge of Circulation included the following:

Laying out the work for members of the department and seeing that all are effectively employed; supervision of the work of assistants; supervision of assistance to readers in the use of the catalog; adjusting complaints where possible, without reference to the Chief Librarian; seeing that individuals obtain books desired if possible; interviewing new appointees; providing working schedules for assistants; handling routine correspondence; keeping records and fines; seeing that the book collections are meeting the needs of faculty and students, and, if not, reporting to Chief Librarian; supervision of delivery of books from the stacks in order to avoid delay.²

In addition to the low level of many of the above tasks, the description of duties is notable in that there is comparatively little emphasis on the work normally associated with the reference department. The information functions that are included concern the card catalog where physical proximity was and is often a factor; and the collection of 'feedback' that would normally be done by any professional librarian in or near the physical location of the circulation desk. Thus there is an implied division of responsibility between circulation and reference.

In class #10, the highest (library expenditures in excess of \$150,000 per year), the faculty rank for this position was increased to

¹Ibid., p. 45.

²Ibid.

that of associate professor. Qualifications were either to be in line with institutional requirements for this rank or were to include the fifth year library degree and six years of successful experience of specified type in a 'scholarly' library of over 100,000 volumes.¹ Duties were very similar to those previously indicated for class #8.

Qualifications specified for the position of reference librarian, on the whole, stressed academic preparation beyond the fifth-year library degree whereas those for the circulation positions stressed experience. The two commanded equal faculty rank and salary.

Throughout the various statements of educational requirements, one is impressed by how relatively little value was accorded educational preparation beyond the fifth year library degree in relation to that given experience.

In the thirties and early forties, the California Library Association was active in the field of job classification. Lists of professional circulation duties taken from classifications published in 1932 and 1941 follow.

¹Ibid., p. 66.

1932

1. Determining rules and regulations
2. Handling complaints, arguments, etc.
3. Planning forms and records
4. Studying methods of routine to improve efficiency
5. Explaining use of the library to new patrons
6. Supervising work of non-professional assistants

1941

1. Making rules and regulations
2. Handling complaints, arguments, etc.
3. Planning forms and records
4. Studying improvements in routine
5. Explaining arrangements and use of the library
6. Revising and editing rules
7. Supervising interlibrary loans
8. Special correspondence with borrowers
9. Other related work¹

A number of the activities regarded as professional above would today be considered clerical or sub-professional. This is especially true of items 2, 4, and 6 in the 1932 column and of 2, 4, and 8 in the 1941 list. Many librarians would consider others to be non-professional. Interlibrary loan work is often performed in other departments.

In 1944 Grazier reported on a classification and pay plan involving circulation at the Pennsylvania State University Library, one that did not involve job analysis. There were at that time three professionals engaged in circulation work.²

¹California Library Association, Handbook and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, 1932 (Sacramento: California Library Association, 1932), p. 60; California Library Association, "Library Tasks: a Classified List," California Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 3 (September, 1941), p. 25.

²Robert T. Grazier, "Classification and Pay Plan for University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 5 (March, 1944), pp. 176-181.

Bryant and Kaiser discussed a position classification plan at the University of California (Berkeley) in 1947.¹ Professional positions were divided into four categories. Loan work was classified in the lowest, which embraced the "less difficult" professional library work.² Requirements for this category included "graduation from a college or university approved by an accrediting agency of more than state-wide standing, plus at least one year of training in a library school accredited by the American Library Association."²

In 1947 the American Library Association Board on Salaries, Staff, and Tenure issued by far the most detailed classification and pay plan that had yet been prepared for academic libraries. This report was entitled Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Learning and was issued in three volumes dealing with non-degree-conferring institutions, four year colleges, and universities respectively.³ Examined here are the sections dealing with both four-year institutions and universities.

In both cases, classification was provided for four different size categories of circulation department and for the positions of Chief Circulation Librarian, Assistant Chief Circulation Librarian, Inter-library Loan Librarian, Reserves Librarian, Supervising Librarian of Stacks, as well as Senior, Intermediate, and Junior Circulation Librarian.

¹"A University Library Position Classification and Compensation Plan," Library Quarterly, Vol. 17 (January, 1947), pp. 1-17.

²Ibid., p. 9.

³(2d ed.; Chicago: American Library Association).

While for both college and university libraries, emphasis was not on the professional information service aspects of circulation service as often conceived, the position of department head and a number of others emerged as clearly professional in nature. Qualifications specified were commensurate. Minimum qualifications for a position equivalent to that of Chief Circulation Librarian in the smallest college library (that of Circulation Librarian) included "graduation from a college or university approved by an accrediting association of more than state-wide standing, including one year of training in a library school accredited by the ALA; or equivalent qualifications."¹

Examples of typical tasks for the above basic position in both college and university libraries included:

Developing the circulation procedure to meet the needs of the institution; assisting readers in the selection of books and in the use of the card catalog; keeping informed on needs of faculty members and students and acquainting them with available material; handling overdues; handling the work with reserves and interlibrary loans; arranging book displays, bulletin boards and exhibits; supervising the work of book shelving; taking inventory; reading and appraising books and other materials and making recommendations for their acquisition; making recommendations and decisions in matters of circulation policy; maintaining a manual of circulation routines; seeing that essential records and statistics are kept; preparing reports and memoranda; handling correspondence; keeping in touch with library developments by attending conferences and reading professional literature; participating in campus activities.²

The functional differentiation of this area from reference, implied in the 1929 work, had not progressed beyond that embraced in the earlier publication. In both classifications, the professional

¹Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 105.

²Ibid., p. 34; ibid., Vol. 3, p. 46.

activities grouped within circulation services tended to be those that would be the task of any professional librarian on the staff as a whole -- activities such as book selection and policy making. Given the presence of a professional librarian at the circulation desk, the duties specified were those that would be instinctively carried out by a professional librarian who sees the immediate need or receives a request that can be met through the investment of a few minutes of time. Such activities tend to be carried out regardless of their presence in or absence from job descriptions. Their acknowledgement in this job classification was therefore not surprising.

For the largest university circulation units, the following were among the optional requirements for the position of Chief Circulation Librarian:

1. The library science doctorate and at least four years of specified professional experience; or
2. A subject field doctorate, one year of library school, and at least four years of specified professional experience; or
3. Master's degree resulting from two years of library school and at least six years of specified professional experience; or
4. Master's degree in a subject field, one year of library training, and at least six years of specified professional experience; or

5. Graduation from a four-year college, one year of library training, and eight years of specified professional experience; or

6. "Equivalent qualifications."¹

An optional qualification for the positions of Assistant Chief Circulation Librarian in the largest university libraries and Chief Circulation Librarian in the largest college libraries was likewise possession of the doctorate.

Comparing these qualifications and responsibilities with those set forth in the 1929 American Library Association university and college library classification plan, it can be said that the required qualifications had been increased while the level of functions and responsibilities had remained roughly the same.

One of the better-known position classifications and analyses was the Descriptive List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries issued in 1948 by the American Library Association's Board of Personnel Administration Subcommittee on Analysis of

Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 156.

Library Duties.¹ The list was intended for all types of libraries. Significantly, in the introduction to the section on registration and circulation the following statement was made:

In larger libraries, registration and circulation routines may be segregated and carried on by special clerical staffs organized for that purpose. In any case, registration and circulation work is nonprofessional in nature, requiring first of all, familiarity with good clerical procedure. Where this work is assigned to nonprofessional staff, however, some professional supervision is required in order that administrative policies may be clearly understood and followed.²

The professional duties listed for circulation services included making rules and regulations for lending, revising and editing rules, planning forms and records, supervising interlibrary loans, supervising reserve book collections, preparing statistical reports, and handling complaints.³

Viewing the list of professional duties, many libraries have chosen to separate reserves and interlibrary loans from circulation services. The other activities tended to fall into two major categories: (1) policy-making, which may also be determined by the library director, or by him in company with staff (since implications here go far beyond the circulation department itself and even beyond the library), and (2) activities where tact and the ability to communicate, as well as other personal qualities, are of preeminent importance.

¹Preliminary Draft (Chicago: American Library Association).

²Ibid., p. 52.

³Ibid., pp. 52-53.

The 1966 Library Position Classification Standards for the U.S. Civil Service are of interest to this study because among the libraries for which the classification was intended were academic libraries supporting instructional and research programs of Federal institutions of higher education.¹ In the area of circulation services the following division of labor is made between the library technician and the librarian:

Library Technicians generally follow established methods and procedures which have been developed by librarians. Occasionally, they may develop individualized work plans or procedures but these are typically in limited or nonprofessional areas (such as mechanical preparation, physical upkeep, or circulation of materials).

Librarians are responsible for planning and developing the library system, functions, or services; and for the formulation, development, and establishment of operating methods or procedures, requiring a broad understanding of the inter-relationship of the various library activities.²

Elsewhere, the standards state:

Establishing systems and planning procedures for registration of borrowers and circulation work is usually done by professional librarians. Actual registration and circulation work, however, is nonprofessional in character. In larger libraries where there is sufficient work to justify using nonprofessional staff, professional supervision may be provided to see that the staff understands and follows administrative policies.³

In general, these standards call for a high degree of utilization of library technical assistants in positions requiring relatively advanced skills and understanding.

¹U. S. Civil Service Commission, Position Classification Division, Library Series, GS-1410/GSI411 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 7.

²Ibid., GS-1411, p. 4.

³Ibid., GS-1410, p. 17.

In 1968, the American Library Association in its "Sub Professional or Technical Assistant: a Statement of Definition" recognized that the position of head of circulation services falls within the scope of assignments of the sub-professional.¹

In this capacity, the sub professional

uses independent judgment and makes decisions within guidelines but consults with librarian or supervisor on unusual problems and works under general supervision of [the] librarian.²

Summary

It can be said that the several classifications published through 1947 differed from each other in their proposals for the circulation department more in their degree of complexity than in their substance. They never did embrace a truly comprehensive reader service role for the department, nor, on the other hand, did they emphasize the clerical nature of much of loan work.

The 1948 American Library Association Descriptive List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries was the first classification to emphasize the distinction between professional and clerical circulation tasks. It did so not so much in the actual separation of duties per se but in its narrative preface to the circulation section.

¹Interdivisional Committee of the Library Education Division and the Library Administration Division, ALA Bulletin, Vol. 62 (April, 1968), p. 395.

²Idem.

The only major job classification published since 1948 is the 1966 Civil Service Classification covering all types of libraries.

This emphasizes the difference between professional and non-professional duties in circulation in much the same terms as the 1948 Descriptive List

Thus, as with the literature of circulation services per se, there is to a large extent a missing link embracing the last twenty years. Lack of recent information makes it impossible to determine the status of current thought and practice in this area through job classification alone. The 1948 Descriptive List the 1966 Civil Service Classification, and the 1968 American Library Association statement regarding the technical assistant imply some movement and change in attitude, but they offer no solid evidence because, among other factors, they are intended for all types of libraries.

The literature of job classification provides some important additional information regarding attitudes and practices in circulation services over the last fifty years, but because there are no widely-accepted classifications governing academic libraries that have been formulated in the last twenty years, this information is not in itself complete.

III. SUMMARY AND TRENDS AS INDICATED IN THE LITERATURE OF CIRCULATION SERVICES

The final chapter of Part 1 will be devoted to a summary of trends that have been identified in the first two chapters.

The analysis of Cannons at the beginning of the first chapter indicated that circulation department functional organization and staffing patterns did not attract much in the way of published attention (and possibly little of any sort) during the first two decades of this century. Rather, preoccupation was with such matters as loan policy and desk routines. This was in keeping with the very practical nature of librarianship during that period, reflected both in library school curricula and in the large number of librarians who had gained their knowledge of library practice via the apprentice method. During the same period, managerial theory, both in and outside of librarianship, was in its infancy. The preoccupation with mundane matters at the expense of broad professional issues in this area can, under any circumstances, be well understood.

It is evident from the American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States that reference services were still

to a large extent centered around the circulation desk in the early twenties. Even so, the separation of reference and circulation had, at least on paper, been made in a number of libraries and at the time of the survey two institutions included had made the change recently.

Somewhat at odds with this trend by implication was the broad conception of circulation services advanced by Brown and Bousfield as well as contributions to library periodical literature by a number of individuals. The book by Brown and Bousfield followed the lead set by Flexner writing in the public library sphere in claiming a substantially augmented circulation role. This had received tacit approval from the various job classifications of the American Library Association and the Public Personnel Classification Board even if reference functions per se were not emphasized in these detailed analyses. As mentioned previously, however, the ambitious circulation information service role advocated by Brown and Bousfield never had more than tacit support from the literature of job classification; the recognition that was forthcoming was mostly of the departmental role in collecting feedback from patrons, library instruction, and assistance at the physically proximate card catalog. One reason for this reticence may have been that those working on job classifications were concerned with both the circulation and reference departments

and thus were compelled to treat the question more impartially than some writers, especially in comparison with those viewing circulation services from within. In effect, those working on job classifications made what they felt was a logical division of labor between the reference and circulation departments. This did not impart an active information role to circulation. That these planners did allocate a somewhat marginal and purely local information function to the circulation department in many cases was understandable given the assumed presence of professional librarians there. Most job classifications, after all, were intended as mirrors of current practice. Those that were intended to set standards were often concerned with boosting library professionalism and with it the professional staff ratio rather than with the equally urgent and related question of efficient staff utilization.

Beginning with Coney's review of the Brown and Bousfield book and taking into consideration library literature as a whole; a definite trend away from emphasis on the information function of the circulation desk can be perceived. This trend was not, however, uniform even if it can be said that many of the gainsayers obviously had not submitted the matter to careful analysis. Thoughtful and comparatively late advocates of the broad concept of circulation services can be found in Bousfield (1944) and Wilson and Tauber (1945) in the first edition of their library administration text.

There has not been a significant amount of published interest in circulation services during the postwar years outside of discussions

concerning hardware and, to a lesser extent, loan policies. The limited number of writers dealing with the broader aspects of circulation services have, however, produced a consensus in favor of a more restricted departmental function. Several have been critical, directly and by implication, of the use of professionals in this area.

Supporting the above consensus were McDiarmid (1948), the American Library Association Descriptive List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries (1948), for the most part the second edition of Wilson and Tauber (1956), Harlow (1965), the Civil Service position classification standards issued in 1966, and the American Library Association statement concerning the library technical assistant issued in 1968. Two of the above, the American Library Association Descriptive List . . . by implication and Wilson and Tauber explicitly, advocated retention of at least one professional in the department for supervisory reasons. However, the duties themselves have generally been defined in such a way that the professional aspects can be separated from the department proper.

Against the general movement indicated above have been a number of contributors to the July, 1957 issue of Library Trends (see pp. 25-26); the 1961 edition of Lyle; and the 1948 American Library Association Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Education. However, in the first two cases there is either direct or indirect acknowledgement of the trend mentioned above.

While the writer hypothesizes that the functions of inter-library loan and reserves have also been separated from the loan desk in the major university library, there is no objective indication

of this in the literature. Such a movement would be in harmony with the organization theories discussed in Chapter IV and would appear to be an operational necessity for very large institutions.

American Library Association work in the broad area of job classification embracing professional as well as non-professional positions largely ceased after 1948. Thus, the only official organization statement indicating any change in attitude toward circulation services over the last twenty years is the 1968 position taken regarding the library technical assistant -- not a detailed statement. The 1948 American Library Association Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Education did not support the trend we have outlined above; rather, it displayed a viewpoint that was very similar to that expressed in the 1927 and 1929 Association classifications where, if the information service function of the circulation desk was not emphasized, professional qualifications and duties labeled 'professional' were. This was in marked contrast to the Association's Descriptive List . . . , previously referred to and issued the following year. The List emphasized that most aspects of circulation service, other than those involving policy-making, were routine and did not require professional librarians. The latter is much more in keeping with circulation and managerial trends expressed elsewhere than is the 1948 Classification in that it reduced the circulation department role to the point where it could easily be fulfilled by technical assistants and clerks within the department working with intermittent professional supervision from without.

PART 2

CIRCULATION SERVICES IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES:
MANAGERIAL ISSUES

IV. AN ANALYSIS OF GENERAL MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Before surveying the literature of library administration in search of principles applicable to the area of university library circulation services, the relevant literature of general management will be examined. As will be seen in the next chapter, many of the writers in library management have drawn heavily on the field of general management, interpreting the latter in the specific context of the library.

In studying the various schools of management thought with a view toward synthesizing a body of relevant principles, one is confronted with a multiplicity of viewpoints and frames of reference. Koontz has referred to this as the "Management Theory Jungle."¹ Elsewhere Koontz identifies six schools of management which embrace, semantic confusion aside, the distinct bodies of thinking that have emerged. He labels them (1) the Operational School (elsewhere referred to as the Classical School and separated into two branches: the 'scientific management' approach of Frederick W. Taylor and the 'principles and processes' approach of Henri Fayol); (2) the Human Behavior School (or the human relations, Neo-Classical approach); (3) the Social Systems School (including the organizational humanists);

¹Harold Koontz, "The Management Theory Jungle," Journal of the Academy of Management, Vol. 4 (December, 1961), pp. 174-188.

(4) the Empirical School (embracing the case method of Dale); (5) the Decision Theory School; and (6) the Mathematical School.¹ To these the writer would add the Systems School. Others will undoubtedly come to the mind of the reader who may also challenge the 'school'-status of some of the above.

In studying this 'management theory jungle' and making appropriate generalizations the individual assumes a number of risks. It is nevertheless true that one of the tests of any discipline is the generalizability of its principles to individual problems. This is no less true of library science (to the extent that such principles exist) than it is of management. It is in this spirit, and with full regard for the context of individual principles here synthesized, that the writer approaches the task of studying the relationship between relevant management theory and the allocation of functions and staff in circulation services.

In examining the circulation department in managerial context, some schools are more relevant than others. This study is primarily concerned with the allocation of functions, related to organization theory, and staffing patterns in the area of personnel. The schools that yield the most generalizable theory in the area of our concern are the Operational or Classic School and the Systems School. The latter is discussed at some length in the next chapter since it has become widely used, more or less intact, in libraries.

¹Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnel, Principles of Management (4th ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), pp. 35-36.

As mentioned previously, modern writers have divided the Operational School into two branches: that centered around the individual unit of work, exemplified by Taylor's 'task management'; and the segment primarily concerned with broad theory or 'principles and processes' founded by Henri Fayol. Both approaches sought efficiency, but Taylor began at the bottom with the individual task and Fayol formulated principles which then were utilized in viewing issues of narrower concern. The writer views the latter approach as the most valuable to this study inasmuch as it provides for examination of the total organization. Also, most previous published attention to this area has taken the less general approach.

Division of work was Fayol's first principle of management.

In his words,

The worker always on the same part, the manager concerned with always the same matters, acquire an ability, sureness, and accuracy which increase their output. Each change of work brings in its train an adaptation which reduces output. Division of work permits of reduction in the number of objects to which attention and effort must be directed and has been recognized as the best means of making use of individuals and groups of people. It is not merely applicable to technical work, but without exception to all work involving a more or less considerable number of people and demanding abilities of various types, and it results in specialization of function and separation of powers.¹

He then pointed out that differentiation has its limits, namely those indicated by common sense.

¹Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, trans. by Constance Storrs (London: Pitman, 1949), p. 20.

Regarding the application of Fayol's organizational theory to circulation services, one discerns a very pronounced trend over the last half century toward specialization of functions formerly performed by generalists within the circulation department. It is interesting to view this evolution in the above context.

Chester Barnard discussed the origin and growth of organizations and the bases and kinds of specializations. He stated that organizations have originated in one of the following ways: spontaneously; the direct result of an individual's effort to organize; infant bodies set off by an existing parent organization; the result of segmentation of existing organizations caused by schism, rebellion, or the interposition of an external force.¹

Elements of the dispersal of the circulation function may be seen in several of the above, especially in older institutions that have been of substantial size during the entire period under study. One of the most potent factors has been external pressure brought about by the increasing size and specialization of the parent institution. With this has come the demand for increasingly sophisticated information service such as could no longer be provided by a generalist with heavy technical as well as information responsibilities.

¹Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 101-102.

Barnard stated the following as bases for specialization:

(a) the place where work is done; (b) the time at which the work is done; (c) the persons with whom work is done; (d) the things upon which work is done (i. e. the product); and (e) the method or process by which work is done.¹

Geographical specialization appears to have been a great binding force in the adherence of many non-circulation functions to the department. To paraphrase McDiarmid's statement, quoted in the first chapter, the concept of providing the reader with the most specialized information service he will ever need as soon as he enters the library is an attractive one even if, in practice, it is virtually impossible to implement.

Considering some of the other bases for specialization mentioned by Barnard, (b) "the time at which the work is done" also appears to have been a negative force from the standpoint of this evolution in that reference service often is attendant with the circulation of library materials. This brings us to another ideal which increasing numbers of students and the ever more specialized nature of their studies have rendered impossible of attainment in the major university library of today: that the reader will generally have all his needs

¹Ibid., pp. 128-129.

met by a single individual (in line with geographical considerations, the first member of the library staff encountered on entering).

The same reasons have made the division of labor essential and given it higher priority than the consideration of "the time at which the work is done" and "the persons with whom the work is done!" Obviously, it is no longer possible in the major library organization to specialize totally on the basis of "the things upon which work is done" e.g. the library collection and its dissemination, except inasmuch as this activity, embraced by reader service, is further subdivided. In the last analysis, (e) the method or process by which work is done, or essentially the division of labor, has had to serve as the basis for organization of most reader services.

In this regard, Mooney and Reiley have outlined their Principle of Functionalism which is a useful framework within which to examine the work of the library department.¹ The principle stated:

In every organized undertaking there must be some function that determines its objective, another that moves to its attainment, and a third that makes interpretative decisions in accordance with those rules of procedure that have been predetermined. These functions may be called determinative, the applicative, and the interpretative, and are related as principle, process, and effect.²

The authors compared these functions with the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of government and paraphrased them as "the determination of something to be done, the doing of that something,

¹James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, The Principles of Organization (New York: Harper, 1939), chap. IV.

²Ibid., p. 26.

the decision of questions that may arise in the course of doing in conformity with predetermined rules and practice."¹ The important thing is that all these tasks be correlated and integrated within the organization so that a given 'organized undertaking' will be accomplished.

The reader will remember from our discussion of the various job classifications that many of them presupposed that all three of the above general functions would be executed within the circulation department proper. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to place a professional librarian at its head to carry on the determination of policies and the formulation of objectives. However, within the framework of the library organization as a whole and the Principle of Functionalism, the determinative function can be performed outside of the department proper. The applicative and determinative functions can be performed by sub-professional and clerical staff inside of the department. The non-professional circulation head would receive from his immediate superior, as the American Library Association statement in Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries suggests, "some professional supervision . . . in order that administrative policies may be clearly understood and followed."² The above is possible as long as functional correlation is maintained.

¹Ibid., p. 27.

²Board of Personnel Administration, Subcommittee on Analysis of Library Duties, Descriptive List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries, Preliminary Draft (Chicago: American Library Association, 1948), p. 52.

Ralph C. Davis, an organizational humanist, has also advanced a theory concerning functional differentiation and integration. The following is taken from his Functions of Top Management:

Operational specialization, both line and staff, is an effect of the growth and development of an organic function. Separation of the work of the organization into its component elements takes place with increasing business volume. It is caused by the need for increased division of labor. The continuing development of business processes necessitates specialization. The nature of the separation is conditioned by the nature of the organization's service objectives and their requirements. . . . It is universal in all forms of human activity in which organization is necessary.¹

He adds that this results in problems concerning proper relationships among the functions that have been differentiated.

It is interesting to view the evolution of circulation services in Davis' framework. As the university library grew, there was a tendency to divide personnel between technical services (centered around the cataloger) and public services (with the loan desk as its hub). As the curriculum changed and the demand grew for more frequent and varied information service, this latter function became separated from the loan desk into a department of its own. To an undetermined extent, reserve and interlibrary loan functions followed.

¹Ralph C. Davis, Fundamentals of Top Management (New York: Harper, 1951), p. 213.

Concerning the optimum differentiation of functions and activities, Davis has enunciated his Principle of Functional Similarity:

Functions should be grouped in organizational elements, large or small, in accordance with their functional similarities. Similar functions may be defined as those that have like objectives and work characteristics; that in consequence give rise to similar problems involving similar factors, forces, and effects; that require similar background, training, experience, intelligence, and personality in the personnel assigned for their performance.¹

This applies directly to the question of separating the circulation and information functions in the university library.

It should be borne in mind that the above theories, although they are not all presented by classicists, carry with them the usual limitations of classical management theory. Some of these are outlined as follows by March and Simon:

- (1) The motivational assumptions underlying the theories are incomplete and consequently inaccurate.
- (2) There is little appreciation of the role of intraorganizational conflict of interests in defining limits of organizational behavior.
- (3) The constraints placed on the human being by his limitations as a complex information-processing system are given little consideration.
- (4) Little attention is given to the role of cognition in task identification and classification as well as in decision.
- (5) The phenomenon of program elaboration receives little emphasis.²

¹Ibid., p. 223.

²James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: Wiley, 1958), p. 33.

On the other hand, more quantifiable and empirically validated methods than those associated with classic organizational theory are inadequate for and unsuited to the examination of organizational dynamics over a period of half a century. On this relatively massive scale, the classic principles that have been enunciated by a variety of management theorists are perhaps the best instrument and perspective with which to view events. These principles represent a synthesis of human and organizational experience. To an impressive extent, they have stood the test of time.

The manner in which these have been interpreted specifically in a library context will be examined in the next chapter.

Summary

The writers discussed in this chapter have provided a number of useful insights into the organizational dynamics governing the circulation department. Chester Barnard has discussed the origin and growth of organizations, and Ralph C. Davis has elaborated on this somewhat in discussing the reasons for the development of specializations within, and as an offshoot of, an organization.

Fayol and Davis have argued strongly for unity of function. This is an issue within the circulation department where traditionally a very heterogeneous set of functions have been assigned for performance by the same staff and, often, by the same individuals. Davis, in his Principle of Functionalism, has provided a further insight into the mechanics of assigning functions to a given department, and of providing for the fulfillment of basic library functions within the total organization.

As will be seen in subsequent chapters, all these issues are directly related to the evolution in function and staff of circulation services, and to the question of optimum function and staff in this area.

V. PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING PATTERNS IN LIBRARIES
AS DEFINED BY LIBRARIANS

As one examines the literature in which librarians have addressed themselves to library problems from a general managerial-viewpoint, one finds virtually no specific interpretation of principles to the special problems of the circulation department above the hardware and 'task management' levels. However, one does encounter a number of enunciated principles which can be given relevant interpretation by the reader in studying circulation department function and staffing patterns and their dynamics over the last half century.

Austin noted in 1911 that two general principles could be synthesized from the activity in scientific management that was then at its peak: the standardization of method and the functional division of labor.¹ He then, in the judgement of the writer, proceeded to misinterpret the application of division of labor to the reader services area. He correctly stated, "It is a cardinal principle of the business world that a combination of closely allied interests is more efficient than to break them up into independent units."² However, he then continued, "The various uses made of a large library are so interwoven that to separate them into several independent divisions is pretty sure to result in duplication of work and encroachment on each other's needs,

¹Willard Austin, "Efficiency in College and University Library Work," Library Journal, Vol. 36 (November, 1911), p. 566.

²Ibid., p. 568.

not to emphasize unnecessary duplication of materials that might easily serve more than one need at different times."¹ This can be interpreted in a number of ways. It is evident that Austin would be in sympathy with the modern reader services division. However, the statement could also have been used to defend the circulation department embracing all functions concerning library use, something that in effect is the opposite of division of labor, particularly in the large organization.

Bostwick in 1914 discussed conflicts of jurisdiction in the specific context of branch libraries in a public library system.² He did, however, enunciate principles in the solution of such conflicts that would be applicable to the perennial problem, touched on by Austin, of defining the functional separation of the various components of reader services.

Williamson, writing in 1919, discussed a number of management principles in a library context. He lamented that departmentalization could not be carried further for achievement of maximum efficiency due to the low volume involved in most operations.³ Later, in his report on library education, he urged that further attention be given to the separation of professional and clerical work.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 568.

²Arthur E. Bostwick, "Conflicts of Jurisdiction in Library Systems," Library Journal, Vol. 39 (August, 1914), pp. 588-591.

³Charles C. Williamson, "Efficiency in Library Management," Library Journal, Vol. 45 (January, 1919), p. 76.

⁴Charles C. Williamson, Training for Library Service . . . (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1923), chap. I.

In 1930, Donald Coney contributed an article entitled "Scientific Management and University Libraries" to a collection of general management essays.¹ In it he discussed the 'functionalization' of library work, defined as the process of dividing work toward a given object

in as many parts as it logically and conveniently can [be so] that the responsibility for each unit of this subdivided work rests with a single person or a group of people, all performing a homogeneous kind of labor.²

He pointed out that this ideal was rarely achieved, especially with regard to form-of-material departments, branch libraries, and such library-wide activities as typing. He included a table showing the division of responsibility in the University of North Carolina Library.³ At that time the circulation department had primary responsibility only for book circulation but performed services in the areas of reference, periodicals, and departmental libraries. While Coney accepted this arrangement as satisfactory, he also stated, "The presence of more than one function to a department is a signal to the administrator to consider the desirability of removing the less important function, building and personnel permitting."⁴ It is interesting to note how Coney's thinking in the area of circulation services evolved from the time of this article (1930) to his 1933

¹In Management Problems, ed. by G. T. Schwenning (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), pp. 160-198.

²Ibid., p. 182.

³Ibid., p. 186.

⁴Ibid., p. 182.

review of Brown and Bousfield's book, Circulation Work in College and University Libraries. Both his review and the book have been extensively described and quoted in Chapter I.

Howard, in his 1940 study, "The Functions of Library Management", discussed library organization. He pointed out two devices for organizing libraries: departmentation and personnel placement.¹ He listed the following factors affecting organization: (1) the library's objectives; (2) the nature of the community to be served; (3) the nature of the materials with which the library is concerned; (4) the type of staff; (5) the financial ability of the library; and (6) the physical plant.² It is readily apparent that all these factors, in varying degrees, commonly affect function and allocation of personnel in the area of interest here. The 1926 American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States specifically indicated that the physical plant was occasionally a factor in the functional differentiation of reference from the circulation department.³ Howard, in his study, went on to discuss specific ways in which the various factors affected organization.

In 1943, Henkle enunciated general management principles applied to libraries.⁴ He discussed the basis for departmentalization as follows:

¹Paul Howard, Library Quarterly, Vol. 10 (July, 1940), p. 338.

²Ibid., p. 336.

³Vol. 2, pp. 155-156.

⁴Herman H. Henkle, "Principles and Practice of Administrative Organization in the University Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (September, 1943), pp. 277-284.

The primary basis for departmentalization in the organization is function. Closely related functions, that is, functions not easily separable for purposes of administration, should be kept together. . . . The central functions of the university library are 'book service' and bibliographical or reference service. . . . These functions are served by two general types of departments, the circulation department, serving the function of book service, and the reference department, serving the function of bibliographical or reference service to the university community as a whole or to separate groups of readers within the university.¹

Williams, in a 1945 article entitled "Who Does What: Unprofessional Personnel Policies," studied personnel utilization in libraries, professional/non-professional staff ratios, and the degree to which professional staff were assigned to professional duties.² He found great variation in staff ratios and lamented that professionals were frequently employed in work that was less than professional. Consenting to the continuation of this situation, he stated, amounted to

accepting a vicious circle - or descending spiral - of personnel surplus, resulting in clerical grade work and low wages, both of which, in turn, mean inferior recruits. The latter, of course, help to insure continued low-grade work and low wages.³

In attempting to discover the reason for pronounced variation in professional/non-professional ratios, he conducted a follow-up survey involving a few administrators in whose libraries the ratio extremes existed. He asked each individual director

¹Ibid., p. 278.

²Edwin E. Williams, "Who Does What: Unprofessional Personnel Policies," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 6 (September, 1945), pp. 301-310.

³Ibid., p. 304.

if he believed that the difference between percentage of professionals on his staff and the percentage in libraries at the other percentage extreme resulted from differences in the work done or, at least in large part, from genuine differences in the extent to which trained librarians were used for clerical work. Three of the nine who replied (including two from 'high percentage' libraries) indicated that, as far as they could see, the differences in personnel bore no relation to differences in the work done. None of the replies asserted that the differences were entirely accounted for in this way. . . .¹

A number of rival hypotheses were advanced and discounted.

Significantly,

all four administrators of 'high percentage' libraries, whether or not they believed their high percentages to be desirable, stated that their professional staff members were doing a considerable amount of clerical work.²

.....

It seems fair to conclude that a preponderance of evidence favors the view that the work differences do not explain very much of the variations in percentage of professional employees . . . and that these percentages do reflect, to a large degree, differences in the extent to which professional members are being used for clerical work.³

In one of the tables analyzing the distribution of staff in three of the larger university libraries, the number of professionals employed in loan work were 3.14 (Harvard), 3 (University of Texas), and 16 (Illinois).⁴

Ralph Shaw in 1947 discussed scientific management and the growth of specialization in libraries.⁵ He was concerned with resulting problems in coordinating and integrating the various

¹Ibid., p. 305.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 310.

⁴Ralph R. Shaw, "Scientific Management in the Library," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 21 (January, 1947), pp. 349-352.

specialties that had evolved in the library organization. Regarding the determination of where a given task is to be performed, he stated:

One of the fundamental principles of sound management is the assignment of each task to a particular person or group and the elimination of responsibility for and authority over that work from all other groups.¹

McAnally noted in 1952 that most college and small university libraries were organized around three functional departments -- circulation, reference, and reserve, as well as occasionally a fourth commodity or form-of-material department embracing periodicals or serials. He reported that decentralized circulation organization still prevailed in some libraries.²

In 1958, Wasserman surveyed the state of general management theory in librarianship.³ While he recognized some significant contributions in this area, he noted that library management thought had not achieved anything like mature status. He observed,

In sharp contrast with other professions, no book or monograph has yet been written which attempts to evolve or apply a theoretical framework as a tool for achieving a better understanding of library administration. . . . A large mass of material published in the professional journals of librarianship dealing with management issues can best be characterized as a type of latter-day folklore.⁴

He cited a plethora of how-we-do-it articles which describe individual techniques applied to particular libraries, then stated:

¹Ibid., p. 352.

²Arthur M. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 1 (July, 1952), pp. 20-36.

³Paul Wasserman, "Development of Administration in Library Service: Current Status and Future Prospects," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 19 (July, 1958), pp. 283-294.

⁴Ibid., p. 285.

Virtually no writing has attempted to distill from a study of administrative practices in a number of institutions a set of hypotheses which might provide a framework for understanding common situations in different settings.¹

In 1969, Thomas Parker discussed in Library Journal potentialities of operations management in the separation of professional and clerical tasks, in personnel assignments, and as an aid to solving many other library problems.²

During the mid- and late sixties a substantial body of literature dealing with systems analysis applied to libraries came into being. The systems technique is a valuable instrument for examining the functions and objectives of reader services, establishing optimum organization for providing these services, indicating proper locations where each individual function is to be provided, and for gearing personnel and general resource allocation accordingly. Too often, however, systems articles -- both those dealing with the library in general as well as studies concerning the circulation department in particular -- become, for the purposes of this study, excessively preoccupied with hardware and routines: to paraphrase Wasserman, they often become a form of latter day 'task management.' Systems analysis has been widely used in many fields of management as an instrument for considering broad questions. Few such analyses have reached print

¹Ibid.,

²"The Missing Stream: Operations Management in Libraries," Vol. 94 (January, 1969), pp. 42-43.

in the library field. Too often, judging from the absence of discussion, assumptions concerning functions and staffing patterns are accepted and the only existing procedures that are questioned relate to routines and circulation policies, especially the latter as they affect hardware and mechanical capabilities. This constitutes a technician's approach which does not result in far-reaching professional reconsiderations. The writer has not encountered a single significant treatment of systems theory applied to circulation/reader services function and staffing patterns. Since the systems approach originated in biology where it provided an instrument for the broadest consideration of ecology and other matters, the above situation is indeed paradoxical.

Yet systems techniques and thinking have been disseminated with sufficient thoroughness to constitute a massive and, in the judgement of the writer, salutary influence on library managerial thought. The flourishing of managerial theory at the University of Chicago Library School in the late thirties and forties was a credit to the school and to the profession. In a number of respects, especially in its early consideration of Fayol, it was advanced by any standard. Yet the limited dissemination of its work -- by present standards -- and its inappropriately limited acknowledgement by the library world in general, severely and perhaps critically limited its influence.

Systems thinking, however, forced its way into the general philosophy of the profession with the advent of computerized library

techniques in the early Sixties. For any library undertaking computerized mechanization, the techniques of systems analysis could not be relegated to the halls of a distant academy. It had to be mastered and understood by the practitioner, at least to the extent of being able to assume responsibility for large-scale projects.

While the writer, as previously mentioned, has not encountered any significant published reference to systems thinking specifically applied to circulation services function and staffing patterns, he has nevertheless been greatly influenced by this thinking in every phase of the present research project. It is easy to hypothesize that, to the extent that systems thinking has motivated librarians to think in terms of objectives, functions to achieve these objectives, and appropriate supportive resource allocation, systems thinking has had a profound influence on the increased rationalization of reader services in the American university library and on the deprofessionalization of the circulation department.

Summary

In reviewing the relevant literature of library management, one is impressed by the excellence of a number of individual contributions and, at the same time, with its lack of completeness and maturity as a unified body of thought. A few writers have drawn on general management literature to synthesize principles of relevance to issues in function and personnel allocation. Others have dealt with realities of current practice and have attempted to

view them in perspective. Regarding systems thinking and such techniques as cost benefit analysis, one can only conclude that their full promise is yet to be achieved.

Nevertheless, a number of useful observations arguing for increased division of labor where practical, and adequate separation of professional and clerical tasks in personnel assignment have been made. Both of these issues are closely related to the evolution of circulation services in the major university library.

VI. SUMMARY OF RELATED MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Relevant managerial literature is centered on three aspects: (1) organizational theory dealing with unity of function and division of labor, (2) related theories concerned with departmentalization and departmental emergence, and (3) significant and relevant aspects of systems. The interpretation of these bodies of literature has been discussed at some length and we shall confine ourselves here to an analysis of their significance as a group.

Theoretical implications and discussions in the first category go far beyond the issues themselves. In fact, they are at the heart of the issue in determining optimum function and related personnel allocation in reader services. Fayol spelled out the advantages of functional unity in personnel assignments and individual efficiency. Within our profession, the concept has been strongly advocated by Coney, Henkle, and Shaw. Coney discussed this issue in the specific context of the circulation department and noted the dissimilarity between the basic circulation and information service functions. By implication, the questions here analyzed include the following:

1. If information service, reserve, interlibrary loan, and circulation functions are all assigned to the circulation department, will they be performed as efficiently and effectively as in an alternate grouping?
2. Are efficient personnel assignment and utilization possible in the above circumstance?

3. With the grouping indicated in #1, will all functions receive attention in proportion to their importance?
4. In the most general terms, is the broad concept of circulation service viable in the major university library, given the volume and types of service demanded?

The management principles examined by the writer indicate that the answer to all these questions is strongly in the negative. In addition, and aside from the question of efficiency in staff utilization, the issue has been validly raised concerning the suitability of the loan desk as an information service point even given the presence of professionals.

Our primary interest in the area of departmentalization and related dynamics centers around examination of the phenomenon of the emergence of reference, reserves, and interlibrary loans as separate departments in the context of the total evolution that concerns us here. The emergence of these separate units finds ready explanation in organizational theory relating to the department as does the adherence of the information function and others to the circulation desk for such an extended period. This area has been dealt with by Williamson, Howard, Shaw, Barnard, and Davis.

Systems thinking tends to support the above evolution in the context of the major university library, inasmuch as it tends to favor unity of function and efficient staff utilization.

A number of librarians have discussed the crucial related problem of using professional librarians for professional work. None has done so more eloquently than Williams (see pp. 48-49).

In summary, the above principles, when applied to the circulation area, argue for the separation of circulation from other functions in order to allow for homogeneity of staff and activity. In addition and perhaps most important, such separation is most likely to yield the most efficient and effective performance of the circulation department's raison d'être: the circulation of books and control of the library's resources.

PART 3

CURRENT THOUGHT AND PRACTICE

IN

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CIRCULATION SERVICES

VII. THE PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGY

Part 3 is largely devoted to the survey indicated by questions left unanswered in the literature study of Parts 1 and 2. The section which follows includes (1) a more detailed statement of the problem, (2) the methodology that grew out of it, and (3) the resulting survey.

It can be seen that the literature analysis indicated general trends as reflected in the sum total of published thinking related to circulation services in academic libraries during this century. However, it yielded little in the way of objective indications regarding current status. The primary reason for this is that the area, apart from routines, loan policies, and hardware, has received little published attention in the last twenty years.

The specific questions to be answered include the following:

- (1) what functions are most commonly allocated to the circulation department,
- (2) what are staffing patterns,
- (3) what is management's conception of the circulation department role,
- (4) to what extent are professional librarians employed in this area,
- (5) what, if any, patterns emerge in comparing functions present in individual libraries and the presence of computerized routines and/or systems analysis in the circulation department, and finally,
- (5) do staffing patterns appear to be appropriately related to functions allocated?

In order to answer these questions, a questionnaire survey was conducted of 126 libraries serving institutions graduating more than thirty Ph.D's per year. This criterion was chosen for the following reasons:

1. It eliminated institutions with major enrollments but which make relatively unsophisticated demands on their libraries. Examples of these are large municipal junior colleges and state colleges that have grown to, in some cases, over 10,000 students, but which still are primarily undergraduate institutions. A major focus of the study is the extent to which the information service function has been separated from the circulation desk and department. Where extensive graduate and research programs create more sophisticated information demands, this element within the total range of reader services becomes more crucial and requires greater attention and personnel/resource allocation. The decision whether or not to rationalize in terms of a given function is more important. The resulting implications in service and resource allocation are greater.
2. The number of staff members in circulation and other reader service departments and volume of circulation or other services handled expand the number of options regarding how and where a given service is to be offered. A number of contaminating factors -- in the form of courses of

action that are not really open -- are thereby eliminated. Among such contaminating influences are inadequate demand for a given service so that specialization on the basis of it is impractical, and numerically inadequate total staff to provide for additional specialized departments. The libraries included in the study have sufficient volume and staff to have a large number of organizational options.

3. The institutions selected tend to be older, and the factor of evolution has had the opportunity to develop within individual institutions. The option to retain existing staff and functional patterns is present.
4. The universe, once identified, consists for the most part of libraries organizationally of interest to this study. The criterion is limiting only inasmuch as it eliminates institutions of lesser interest. Identification of the universe is authoritative and efficient through use of the latest edition of Earned Degrees Conferred, published by the U. S. Office of Education.¹ The number of institutions included -- 126 -- can manageably be studied in their entirety. The need for random selection is eliminated. Descriptive statistics and related methodology are adequate for analyzing survey results.

The 126 institutions selected in this manner (seventy-five public, fifty-one private) had an average of 15,903 students

¹Earned Degrees Conferred: Higher Education, Part A: Summary Data, 1967/68.

and were served by libraries averaging 1,173,203 volumes.¹

A breakdown by category is provided in Table 3.

TABLE 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS AND LIBRARIES INCLUDED IN STUDY (1970)

Data Group	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Total
Library Group 1 (Less than 500,000 volumes)	14	13	27
Library Group 2 (500,000 - 999,999 volumes)	18	31	49
Library Group 3 (1,000,000 - 1,999,999 volumes)	11	21	32
Library Group 4 (2,000,000 volumes and over)	8	10	18
Total	51	75	126
Student Group 1 (Less than 5,000 students)	11	3	14
Student Group 2 (5,000 - 14,999 students)	29	23	52
Student Group 3 (15,000 students and over)	11	49	60
Total	51	75	126

¹As determined in American Library Directory, 1970/71.
(27th ed.; New York: Bowker, 1970).

The Questionnaire

In order to obtain information regarding objective characteristics of circulation departments and management attitudes relating to them, the questionnaire method was used. The questionnaire, reproduced in Appendix A, was drafted by the researcher, and was tested and reviewed by a variety of students, faculty, and librarians, including a number who had had previous experience with the construction of questionnaires. It was also reviewed by staff of the statistical consulting service to insure that the results would be statistically valid.

The study was confined to universities that had centralized circulation departments and services -- centralized aside from the circulation of reserves, periodicals, and special forms of materials. The reason for this is that the study is focused on the circulation department as a unit, one that as a single entity formerly embraced most of the reader service functions. Objective characteristics of decentralized circulation departments could not be fitted into a highly structured questionnaire relating to the typical centralized circulation department. To obtain a substantial amount of information and a large return, a structured questionnaire demanding comparatively little of the respondent was highly desirable.

The first half of the questionnaire was devoted to the functions embraced within circulation services and the degree of departmental responsibility for them. Questions followed regarding qualifications of the department head, number and level of supporting staff, the use of student assistants, and specialized positions that had been

differentiated within the department. The last half of the questionnaire dealt with the degree to which systems analysis and computer-based mechanization had been factors relative to the scope of functions and size of professional staff; architectural influences; the degree to which stacks were open; and management attitudes toward the role of the circulation department.

While the sections regarding functional allocation and number and level of staff were intended to determine objectively what is being done within the circulation department, the sections regarding automation, systems analysis, architectural influences, and open stacks were specifically intended to gain evidence of causality.

Of 126 institutions included in the survey, replies were received from 114 (90.5%). Returns by data group are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4
SURVEY RESPONSE BY DATA GROUP

Size of Library	Response		Size of Student Population	Response	
	No.	%		No.	%
Group 1 (Less than 500,000 volumes)	25	92.5	Group 1 (Less than 5,000 students)	11	78.6
Group 2 (500,000 - 999,999 vol.)	42	85.7	Group 2 (5,000 - 14,999 students)	43	82.6
Group 3 (1,000,000 - 1,999,999 vol.)	30	93.8	Group 3 (15,000 students and over)	60	100
Group 4 (2,000,000 and over)	17	94.4			

As the primary means of analyzing returns, four data groups were selected representing different types (rather than merely degrees) of magnitude in size of library. Thus, the categories selected were the following: less than 500,000 volumes (essentially small libraries by the standards of this universe); over 500,000 volumes but less than one million (medium-sized libraries, able to function to varying extents in much the same way as smaller institutions, but beginning to experience the organizational dynamics and pressures of larger libraries); one million or more but less than two million (large libraries); and over two million volumes, the 'multiversity' library, often two or three times the lower limit of this group, where totally different dynamics may affect circulation function and staff.

Where relevant, institutions were also divided and returns analyzed according to three different levels of student enrollment: less than 5,000 students; more than five but less than fifteen thousand students; and fifteen thousand students or more. These three gradations represent the relatively small university; the medium-sized institution; and the very large university, each with different problems relating to the dissemination and control of the book collection. They represent varying magnitudes of pressure, not only on circulation and related services but on information service.

A variety of other categorizations will be made in order to facilitate examination of individual factors.

VIII. FUNCTIONS AND FUNCTIONAL PATTERNS IN CIRCULATION SERVICES

The presence or absence of ten functions, the degree of departmental participation in them, and the extent to which the circulation department is involved in the formation of loan policies were measured in the first half of the questionnaire.

The functions studied were the following: reserve books, in-depth information service, quick information service, interlibrary loans, library instruction and/or orientation, assistance of readers in the use of the card catalog, inventory of book collection, book selection, shelving of books, and stack maintenance. Functions generally performed by all university library circulation departments, such as checking out books and administering fines, were omitted from the list in order that other more significant items could be included elsewhere in the questionnaire. An attempt was also made to ascertain the degree to which the circulation department was responsible for fulfilling individual functions.

Each function will be discussed separately. Of the 114 libraries responding to the questionnaire, eleven (9.7% of response) had decentralized circulation services. Thus, in discussing all the functions indicated above we are referring to their presence in the 103 libraries (90.4% of response) with centralized circulation departments. Under the definition of 'centralized circulation department' employed in the questionnaire, reserves, periodicals, and special forms of

materials could be charged from positions administratively and physically separate from the main circulation desk.

Reserve Books

A majority of the 100 libraries responding to this question (67.0%) allocated the function of reserves in some degree to the circulation department. This was most frequently the case in libraries of under 500,000 volumes where only two (11.0%) did not so allocate this function. Only in the largest library category -- libraries of 2,000,000 volumes and over -- did the majority of libraries (57.0%) administer reserves separately from the circulation department. A uniform trend from the smallest library group to the largest is that as a library increases in size it is increasingly likely that reserves will be administered separately. The same trend exhibits itself in progressing from the smallest to the largest student enrollment group.

In fifty-four (82.1%) of the libraries where the circulation department has some responsibility for reserves, the department has a primary role. In two cases, activity is limited to items on permanent reserve.

It is of interest to this study to note the location from which reserve service is handled because in the academic library circulation departments during the early part of this century, reserves, like most other aspects of reader service, tended to be handled

directly from the circulation desk. It is hypothesized that as libraries have increased in size and complexity, this function has tended to be removed physically as well as organizationally from the circulation desk. In the smallest library category, half of the circulation departments embracing reserve functions offer this service from the central circulation desk(s).

In the second category (libraries of 500,000 volumes but less than a million), the proportion offering this service from the circulation desk decreases to one third. In libraries of one million volumes but less than two million, only three in sixteen (18.6%) so configure their reserve operation.

The proportion is roughly the same (16.7%) in the largest library category. There appears to be no uniform trend by size of student population.

In-Depth Information Service

Only four libraries (3.9%) reported that the circulation department provided in-depth information service. Of these, three libraries were in the smallest category while one was in the largest. This type of information service was defined as "with few exceptions, no queries referred elsewhere." Not surprisingly, the concept of providing such service from the circulation desk is all but dead.

The question of providing other degrees of information service from the circulation department is dealt with in the next section.

Quick Information Service

Ninety-one libraries (89.2%) indicated that this is part of the circulation department function. In an attempt to ascertain the depth of information service offered in this category, three statements representing varying degrees of activity were presented to be checked by respondents as appropriate for the individual library. The three degrees, or limitations, of such service were represented as follows:

- a. Queries requiring professional knowledge for solution are referred elsewhere.
- b. Questions requiring extended time to answer are referred elsewhere.
- c. Direction and incidental queries (such as those involving library rules) are the only ones handled.

Respondents were asked to check as many of these as applied to their circulation departments. Many checked all three, or 'a' and 'c', both of which responses are equivalent in meaning to 'c' and were so tabulated. On the other hand, 'b' leaves open the possibility that questions requiring professional expertise that do not demand extended time to answer would be handled from the circulation desk.

Of the ninety-one respondents indicating that quick information service was part of the circulation function, eighty (87.9%) reported that direction and incidental queries were the only ones handled. Responses 'a' and 'b' were the choices

of four and three respondents respectively. Another indicated that the department answered only questions relating to inventory control.

A further breakdown of responses is provided in Table 5.

Responses to this question indicate that the information service function, while very much alive within circulation, is limited principally to ephemeral requests and in its present form can hardly be considered a professional-level duty.

TABLE 5

QUICK INFORMATION SERVICE AS A CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT FUNCTION:
BY SIZE OF LIBRARY (N = 102)

	Group 1*	Group 2*	Group 3*	Group 4*	Total
Service rendered	21	36	23	11	91
Not provided from within the circulation department	1	3	4	3	11
<u>Degree of Service Provided:</u>					
Queries requiring professional knowledge for solution referred elsewhere.	1		2	1	4
Questions requiring extended time referred elsewhere.		1	2		3
Only directional and incidental queries handled.	19	34	17	10	80
No response.	1	1	2		4

*Group 1, libraries of less than 500,000 volumes; Group 2, 500,000 - 999,999 volumes; Group 3, 1,000,000 - 1,999,999; Group 4, 2,000,000 volumes and over.

Interlibrary Loans

Of the 103 libraries responding to this question, sixty-three (61.2%) have allocated this function outside of the circulation department. However, no clear pattern can be detected by size of library or size of student population. As may be seen from Table 6, in Library Group 1, 45.5% incorporate the interlibrary loan function within the circulation department. The percentage for Library Groups 2, 3, and 4 are 25.0%, 37.0%, and 71.4% respectively.

Regarding libraries that have accorded the circulation department some responsibility in this area, twenty-three (62.1%) have made the department administratively responsible for this function.

The writer was, once again, interested in determining the extent to which interlibrary loan had been physically, as well as administratively, divorced from the circulation desk. As will be seen in Table 6, the libraries reporting, considered as one group, were almost evenly divided. In 47.5% of the departments having some interlibrary loan responsibility, this service was provided from the circulation desk. In the largest library category, however, only two of eight institutions (25.0%) so configured their interlibrary loan service. For the three student enrollment categories (beginning with the smallest), the percentages of libraries offering this service from the circulation desk were 47.0%, 50.0%, and 42.8% respectively.

TABLE 6

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICE AS A CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT-FUNCTION:
AN ANALYSIS BY SIZE OF LIBRARY (N = 103)

	Group 1 ^a	Group 2 ^a	Group 3 ^a	Group 4 ^a	Total
Service rendered by circulation department	10	10	10	10	40
Not rendered	12	30	17	4	63
<u>Degree of Responsibility:</u>					
Primary	6	7	3	7	23
Secondary, assisting other departments	4	2	6	3	15
No response		1	1		2
<u>Location From Which Service is Offered</u>					
Central circulation desk(s)	4	6	6	2	18
Other location	6	3	4	8	21
No response		1			1

^aGroup 1, libraries of less than 500,000 volumes; Group 2, 500,000 - 999,999; Group 3, 1,000,000 - 1,999,999; Group 4, 2,000,000 and over.

Viewing trends in the provision of interlibrary loan service, there is a measurable tendency not to provide this service within the organizational confines of the circulation department. When this function is found within the department, circulation responsibility is usually a primary one but the service is most often rendered from a point other than the circulation desk.

Library Instruction and/or Orientation

Just thirty-five (34.0%) of the 103 libraries responding to this question incorporate this function within the circulation department. When this activity is present, with two exceptions, the departmental role is a supportive rather than a primary one. A more detailed breakdown of patterns emerging is provided in Table 7.

It is evident that this is not an accepted activity within the circulation department of most libraries, and that when this participation is present it is usually on a supportive rather than a primary basis.

TABLE 7

LIBRARY INSTRUCTION AND/OR ORIENTATION AS A CIRCULATION FUNCTION:
AN ANALYSIS BY STUDENT AND LIBRARY CATEGORY (N = 103)

	Participation	No Participation
<u>Student Categories</u>		
Less than 5,000 students	3	6
5,000 - 14,999 students	18	22
15,000 students and over	15	39
<u>Library Categories</u>		
Less than 500,000 volumes	5	17
500,000 - 999,999 "	16	24
1,000,000 - 1,999,999 "	8	19
2,000,000 volumes and over	7	7

Assistance of Readers in the Use of the Card Catalog

Just forty (38.8%) of the 103 libraries reporting consider this to be a function of the circulation department. Patterns by size of library are given in Table 8.

Of the thirty-nine libraries reporting degree of responsibility for this function, only three indicated that their role was a primary one, although an additional three rendered this service along with the reference department on an approximately equal basis.

All but four libraries participating in this activity performed the service from the circulation desk, an indication that this assistance is more incidental than critical in the range of departmental functions.

Inventory of Book Collection

Several libraries within the universe surveyed reported that they did not conduct inventory on a regular basis in the normally accepted sense of the term. As one library put it, "Who can afford it?" Nevertheless, this is a fully-acknowledged function in conventional form of most of the circulation departments included in the survey.

TABLE 8

ASSISTANCE OF READERS IN THE USE OF THE CARD CATALOG
AS A CIRCULATION FUNCTION: AN ANALYSIS BY LIBRARY SIZE (N = 103)

	Library Group 1 ^a	Group 2 ^a	Group 3 ^a	Group 4 ^a	Total
Function Present	13	13	8	6	40
Not Present	9	27	19	8	63
<u>Degree of Responsibility</u> N = 39 ^b					
Primary		2	1		3
Shared With Reference on an Equal or Near-Equal Basis	1		2		3
Subordinate	12	10	5	6	33
<u>Location From Which Circulation Department Performs Function</u> N = 33 ^c					
Main Circulation Desk(s)	9	8	6	6	29
Other Location	1	2	1		4

^aLibrary Group 1: less than 500,000 volumes; Group 2: 500,000 - 999,999 volumes; Group 3: 1,000,000 - 1,999,999 volumes; Group 4: 2,000,000 volumes and over.

^bOne non-response to this portion of the question.

^cSeven non-responses.

Of the 101 libraries responding to this item, sixty-two (61.4%) entrusted at least part of the responsibility for taking inventory to the circulation department. Of fifty-eight libraries reporting some degree of involvement, forty-three (74.1%) indicated that the circulation department was responsible for directing the inventory. This trend is particularly strong in the largest libraries -- those of two million volumes or more -- where twelve of fourteen libraries reporting (85.7%) indicated that this department directed the inventory. The libraries are more evenly divided in degree of responsibility allocated in the smallest category, where seven of twelve circulation departments bore primary responsibility.

Thus, the taking of inventory is firmly entrenched among circulation department functions -- not surprising in view of the technical nature of this activity and its close relationship with the dissemination and control of the library collection.

Book Selection

To proponents of a broad role for the circulation department, book selection was an important function because of the major departmental role in reader services. Activities in this area included the collection of feedback regarding collection adequacy, liason with

faculty, and selection on the basis of what was presumed to be a good working knowledge of student and faculty requirements?

At present, many libraries utilize their entire professional staff in book selection. The original circulation function in this area, as implied by a number of early writers, went considerably beyond this into a special responsibility -- one considerably more significant than the ordering of replacements. Thus, in addition to discovering the extent of circulation department activity in book selection, the questionnaire sought to discover (1) if the role was appreciably greater than that of other departments (especially other than acquisitions and reference), and (2) in order to facilitate evaluation of responses, the extent to which departments other than acquisitions participated in book selection.

Of the 103 libraries responding to this question, fifty-four (52.4%) undertook as part of their function some form of book selection. Thirty-three of these participating departments (61.1%) were in libraries where book selection was undertaken by all or virtually all departments. In an additional fourteen cases (35.9%), book selection was participated in by acquisitions and reader services departments. In only one library reporting

was the degree of participation on the part of circulation greater than that of other departments (with the exception of acquisitions and reference). There is no substantial variation in numbers of participating and non-participating departments by size of library or level of student enrollment.

From the foregoing it is evident that while the circulation department is still an active participant in book selection, its role is not appreciably greater than that of other library departments (excluding acquisitions and reference). Its participation seems to reflect the well-established trend toward library-wide activity in this area rather than any special or unique role for the circulation department as such.

Shelving of Books/Stack Maintenance

These two separate functions will be discussed in this single section because of the homogeneity of responses and of the two types of activity. Eighty-eight of the 103 libraries reporting (85.4%) have allocated these two functions in some degree to the circulation department. Seventy-eight in eighty-five (91.8%) reporting degree of responsibility for shelving indicated that circulation superintended this activity. The percentage for stack maintenance was 87.8% (seventy-two of eighty-two reporting). Neither figure is surprising inasmuch as this is one of the activities most closely associated with the

technical function of circulating library books. There appears to be no significant pattern of variation by size of library or level of student enrollment.

Formulation of Circulation Policy

The degree to which departments engaged in policy formation was of particular interest to this study inasmuch as this is one of the few purely circulation activities that is almost totally divorced from the clerical or technical. Circulation policy has widespread implications that extend far beyond the department itself. Under virtually all circumstances one can envision the department being consulted, even if this consultation involves only methods of implementation and possible difficulties. Consultation on a professional level is related to the degree in which departmental staff engage in formation of substantive policy on other than a procedural level.

A structured range of four responses was provided in the questionnaire to gauge the degree and level of participation in policy formation:

- (1) Chief of circulation services recommends policies to immediate superior for review and adoption.
- (2) Chief of circulation department participates in committee with representatives of other departments et al in policy formation.
- (3) Policy developed outside of department with consultation of department.

- (4) Policy developed outside of department, without consultation.

Additionally, a fifth option labeled 'Other' was provided together with space to indicate another degree of consultation/participation.

As shown in Table 9, the chief of circulation services recommends policies for review and adoption in roughly one third of the libraries in the lowest three size categories. Thus implies a very substantial responsibility. Of the fourteen libraries of over two million volumes reporting, only two (14.3%) formulate policy in this way.

In twenty-seven libraries (27.3% of those responding to this question), the chief of circulation services participates in committee with representatives of other departments et al in policy formation. This is the case in eight (57.1%) of the fourteen largest libraries reporting, and in one-fourth to one-fifth of libraries in other categories.

Twenty-four libraries (23.5%) reported that a combination of both the above methods was used.

Those checking one or both the above responses represented eighty-one (79.4%) of those reporting. This indicates that in the libraries concerned the circulation department involvement in policy formation is a fully professional one. Whether this reflects the presence of professionals, or whether this is a significant reason why they are placed there, is not clear.

TABLE 9

CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT PARTICIPATION IN POLICY FORMATION:
AN ANALYSIS BY LIBRARY SIZE (N = 102)

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Department Participates	21	40	27	14	102
No participation	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Degree of Participation^a</u>					
Department head recommends policies to immediate superior for review and adoption.	7	13	9	2	31
Chief of circulation department works in committee with other department heads in policy formation.	5	8	6	8	27
Policy developed outside of department with consultation of department.	1	2	3	1	7
Policy developed outside department without consultation.					
All above.			1		1
First through third options		2	1		3
Options #1 and #3	3	2	2		7
Options #1 and #2	5	11	5	3	24

^aTwo non-responses to this sub-section.

Mooney and Reiley's Principle of Functionalism implies that there is no essential reason why policy formation must take place within the department -- as long as correlation among the three basic functions indicated is maintained. This presupposes that policies will be developed with full knowledge of operating realities. It is gratifying, however, that given the wide-spread use of professionals in this department (to be discussed in the next chapter), they are involved in this professional activity.

Patterns of Function Allocation

For the purposes of analyzing functional patterns, the functions in the questionnaire and varying degrees of involvement within them were divided between those that were clearly professional and those that would not, in the majority of cases, require professional skills in their fulfillment. The items regarded as professional were the following:

1. In-depth reference service.
2. Quick information service where the only questions referred elsewhere are those requiring extended time to answer.
3. Primary responsibility for interlibrary loan.
4. Primary responsibility for instruction and/or orientation in the use of the library.
5. Assisting readers in the use of the card catalog where the circulation department either has a primary role or shares it equally with reference.

¹James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, The Principles of Organization (New York: Harper, 1939), p. 26.

6. Book selection: any degree of responsibility.
7. Policy formation, with distinction made between (a) initiation or formulation of policy with others and (b) where policy is developed outside of the department but where consultation with the circulation department takes place. The second alternative would often be consultation on a procedural level regarding implementation, but could conceivably involve professional judgement when policy is formulated by the director and the resulting consultation is on a one-to-one basis. In summary, the first category is always professional whereas the second may not be.

This distinction relegated to the status of sub-professional or clerical the following functions:

1. Reserve books (all degrees of involvement).
2. Quick information service where queries requiring professional knowledge are referred elsewhere, and/or where directional and incidental queries (such as those involving library rules) are the only ones handled.
3. Supportive work with interlibrary loans.
4. Supportive work in library instruction where primary responsibility (including that for curricular/course planning) lies elsewhere and other professional personnel are available to work with sub-professionals within the department in implementation.

5. Inventory work.
6. Shelving and stack maintenance.

A further distinction was made in professional functions between (a) those that would probably be performed within the circulation department primarily because a professional was already available there, and (b) functions that would in themselves justify the special assignment of professional staff to this department.

In the first category were placed the following:

1. Quick information service where only questions requiring extended time to answer are referred elsewhere.
2. Book selection -- when participated in on a more or less equal basis by professionals in all departments (except for greater participation by acquisitions and reference).
3. Policy formation. As discussed in Part I of this study, this need not take place within the circulation department and in a number of respects is not really a function of the circulation department per se.

In the second category were placed the following functions:

1. In-depth information service. The presence of this function would involve calculated and significant staff availability.
2. Primary responsibility for interlibrary loans. This is an important library function which, if allocated to the circulation department, would require provision of professional staff on a full or calculated part-time basis.

3. Primary responsibility for library instruction and/or orientation. In institutions with major student enrollments -- a category embracing the majority of institutions in this study -- such a responsibility, depending on the program, involves a great deal of planning and implementation and would be a major staff consideration. This is true even if a significant portion of the implementation is left to sub-professional staff (especially those with the Bachelor's degree who are competent teachers but not literally professional).

In the category of professional functions requiring specific professional staff assignment, only thirty (thirty per cent) of libraries reporting undertook even one of the services in the degree and under the conditions prescribed. Of this number, twenty-seven undertook only one.

Considering all functions requiring professional personnel, just under half of the libraries reporting (forty-eight per cent) embraced only one such activity -- that of policy formation. In addition, thirty per cent of the departments embraced two, and eighteen per cent undertook three. All libraries allocated at least one of the professional functions (considering both categories of professional activity) to the circulation department. Further details are given in Table 10.

TABLE 10

PATTERNS IN TWO TYPES OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS IN CIRCULATION SERVICES
 -AN ANALYSIS BY SIZE OF LIBRARY (N = 100^a)

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
<u>Number of Profes- sional Functions Present Requiring Special Assignment of Professional Personnel (see pp. 103-106)</u>					
1	7	8	6	6	27
2	1	1	1		3
<u>Total Professional Functions Present (Including Above)</u>					
1	8	19	15	6	48
2	6	14	8	2	30
3	7	3	2	6	18
4		1	2		3
5	1				1

^aThree respondents did not provide sufficient information to be included in this analysis.

The major significance of the pattern emerging is that, while all departments included in the study have at least one professional function, in roughly half of the cases this was that of policy making which, as previously discussed, need not take place within the department. Thirty of the circulation departments (30.0%) embrace activities which make necessary the presence of professional personnel within the department. In twenty-seven cases there is only one such activity, in twenty instances being that of interlibrary loan. To many, this function would seem to be more closely related to the information service department (whatever the local designation). The latter department is usually in close proximity with the major bibliographies and, with its many high-level contacts with library users, is in a good position to relate interlibrary loan requests with the adequacy of the collection and need for specific additions to it as well as general improvements. The primary reason for having this function within the circulation department appears to be that the book is loaned.

If one accepts the Principle of Functionalism, frequently the only justification for having professionals in this area -- in the absence of professional functions requiring their presence -- is a supervisory one. More will be discussed concerning this issue later in the study.

Summary

Perhaps the best way to summarize the foregoing is to outline a functional profile of the typical circulation department that has emerged from the survey.

The average department would have primary responsibility for reserve books, although they would be circulated from a location separate from that of the circulation desk(s); in the area of information service, the department would handle directional and incidental queries (such as those involving library rules) but would provide no in-depth reference service; it would have no responsibility in the area of interlibrary loans, library instruction or orientation, assistance of readers at the card catalog, or book selection (beyond that granted to other departments), but would be directly responsible for the inventory of the book collection, shelving, and stack maintenance. It would also play a significant and professional role in the formulation of circulation policy for the library.

Regarding professional functions that would, in the context of the first part of this study, require the assignment of professional personnel to the department for the specific purpose, the average circulation department undertakes no activities in this category.

IX. STAFF EMPLOYMENT AND UTILIZATION IN CIRCULATION SERVICES

The purpose of the staff section of this study was to determine number and level of staff assigned to circulation services, with particular interest in the professional category, and the relationship of staff assignments with functions allocated to this area.

Of the 103 libraries with centralized circulation services, seventy-five (72.8%) satisfactorily completed both the sections relating to the highest degree of the department head and the questions concerning numbers and qualifications of supporting staff. As most of those who failed to complete both parts satisfactorily left blank the space for the highest degree of department head, tabulations reproduced in this section and staff percentages will be confined to the seventy-five who provided complete information. Regarding patterns of this non-response, the percentages of those completing both sections were lower in the smallest and largest library categories. Proceeding from the smallest to the largest library data groups, the percentages were 68.2%, 82.5%, 70.4%, and 52.7% respectively.¹ In most cases, those who left blank the space for highest degree of the department head went on to indicate the area in which the highest degree had been earned. Therefore, the reason for this non-response cannot be that the incumbent does not possess a degree. Respondents, in any case, appeared to show

¹For libraries of, respectively, less than 500,000 volumes; 500,000 - 999,999 vol.; 1,000,000 - 1,999,999 vol.; over 2,000,000 vol.

no hesitation in writing 'none' when appropriate. Since currently it is to some extent unfashionable to use highly educated staff in circulation and is considered a sign of efficiency to employ clerks and technical assistants to the maximum, the omission can hardly have been to avoid a stigma. In any case, the covering letter for the questionnaire assured respondents that the identities of individual libraries would be kept in confidence.

Of seventy-five libraries providing complete responses, fifty-eight (77.3%) had circulation departments headed by individuals with the Master's Degree or higher. Of these, forty-seven (62.7% of responses) possessed the Master's in Library Science. Three held Master's Degrees in other fields, seven had two Masters', and one the equivalent of an advanced Master's Degree. The most common qualification range beneath the Master's level was the subject Bachelor's Degree, held in nine (12.0%) institutions. Additional details are given in Table 11.

Supportive staff ranged from those possessing the doctorate (held in one case) to those with less than two years of preparation (including those with none at all). A total of fifty-nine with the Master's Degree in Library Science were employed in the seventy-five libraries. In addition, there were twenty-five with subject field Master's. There were some 270 employed at the Bachelor's Degree level, twenty-four of whom have some library courses or degrees in librarianship. Only seven graduates of technical assistant programs were represented. Further details are found in Table 12.

TABLE 11

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY CHIEF OF CIRCULATION SERVICES (N = 75)

Degree	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Advanced Master's		1			1
Two Masters'		2	2	3	7
Master's in Library Science	9	22	11	5	47
Master's in Other Field	1	2			3
Bachelor's With Library Science		4	1		5
Bachelor's Without Library Science	2	3	4		9
No Degree	3	1	1		5
Total Reporting, by Category	15	33	19	8	75

The percentage of professionals with a Master's Degree in Library Science or higher degree in relation to all circulation staff, including the department head, is 13.7% (Group 1), 12.6% (Group 2), 15.2% (Group 3), and 12.5% (Group 4). Including those holding the Bachelor's Degree and at least some library courses, these percentages become 13.7%, 16.8%, 23.0%, and 15.3% respectively. Those with a subject field Master's are

excluded from the professional category here because in circulation work such credentials bear no relevance to the largely technical demands of the job.

TABLE 12

HIGHEST DEGREES HELD BY SUPPORTIVE STAFF IN CIRCULATION SERVICES

Degree/ Qualification	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Doctorate				1	1
Master's in Library Science	4	17	23	15	59
Master's in Other Field	2	11	8	5	26
Bachelor's With Library Science		10	12	2	24
Bachelor's With- out Library Science	26	98	68	54	246
Graduates of Li- brary Technical Assistant Programs		2	5		7
Two Years of College in Any Area	21	59	65	72	217
Less than Two Years of College	59	104	88	75	336

^aRefers to number of libraries.

Another section of the questionnaire was devoted to measuring the extent to which sub-sections specializing in one or another activity have been set up within the circulation department. Also scrutinized, in the same section, was the extent to which the

position of assistant or associate circulation librarian has been established and the level of staff employed in it. The three structured responses in this section were for the positions of assistant or associate director of circulation services (defined as the number two position in the department), interlibrary loan librarian and staff, and reserve librarian and staff. Space was left for any other specialized positions that may have been established.

Of the 103 libraries with centralized circulation departments, sixty-three (61.2%) had the specialized position of assistant or associate director of circulation services. Most frequently, this position was occupied by a technical assistant (in twenty-seven or 26.2% of libraries reporting this position). In one case, however, the occupant held the doctorate and in sixteen (twenty-five per cent) the Master's in Library Science.

The circulation departments of twenty-seven libraries (26.2%) maintained the position of interlibrary loan librarian. Most frequently, in sixteen or 59.2% of the libraries reporting this position, the occupant held the Master's Degree in Library Science. Other staff consisted of four subject-field Master's holders, nineteen technical assistants, and thirty-two clerks.

Forty libraries reported a sub-department for reserves within circulation services. The thirty-seven libraries reporting staff composition employed eleven professional librarians (Master's

in Library Science). Their efforts were supplemented by forty-nine technical assistants and eighty-seven clerks.

Further details concerning the level of staff in these positions are given in Table 13.

TABLE 13
STAFFING OF SPECIALIZED POSITIONS
WITHIN THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT (N = 75)

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
<u>Position of Assistant or Associate Director of Circulation Services</u>					
Presence of Position Reported	11	27	14	11	63
Degree/Qualification Category of Incumbent:					
Doctorate		1			1
Master's in Library Science	3	6		7	16
Master's in Other Field			6		6
Technical Assis- tant Qualifications	5	12	6	5	28
Clerical Qualifications	3	7	2		12

TABLE 13 - Continued

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
<u>Interlibrary Loan</u>					
<u>Librarian/Staff</u>					
Presence as Sub- Department of Circu- lation Reported	4	9	7	7	27
Degree/Qualification Categories of Li- brarian and Staff:					
Master's in Library Science	2	8		6	16
Master's in other field		1	4		5
Technical Assistant Qualifications	4	2	2	11	19
Clerical Qualifications	3	11	11	7	32
<u>Reserve Librarian/ Staff</u>					
Presence as Sub- Department of Circu- lation Reported	10	21	13	5	49
Degree/Qualification Categories of Li- brarian and Staff:					
Master's in Library Science	3	4	5	2	14
Master's in other field	-	-	-	-	--

TABLE 13 - Continued

<u>Reserve Librarian/ Staff -- Degree/ Qualification</u> Category of Librarian and Staff (Continued):	Library				Total
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Technical Assistant Qualifications	9	13	15	12	49
Clerical Qualifications	9	39	24	15	87

The Relationship Between Staffing Patterns and Functions

One of the more significant aspects of this study is the extent to which the presence of high-level professional staff is found to coincide with the allocation of appropriate functions of similar level. Table 14 shows the correlation between the presence of professional staff and professional functions in the two previously-discussed categories; those which would probably be assigned because professionals were already available within the department, and those which would in themselves require and justify the assignment of professional staff to the area of circulation services.

Of seventeen circulation departments employing four or more professionals¹ in their staff, seven have no professional function that in itself would indicate the assignment of professional staff; six embrace only one professional function of any kind -- that of policy formation. Of forty-three departments employing two or more

¹The professional category includes twenty-seven in the BLS/Bachelor's with Library Science category, along with 234 who have the Master's in Library Science or higher qualification.

TABLE 14

PROFESSIONAL STAFF ASSIGNMENTS IN RELATION TO TWO TYPES OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS (N = 58¹)

	1 SF ²	2 SF	No SF	1 F ³	2 F	3 F or More
One Professional in Department	3	2	19	15	3	6
Two Professionals	5	1	11	7	6	3
Three Professionals	2		7	6	3	
Four or More Professionals	8	2	7	6	6	5
No Professionals	3		13	10	4	3

¹Seventeen responses insufficiently complete for inclusion above.

²'Special Function' -- according to criteria described on pp. these are the functions that specifically would in themselves justify and require the the special assignment of professionals to the department.

³General professional function. While professional in nature, they are more incidental than integral to the department function and would often be assigned to the department only because professionals were available there. They would not in themselves normally justify the special assignment of professional personnel to the circulation department.

professionals, nineteen have been allocated only a single professional function of any description, while twenty-five have no functions in the category explicitly requiring the assignment of professionals.

The data in Table 14 indicate that, in general, departments employing only one professional or none have fewer professional functions in either of the above categories assigned to them.

Of forty departments in this category, thirty-two have none of the 'special' professional functions assigned to them whereas twenty five embrace only a single professional function in any category.

Viewing Table 14 as a whole, the picture presented is, as expected, a mixed one. The figures do, however, raise an important question as to the need for so many professional staff in the absence of functions requiring their presence. The use of perhaps a single professional for supervisory or liaison reasons is one matter; the need for multiple professionals in the absence of any professional function other than policy formation can, under any circumstances, be questioned.

As a footnote to this section, and to encourage respondents to make a distinction between full-time clerical help and student assistants - often considered to be in the clerical category - libraries were queried concerning the utilization and assignment of student assistants. Of 103 libraries responding, ninety-six (93.2%) used 100 hours per week or more of student assistants in their circulation departments. In ninety-three cases they were employed working with the public at the circulation desk(s).

Eighty-two libraries employed students in general clerical circulation duties and in seventy-eight libraries where shelving/stack maintenance were circulation responsibilities they were used for this purpose.

It is interesting to compare this situation with statements by Randall and Goodrich as well as others regarding the use of students for assignments such as checking out books.

While most libraries in every size category used students to the above extent, the figure was more lopsided (fifty-three out of fifty-four) in the highest category of student enrollment.

More will be discussed concerning staff in relation to a number of factors in the chapters which follow.

Summary

The primary significance of this chapter is not the number of personnel working within the circulation department per se, but rather, the number and level of staff in relation to functions allocated. Viewing staffing patterns in this manner, there are important reasons to suspect that a substantial number of professional staff are being employed in less than professional work. This is notably the case where multiple professionals are employed in the absence of any professional functions justifying their assignment.

X. THE EVOLUTION OF CIRCULATION FUNCTION AND STAFF:

AN ANALYSIS OF SOME RELATED FACTORS

Viewing the close relationship between circulation and a number of other functions, notably reference, noted in the 1926 American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States; the role claimed for circulation by many of its early proponents; the somewhat narrower one claimed for this department by the various job classifications; and the results of this survey, it is evident that circulation services has evolved considerably since 1926. A number of functions -- in the areas of information service, interlibrary loan, book selection, as well as in other areas -- have in varying degree been reallocated to other departments. Where a function has to some extent been retained within circulation, the degree of responsibility for it has often been substantially reduced. As mentioned in the first part of this study, the evolution is far from even and far from complete; but that it has taken place is well established.

A number of the many and complex reasons for this change undoubtedly lie in the growth of libraries and the adjustments they have made in response to changes in the parent institution. Three of the more important of the institutional changes have been (1) the movement away from exclusive use of the lecture and textbook method of teaching and increasing reliance on multiple information sources; (2) the multiplication of student enrollments, something

that has vastly increased the problems associated with the dissemination and control of library resources; and (3) at the same time, a significant increase in specialization in virtually all phases of university activity and, related, an expansion of research programs that has greatly increased the demand for comprehensive library holdings in many areas.

The major external pressures mentioned above have, in turn, prompted a number of responses within the library which have often been assumed as factors in the functional evolution of the circulation department. These internal changes have included the introduction of computer-based routines; a change in the design of library buildings to provide for maximum flexibility, among other things; the near-universal adoption of open stacks; and reorganization of the administrative structure which has included wide-spread adoption of the reader services division. This pattern of organization has, in turn, provided a structure within which the various components of reader services, including those originally grouped around the circulation department, may be rationalized. As influences on the evolution of circulation services, these developments will be discussed separately below.

Automation and Systems Analysis

One of the rival hypotheses concerning the reason for the evolution of the circulation department is that as routines and hardware requirements were examined in preparation for automation, other aspects of the departmental operation were placed under scrutiny, an examination that resulted in the further rationalization

of departmental functions. Sustaining this hypothesis would mean proving that as a result of computerization and/or systems analysis, the range of functions in a given department, and in such departments considered as a group, had been reduced as a result of having undertaken either or both of the above processes. A subsidiary but related development would be that the number of professional personnel employed within these departments would have been reduced, once again as the result of these processes.

The examination of automation/systems analysis as influences was divided into two parts: (1) examining questionnaire responses at face value, and (2) attempting to seek external evidence to compare with questionnaire responses.

The questionnaire sought to ascertain the extent to which automation and systems analysis had been applied to the individual library, and specifically whether either had been applied to circulation services. In addition, respondents were asked if reader services and circulation had been subjected to a joint systems study, whether circulation had been studied by itself or in combination with departments other than reference, or whether systems had been applied elsewhere in the library, but not to circulation. The purpose in making these distinctions was to isolate direct and indirect influences of systems and automation in contrast to situations where neither element was present in any aspect of the library situation.

Sixty-four libraries (62.1% of those with centralized circulation services) reported that they had undertaken some form

of computerization, and thirty-one (30.1%) indicated that this embraced the circulation department.

Eight libraries (7.8%) reported having subjected their reader services, including circulation and reference, to systems analysis. Forty (39.8%) reported having included circulation only, or the circulation division in combination with departments other than reference. Forty-one (39.8%) indicated that they had undertaken systems analysis in other departments.

Surprisingly, thirteen libraries (12.6%) reported that "as a result of computerization of routines, and/or systems analysis . . . the range of functions allocated to the circulation department has been broadened."¹ Two indicated that this scope had been narrowed. Forty-three (41.7%) reported that the range had remained the same.

Regarding professional staff increases or decreases as a result of mechanization, four libraries (3.9%) reported increases in the number of professionals. Six (5.8%) reported reductions. In forty-seven cases (45.6%), professional staffing levels had remained constant.

Further details regarding the above may be found in Table 15.

Bringing external evidence to bear in examining questionnaire responses was more difficult. Various sections of the questionnaire provided a wide variety of information regarding numbers of staff in various qualification categories, numbers of professional functions embraced within automated and non-automated departments, as well as library size characteristics.

¹Quoted from questionnaire, p. 7. See Appendix A.

TABLE 15

EFFECT OF AUTOMATION AND SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ON FUNCTION AND PROFESSIONAL
FUNCTIONS AND STAFF IN CIRCULATION SERVICES

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Computer-based Automation in Library	13	22	20	9	64
. . . In Circulation Department	4	7	13	7	31
Systems Analysis Undertaken Em- bracing Reader Services Including Circulation	1	4	3		8
. . . Embracing Circulation, or Circ. and Departments Other Than Reference	4	15	14	7	40
. . . Embracing Other Departments	6	18	10	7	41
<u>As a Result of Above:</u>					
Range of Functions Broadened	3	2	6	2	13
Range Narrowed	1	1			2
Former Range Retained	5	16	15	7	43
Number of Profes- sionals Increased	1	2	1		4
. . . Decreased	1	2	2	1	6
. . . Retained at Same Level	8	15	16	8	47

Grouping all data together and comparing functions as well as staff in automated and non-automated departments is both an alluring method and invalid. As Table 16 indicates, a larger percentage of libraries in the larger than in the smaller categories have automated circulation departments. All other factors being equal, an examination of data grouped in this fashion would show that automated libraries, on the average, employ a larger number of professionals in circulation services than non-automated libraries -- not because they are automated but because they are larger.

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE OF LIBRARIES AND CIRCULATION DEPARTMENTS UNDERTAKING AUTOMATION IN RELATION TO LIBRARY SIZE GROUP POPULATIONS

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Libraries Undertaking Computer-Based Automation	59.0%	55.0%	74.0%	64.3%
In the Circulation Department ^a	18.2%	31.8%	48.1%	50.0%

^aA subset of libraries undertaking computer-based automation.

Dividing libraries into the four size groups previously used yields N's that are too small to provide generalizable evidence. Dividing the four groups into two, between the two smallest and the two largest, overcomes this problem and still provides some compensation for the varying size of libraries and, therefore, of circulation departments.

Table 17 presents the results of this grouping. In the lower two size categories considered as one group, the automated circulation departments employed an average of .91 professionals whereas non-automated departments utilized a mean of 1.25.¹ At the same time, however, the non-automated libraries undertake, on the average, a larger number of professional functions: 2.19 compared with 1.36. If one were to generalize on the basis of this evidence, he would say that the automated departments had achieved a more advanced stage of evolution in the frames of reference of this study. This would hold true for libraries of less than one million volumes.

TABLE 17

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN AUTOMATED AND NON-AUTOMATED CIRCULATION DEPARTMENTS^a

	No Automation	Automated
<u>Library Groups 1 and 2</u>		
Mean Number of Professional Functions	2.19	1.36
Mean Number of Professional Staff	1.25	.91
<u>Groups 3 and 4</u>		
Mean Number of Professional Functions	1.40	2.10
Mean Number of Professional Staff	1.80	2.53

^aNon-automated circulation departments in libraries without automation projects in any department

¹For the purposes of this comparison, Bachelor's Degrees with Library Science are excluded from the professional category. Considering this category as professional, this figure would become 1.44, thus increasing the contrast.

Patterns within the two largest library groupings give, for the libraries of one million volumes and over, a very different impression. Based on fifteen automated and five non-automated departments, the former employ an average of 2.53 professionals and have been allocated an average of 2.1 professional functions. Non-automated departments utilize an average of 1.8 professionals and embrace a mean of 1.4 professional functions. These figures are, however, somewhat compromised by the low 'N' of the non-automated libraries.

Table 18 provides a functional comparison between circulation departments that have/have not undergone systems analysis. The evidence is not only inconclusive, showing different trends in the two major size categories, but in its general thrust, it contradicts the trends shown in Table 17 inasmuch as there is a substantial overlap consisting of departments that have undergone both systems analysis and automation. Also, systems and automation are in many ways a joint influence, the former having been adopted by libraries in general because of and during the same era as the latter.

TABLE 18

MEAN NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS IN CIRCULATION DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE/HAVE NOT UNDERGONE SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

Systems Analysis	Library	
	Groups 1/2	Groups 3/4
Yes	1.52	1.74
No	1.83	1.64

Considering all evidence presented here, no clear pattern emerges supporting the contention that the computer and/or systems analysis has speeded significantly the evolutionary process in circulation services.

Architectural Influences

Architecture is of interest to this study inasmuch as in the American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States it was reported that limitations in this area were in some cases preventing the separation of the reference function from the circulation department. Such limitations do not appear to be a major influence in the allocation of functions to the circulation departments included in the study. Respondents were asked: were it not for architectural limitations within their present building, would the scope of functions embraced within the circulation department be narrower than at present, broader, or substantially the same? Two (2.1%) of the ninety-four libraries responding indicated that the scope of functions would be narrower, twelve (12.8%) reported that the range would be broader, but the majority (87.0%) reported that the scope would be substantially the same.

This may be explained by the fact that in the last ten years eighty-three libraries have either occupied new buildings or have undergone refurbishing involving the repositioning of the circulation department. Increased flexibility of modern library buildings is undoubtedly an additional element. In any event, architecture is not in any sense a retarding influence in the functional evolution of the circulation department.

Open Stacks

Another rival hypothesis states that as libraries adopted open stacks, users grew less dependent on the circulation department in using library materials. As this division became less involved in student access to books, circulation services lost much of its function as an information service department and one charged with the responsibility of seeing that the individual requirements of students for library materials were met.

Of the 103 libraries possessing centralized circulation departments, in only eleven (10.7%) was access to stacks by students restricted. In nine cases, such restrictions were placed on all undergraduates.

Table 19 presents a functional analysis of the eleven libraries restricting stack access. It can be seen that in closed-stack libraries the circulation department has been allocated an average of two professional functions, whereas in open stack libraries this average is 1.91. On the other hand, the average open-stack library had more professional functions of sufficient significance to require the explicit assignment of professional staff: .33 versus .27 in the restricted-access libraries. Moreover, 81.8% of the closed stack libraries had none of the 'significant' professional functions, compared with 69.7% in open stack libraries.

Taking into consideration the majority of indicators, as well as the small 'N' of the restricted-access libraries, the data

gathered in this study do not sustain the hypothesis that open stacks are a causal factor in bringing about a more restricted range of professional functions in the circulation department.

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS PRESENT IN CIRCULATION DEPARTMENTS OF OPEN STACK AND RESTRICTED ACCESS LIBRARIES (N = 100)

	Number	Average Number
<u>Open Stacks</u>		
Professional Functions Allocated to the Circulation Department	170	1.91
Professional Functions Requiring Specific or Special Assignment of Professional Staff	30	.33
Libraries in Category	89	
<u>Restricted Stack Access</u>		
Professional Functions Allocated to the Circulation Department	22	2.00
Professional Functions Requiring Specific or Special Assignment of Professional Staff	3	.27
Libraries in Category	11	

Rise of the Reader Service Division

Another possible generative force in the evolution of circulation services is the rise of the reader service division. This pattern of internal organization involves grouping all public and information service functions under a single head, usually at

an administrative level between that of library director and department head. This creates ideal conditions for reconsidering the optimum location, form, and interrelationship of the various services thereby embraced.

If the above process has been influential, it should be possible to show that in libraries where the circulation department is formally organized within reader services have on the average fewer professional functions.

Functional patterns emerging in relation to this theory are presented in Table 20. It will be seen that by a small margin circulation departments organized within reader services have fewer professional functions in either category heretofore examined. The only indicator in the other direction is that a larger percentage of independently-organized circulation departments have none of the professional functions requiring explicit assignment of professional staff. The over-all difference, however, is probably not significant.

TABLE 20

PATTERNS OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTION ALLOCATION TO CIRCULATION DEPARTMENTS
WITHIN AND OUTSIDE OF FORMAL READER SERVICES DIVISIONS

Organizational Context of Department	Average Number of 'Special' Professional Functions	Per Cent Without 'Special' Professional Functions	Average Number of Professional Functions
Circulation Depart- ments in Reader Services. N = 31,	.33	67.7%	1.74
Departments Reporting to Library Director/ General Assoc. Director N = 54	.41	68.5%	1.77

Summary

One of the most interesting potential causes of the evolution with which we are concerned that has been examined was that of automation and/or systems analysis, especially the latter. The reason for this is that one might expect a systematic and critical appraisal of functions allocated to circulation to accompany the rather sophisticated process of automation. The circulation department, sometimes assigned a wide variety of functions, would seem particularly eligible for such a review. In actual fact, neither automation nor systems analysis has been shown to be a significant causal factor in relation to the evolution defined in this study.

Also discounted as a significant element was the presence of a reader services pattern of organization.

The few libraries that had restricted stack access did not allocate to their circulation departments a significantly broader range of functions or larger professional staffs than those that did not impose such restrictions. This provides an indication (within the limitation imposed by the small 'N' of restricted stack access libraries) that the circulation department does not automatically become less important in the total range of library functions when limitations of stack access are removed.

Finally, architecture imposes no significant restraint on the scope of functions allocated to, or, alternately, removed from, circulation services.

XI. MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ROLE OF CIRCULATION SERVICES

One of the principal features of the literature relating to circulation services is the lack of uniformity of opinion regarding the departmental role. Published references to this area since 1960 have been primarily concerned with efficient staff utilization, and specifically with preventing the waste of professional personnel in an era of presumed critical shortages. Quite naturally these did not emphasize the professional role, if any, of the department.

In this context, it is of very great interest to this study to discover what, if any, community of thought exists among university library administrators concerning the role of this department in key areas. Thus, the final page of the questionnaire sought to fathom in some detail management attitudes toward the information service role of circulation and toward this department as the appropriate agency for service in six other areas: interlibrary loans, reserve books, library instruction/orientation, assistance to readers in the use of the card catalog (assuming reasonable proximity of the latter to the circulation desk), inventory of the book collection, and a special role in book selection. Results of this survey are given in Tables 21 and 22.

It will be seen that a very substantial community of thought exists toward these functions. Fifty-eight (56.9%) of those responding felt that while the circulation department is a service-oriented department, it is primarily concerned with technical functions; that

virtually all information service queries, other than those involving directional and other information of similar complexity, should be referred elsewhere.

TABLE 21

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD INFORMATION SERVICE
PROVIDED IN THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT (N = 102)

- A = A service department in which the principal objectives embrace both technical functions and information service.
- B = A service department in which the technical functions are of primary importance. It also, however, has a significant information service role although in-depth queries are usually referred elsewhere.
- C = The same as above, only the information service function while recognized is more incidental than described in the preceding option.
- D = Although service oriented, this department is primarily concerned with technical functions. Virtually all queries, other than those involving directional and other information of similar complexity, are referred elsewhere.

Response	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total	Per Cent
A	1	1	5	2	9	8.2
B	5	7	2	1	15	14.7
C	3	9	6	2	20	19.6
D	13	23	13	9	58	56.9

A detailed break-down of management attitudes toward the presence of other functions is given in Table 21. The administrators responding to this study are generally opposed to including inter-library loan, library instruction/orientation, assistance of

readers at the card catalog, and any special role in book selection within the circulation department. They are for including the reserve function and the taking of inventory.

TABLE 22

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE APPROPRIATENESS OF INCLUDING VARIOUS FUNCTIONS WITHIN CIRCULATION SERVICES (N = 103)

Function	No		Yes		No Opinion	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Interlibrary loan	52	50.5	38	36.9	13	12.6
Reserve books	14	13.6	83	80.6	6	5.8
Library instruction/ orientation	65	63.1	22	21.4	16	15.5
Assistance of readers at the card catalog	65	63.1	25	24.3	13	12.6
Taking of inventory	27	26.2	67	65.0	9	8.7
Special role in book selection	52	50.5	35	33.9	16	15.5

Returns from libraries in which the circulation department had been subjected to systems analysis were separately analyzed in order to determine if this element was a potential influence on management thinking. As Table 23 indicates, there is no major variation between these libraries and all libraries considered as a group. This is true in spite of the fact that a marginally greater number of libraries where

departments have been so analyzed accord circulation a more sophisticated information service function, and that from one to five per cent more of those responding considered four of the six other functions included (reserve books, library instruction/orientation, assistance of readers in the use of the card catalog, and inventory) to be inappropriate to the circulation department.

TABLE 23

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD INFORMATION SERVICE PROVIDED IN THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT AND TOWARD THE APPROPRIATENESS OF INCLUDING VARIOUS OTHER FUNCTIONS WITHIN CIRCULATION SERVICE; IN LIBRARIES WHERE THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN SUBJECTED TO SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total	Per Cent
<u>Degree of Information Service to be Provided</u>						
N =	5	19	17 ^a	7	48	
A ^b		1	1	1	3	6.3
B	2	5	5	1	13	27.1
C	1	3	4	1	9	18.8
D	2	10	7	4	23	47.9
<u>Appropriateness of Other Functions to Circulation Services</u>						
Interlibrary loan:						
No		11	10	1	24	51.0
Yes	3	7	6	3	19	40.4
No opinion		1		3	4	8.5
Reserve books:						
No		2	4	1	7	14.9
Yes	5	17	11	4	37	78.7
No opinion			1	2	3	6.4

TABLE 23 - Continued

	Library Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total	Per Cent
<u>Appropriateness of Other Functions to Circulation Services (Continued)</u>						
Library instruction/ orientation						
No	4	14	11	2	31	66.0
Yes		4	4	3	11	23.4
No opinion	1	1	1	2	5	10.6
Assistance to readers at the card catalog						
No	4	16	10	2	32	68.1
Yes	1	2	4	2	9	19.1
No opinion		1	2	3	6	12.8
Taking of inventory						
No	1	7	5		13	27.7
Yes	3	9	11	7	30	63.8
No opinion	1	3			4	8.5
Special role in book selection						
No	1	12	9	1	23	48.9
Yes	3	5	6	4	18	38.3
No opinion	1	2	1	2	6	12.8

^aOne non-response in second section ("Appropriateness of Other Functions to Circulation Services").

^bFor explanation of symbols, see Table 21, p. 132.

Summary

Management at the present time is clearly in favor of a restricted and largely technical role for the circulation department. In general, their preference is parallel to and, measured in percentage of those holding a given view, often stronger than the organizational reality in the libraries they administer.

PART 4

TOWARD A THEORY OF
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CIRCULATION SERVICE

FUNCTIONS

Evolution

Through examination of several early sources cited in the first part of the study, one is able to get a fairly clear idea of the starting point in the functional evolution in academic library circulation services. The 1926 American Library Association Survey of Libraries in the United States pointed up the very close functional (and often physical) relationship between the circulation and reference departments.¹ The Association's 1929 Budgets, Classification, and Compensation Plans for University and College Libraries stressed, in addition to the usual mundane circulation functions, such responsibilities as assistance of readers at the card catalog, insuring that individuals obtain the book desired, and seeing that the book collection is meeting the needs of library users as a group.² Projecting this picture backward in time from the period covered by this study to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is interesting to relate the presence of these functions to the theoretical origin of the circulation department: as the source of all library services in the library staffed by a single librarian in an era when library use was limited and the preservation function took precedence over the service role.

¹See pp. 6-7 above.

²p. 34 above.

The comprehensive circulation department function was advanced by several writers and reaffirmed by Brown and Bousfield in their book Circulation Work in College and University Libraries which remains the most comprehensive work on the subject.¹ This book, in addition to advancing the broad reader service circulation role, claimed and defined an even broader one. It included functions often regarded as the specific concern of reference and other departments. Advocated was the inclusion of such functions as quick information service extending to the use of periodical indexes, reference books, and bibliographies; formal and informal library instruction; reader's advisory service; seeing that the information needs of individual library users are met; public relations; and liason with faculty.

The Brown and Bousfield conception of circulation service is certainly the broadest ever advocated, and cannot be taken as totally representative of most contemporary thought and practice. However, viewing attitudes toward and practices in this area as a spectrum, the view expressed may be accepted as representative of practices in a certain segment of libraries and by no means substantially divorced from the mainstream of thinking at that time.

That the broad Brown/Bousfield conception was not accepted uncritically (and this provides a further insight into variations in thought and practice then prevailing) is evidenced by Coney's reaction,² and an article by Ethel Fair that appeared shortly thereafter.

¹See discussion beginning p. 9 above.

However, Coney's view was probably ahead of his time and it is doubtful that he represented a broad segment of the library community.

The 1929 American Library Association job classification, previously referred to, was probably close to the mainstream of professional thought and practice as it then existed. In it, circulation was given a broad role, but one that is not as broad by specific definition as that claimed by Brown and Bousfield. Considering this classification in terms of the average university library, one can conclude that the circulation department had a substantial reader service function embracing important elements of information service, but that the respective roles of reference and circulation in this area lacked precise definition.

Evidence is that this situation changed but slowly over the next twenty years. This is indicated by the change in emphasis (rather than in direction) of successive editions of library administration texts during this period and within other published references to function in this area. References supporting changes during this and later periods include the American Library Association List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries,¹ various discussions of staff implications (to be covered more fully in the discussion of circulation staff which follows), and the 1966 Civil Service guidelines for libraries,² and perhaps more than any of these, the survey conducted as part of this study.

¹See discussion, pp. 43-44 above.

²P. 45 above.

The Current Picture

The functional profile indicated by the survey in this study indicates a drastically curtailed reader service function when compared with the departmental role during the twenties and thirties. The department most often now has responsibility for reserve books (a primary role), the handling of directional and incidental information inquiries only, shelving, and stack maintenance. The department also participates to a significant extent in circulation policy formulation. However, gone, in most cases, is responsibility for reference service, interlibrary loans, library instruction/ orientation, assistance to readers at the card catalog, and any special role in book selection.

The survey of management attitudes reveals strong sympathy for a restricted departmental function parallel with and sometimes stronger than the organizational realities in the libraries themselves. The general profile of these views coincides with that of functions actually allocated.

The functions allocated, both in preference and in practice, are largely technical in nature and, for the most part, directly relate to the circulation of books and control of library resources.

Related Management Theory

There are a number of general management principles that support the above development so that, in this framework, the rationalization of functions formerly grouped around the circulation desk may be considered a positive development. These include the following:

1. Fayol's first principle of management which stresses staff efficiency gained in limiting the range of concerns to which a given individual or group must address themselves.¹
2. Ralph C. Davis' Principle of Functional Similarity, that organizational elements should be grouped according to their functional similarities. He was referring to functional characteristics that give rise to similar problems requiring homogeneous skills in their solution.²
3. A number of similar theories within classic management thought.
4. With specific interpretation to the field of librarianship, Donald Coney's statement, growing out of principles similar to those expressed in #1 and #2 above, that

The presence of more than one function to a department is a signal to the administrator to consider the desirability of removing the less important function, building and personnel permitting.³

Closely related is Ralph Shaw's statement regarding unity of responsibility for any one function.

STAFF

Evolution

The study has previously referred to the functional relationship between the circulation department of the twenties and thirties -- entrusted with a comprehensive reader service function -- and the librarian of the colonial college who rendered all library service over what was, in effect, the circulation desk. The evolution in staff began

¹Quoted p. 56 above.

³See p. 66 above.

²See discussion, p. 62 above.

with the gradual separation of the reference and circulation functions in the twenties and earlier. By the middle of the second decade of this century, the separation had not proceeded very far either functionally or organizationally.

In the mid and late twenties, a number of concerns, conflicting in their direction, were expressed within library personnel management. Williamson, in his report on library education, indicated great concern for the appropriate use of professional staff. Shortly thereafter, Works stressed the importance of an adequate number and quality of professional staff in an individual library. During the same period, there were a number of apologists for the professional nature of circulation work, its importance to the library, and the need for high-quality staff in the department.

The job classifications beginning with the 1929 American Library Association project through that published by the same organization in 1947 accepted circulation librarianship, and often subordinate positions within the department, as fully professional in nature. This was notably the case with the 1947 Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Learning, where the doctorate was among the optional qualifications for circulation work.¹ Brown and Bousfield's views in this area have already been indicated.

There was only slight movement away from the concept of circulation work as professional during the forties and fifties. Evidence of such movement may be found in the same sources indicating change

¹See discussion beginning p. 40 above.

in function. A special issue of Library Trends in 1957 failed to project any clear concensus on staffing.¹

An increasing concern regarding the use of professional librarians in the sixties, coupled with a growing appreciation of the potential contribution of library technical assistants, stimulated a number of references to circulation staffing suggesting either that professional personnel are not required or that even administrative work in this area may be entrusted to technical assistants.

Taking all sources consulted into consideration, there has been a definite shift in attitude since World War II away from the notion that circulation librarianship is a professional task. That this shift has, in essence, been far from complete is more than borne out in the survey undertaken as part of this study.

The Current Picture

Professionals are still widely employed in circulation services. Even not counting those with the Bachelor's in Library Science, roughly two thirds of the departments included in the study were headed by those possessing at least a Master's Degree in Library Science. This is perhaps less surprising than that an approximately equal number are employed in supportive circulation positions. As Table 13 indicates, a number of these headed separate divisions grouped administratively under the circulation department, though many were general circulation assistants.

One of the most valid ways of judging the use of these professionals is by the extent to which, in the individual library, their

¹See pp. 26-27.

presence coincides with the allocation of professional functions. Table 14 provides a breakdown of this relationship. The evidence raises suspicion that a substantial number of professionals are being employed in less than professional work. Of seventeen circulation departments employing four or more professionals, seven have no professional function that would in itself dictate the assignment of professional staff. Of forty-three departments employing two or more professionals, nineteen have been allocated only a single professional function of any description, while twenty-five have no functions explicitly requiring the assignment of professionals. Often, the only professional function present is that of policy formation which need not take place within the department.

Another possible reason for the assignment of professionals, that of supervision, is a questionable motive. Aside from whether the possession of a Master's Degree in Library Science increases one's basic ability as a supervisor in abstracto, there is the question of what supervision in this department, as opposed to other library departments, entails. In comparison with departmental policies and functions in cataloging, acquisitions, and many other departments, successful implementation of circulation policy and procedures does not involve highly complex professional judgements and expertise or in-depth understanding of librarianship such as one hopefully acquires in library school.

This is not to say that the management of a circulation department is not a highly demanding process. It requires a great

deal of supervisory skill in personnel; the enforcement of a high degree of precision in the conduct of department operations; an almost super-human ability to deal tactfully with people in what are often highly emotional situations and, at the same time, the capacity to respond to any given situation with firmness in protecting the rights of other library users. In short, the position requires all the qualities to be found in the exemplary receptionist/secretary of the caliber usually entrusted with management of an office. It is not that such qualities are most often lacking in a professional librarian; it is that basically, they are irrelevant to the Master's Degree in Library Science.

One of the most important reasons for not employing professional librarians in the absence of professional functions justifying their presence is that, for human reasons, they often cease to function on a professional level. They become bored -- especially in subordinate positions -- with endless routines that require too constant attention. They become depressed at the barrage of problems and with the many disputes between the library and users that take place at the circulation desk. These are relieved by too few pleasant and rewarding experiences in such interaction. The dichotomy between the library and its users in the area of book circulation -- one of misunderstanding and chronic hostility -- can easily come into the open. A bored and frustrated professional is poorly equipped to handle this situation.

On the other hand, a competent, well-organized, secretary/receptionist or technical assistant is more likely to regard this

task as a challenge and to take pride in the smooth, if routine operation of the department. This situation becomes especially desirable in a reader service context where higher-level problems are referred and solved in an environment of service rather than collection security.

There are problems: finding the right person, and being able to pay an equitable salary -- equitable in relation to the professional staff as well as sufficiently attractive to draw the right kind of sub-professional. These are often, however, not insurmountable barriers.

In summary, the use of professionals in the circulation department can sometimes be justified through the presence of professional functions or, in supervisors, by the presence of the right qualities which are unrelated to library expertise. However, the presence of professional librarians per se is not justified in the absence of functions requiring their presence; and the assignment of professionals in subordinate positions, in the absence of specifically related professional functions, can in any case be questioned. The evidence gathered by the survey described in Part 3 of this study indicates that there is a great deal to question.

Related Management Theory

As is implied by Fayol in his first principle of management, the objective is to concern a given department with a homogeneous

kind of work requiring generally similar abilities and, once having achieved this, to assign appropriate staff. As a profession, academic librarianship seems to have done much better at the first part of the task than at the second.

One finds within the literature of librarianship (though not, certainly, in the specific context of the circulation department) a substantial body of writing on the subject of staff utilization that has contributed greatly to theory in this area. These articles have been written both in times of personnel surplus and personnel shortage. The reasons for sparing use of professional staff are more obvious in times of professional shortages than in times of abundance when such personnel may be obtained for a wide variety of positions without difficulty.

Williams, writing in 1945, anticipated that there would be a great surplus of professionals following the return of war veterans which, he felt, might result in an unusually large number of professionals doing low-level work.¹ He pointed out that this would mean

accepting a vicious circle -- or descending spiral -- of personnel surplus, resulting in clerical grade work and low wages, both of which, in turn, mean inferior recruits. The latter, of course, help to insure continued low-grade work and low wages.²

The reasons for evaluating critically the need for continued wide-spread employment of professionals in circulation services even in a time of surplus are well summarized in this quotation.

¹See pp. 68-69 above.

²Ibid.

THE EVOLUTION OF FUNCTION AND STAFF IN CIRCULATION SERVICES: CAUSALITY

The section of the study concerned with the evolutionary dynamics of circulation services concentrated on a number of motivating forces that in themselves appeared to be potentially responsible for accelerating the change in function and staffing patterns. These included automation, systems analysis, open stacks, and the rise of the reader services pattern of organization. One possible restraining influence, library architecture, was also investigated.

This study has uncovered no evidence that any of these factors has significantly furthered this evolution. The number of libraries with restricted stack access (eleven) was too small to serve as a basis for large-scale generalizations. It is conceivable that over the last thirty years the conversion of most libraries to open stacks has had considerable influence in circulation and other areas. Examination of this influence, in view of the state of library history, would be difficult without large-scale in-depth studies of randomly selected libraries, a project involving lengthy examination of such library records as exist. This would make a very useful contribution to the history of the American academic library, however, and hopefully such a study will be undertaken.

Due to the above factors, one must look largely elsewhere in seeking the origins and primary motivation for the evolution with which we are concerned.

In all probability, the generative force in this evolution is the growth of libraries as organizations and the dynamics that become operative under these circumstances. There are a number of very basic management theories that support this. Also, this concept does not preclude the presence of other factors in individual libraries.

To quote once again Ralph C. Davis in his book Functions of Top Management:

Operational specialization, both line and staff, is an effect of the growth and development of an organic function. Separation of the work of the organization into its component elements takes place with increasing business volume. It is caused by the need for increased division of labor. The continuing development of business processes necessitates specialization. The nature of the separation is conditioned by the nature of the organization's service objectives and their requirements. . . . It is universal in all forms of human activity in which organization is necessary.¹

Related, Chester Barnard has stated that the phenomenon of infant bodies set off by an existing parent organization is one of the origins of organizations in general.² Thus, we see that separate departments for reference and other library functions have, in the course of academic library history, split off from the circulation department to constitute separate units.

Indeed, the university library itself is a product of these forces. Brubacher and Rudy in their book, Higher Education in Transition, relate how the colonial college librarian, in addition to being the source of all library service, was also a member of the teaching faculty or even the president himself.³ One can only

¹See p. 61 above.

²See p. 57 above.

³John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy (New York: Harper, 1968), p. 97.

speculate, in this context, on what will be the nature of the university library two hundred years hence.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

CIRCULATION SERVICES FUNCTION AND STAFF IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Where boxes are provided, please check one unless otherwise indicated.

1. Within your principal library building, the circulation of regular library materials is substantially . . .

centralized. decentralized.

Note: please exclude from consideration the circulation of reserves, periodicals, and special forms of materials.

IF DECENTRALIZED, PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITHOUT COMPLETING THE REMAINING SECTIONS OF IT.

2. Position of the administrator to whom the chief of circulation services reports _____.

FUNCTIONS

Does the circulation department in your library perform any services in the following underlined categories? If not, please check 'NO' and go to the next underlined item. If so, check 'YES' and complete the corresponding sub-section if one has been provided.

NO YES

1. Reserve books.

- a. Service provided from central circulation desk(s).

Yes

No

- b. Type of responsibility for function (check more than one if appropriate).

(1) Primary

(2) Service rendered, but primary responsibility elsewhere.

(3) Service limited to items on permanent reserve.

(4) Other _____

NO YES

 2. In-Depth information service (with few exceptions, no queries referred elsewhere). 3. Quick information service.

Check any of the following that apply.

a. Queries requiring professional knowledge for solution are referred elsewhere. b. Questions requiring extended time to answer are referred elsewhere. c. Directional and incidental queries (such as those involving library rules) are the only ones handled. d. Other _____
_____ 4. Interlibrary loans.

a. Type of responsibility

(1) Primary. (2) Secondary, assisting other departments.

b. Location of service.

(1) Provided from central circulation desk(s). (2) Interlibrary loans circulated from elsewhere. 5. Library instruction and/or orientation.

a. Type of responsibility.

(1) Primary. (2) Assists other departments in joint or supportive role.

(3)

NO YES

 6. Assistance of readers in the use of the card catalog.

a. Type of responsibility.

- (1) Primary.
- (2) Shared with reference on a nearly equal basis.
- (3) Subordinate role.

b. Location from which circulation performs this service. (check either or both).

- (1) Circulation desk(s).
- (2) Separate service point.

 7. Inventory of book collection:

(a. Type of responsibility.

- (1) Primary (i. e. directs inventory).
- (2) Secondary, assisting other departments.

 8. Book selection.

a. Is the role of the circulation department in book selection appreciably greater than that of other departments (especially other than acquisitions and reference)?

 Yes No

b. Book selection is participated in by . . .

- (1) All or virtually all departments in the library.
- (2) Acquisitions and reader services departments.
- (3) Other _____

NO YES

 9. Shelving of books.

a. Type of responsibility.

(1) Primary (i. e. most books shelved by circulation staff). (2) Secondary, assisting other departments. 10. Stack maintenance, i. e. seeing that shelves are in order.

a. Type of responsibility.

(1) Primary. (2) Secondary, assisting other departments. 11. Formulation of circulation policy.

a. Please check the statement that most nearly describes the role of the circulation department in this area. Check more than one if applicable.

(1) Chief of circulation services recommends policies to immediate superior for review and adoption. (2) Chief of circulation department participates in committee with representatives of other departments at al in policy formation. (3) Policy developed outside of department with consultation of department. (4) Policy developed outside of department, without consultation.

(5) Other _____

Note: functions generally performed by all university library circulation departments have been omitted.

STAFF

1. Highest degree, if any, held by Chief of Circulation Services _____.

Area of highest degree:

a. Library Science.

b. Subject field, without library courses.

c. Subject field, with library courses.

2. Education of other circulation department staff. Please indicate approximate full-time-equivalent numbers for each category, including funded vacancies.

a. Doctor's degree. _____

b. Master's in library science. _____

c. Master's in subject field. _____

d. Bachelor's with LS. _____

e. Bachelor's without LS. _____

f. Graduates of library technical assistant programs. _____

g. Two years of college in any area. _____

h. Less than two years of college. _____

3. Student assistants.

a. Do you employ more than one hundred hours of student assistance per week in the circulation department?

Yes No

b. In which of the following task categories are they employed?

Work with the public at desk(s).

General clerical duties within the department.

Shelving books (if this is a circulation responsibility).

4. In the following section, please check (a) the specialized staff positions, including funded vacancies, that have been created within the circulation department, and (b) the qualification categories sought, or held by the incumbents.

a. Assistant or Associate Director of Circulation Services (number two position in the department).

- Doctorate.
- Master's.
 - in LS
 - in subject area.
- Technical assistant, as locally defined.
- Clerical.

b. Interlibrary Loan Librarian and staff.

Number Full-Time
Equiv. Personnel

- Master's
 - in LS.
 - in subject area.
- Technical assistant, as locally defined.
- Clerical (excluding student assistants).

c. Reserve Librarian and staff.

Number Full-Time
Equiv. Personnel

- Master's
 - in LS.
 - in subject area.
- Technical assistant, as locally defined.
- Clerical (excluding student assistants).

Other specialized staff positions _____

AUTOMATION/SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

1. Have you completed an automated computer-based project in your . . . (check both, one, or none)

- library? circulation department?

2. Have you conducted a project in systems analysis (including flow charting, consideration of objectives, etc.) embracing . . .

- reader services including circulation and reference? circulation services only, or circulation and department(s) other than reference?
 other department(s)?

Note: please check any of the above that apply.

3. To the best of your knowledge, as a result of computerization of routines, and/or systems analysis, has the range of functions allocated to the circulation department been . . .

- broadened? narrowed? Same scope retained?

4. As a result of computerization of routines and/or systems analysis, was the number of professional staff . . .

- increased? decreased? maintained at same level?

ARCHITECTURAL CONSIDERATIONS AND INFLUENCES

NO YES

Has your main collection been moved to a new building within the last ten years?

. . . within the last five years?

Has your building undergone renovation and/or enlargement involving repositioning of the circulation department during the last ten years?

. . . during the last five years?

Were it not for architectural limitations in your present building, would the scope of functions embraced within your circulation department be . . .

- narrower than at present? broader? substantially the same?

OPEN STACKS

Aside from special collections, to what extent does your library have open stacks?

- Stacks are entirely open. Restricted access for all undergraduates.

Other access pattern _____

OPTIMUM FUNCTIONS

1. Which one of the following most nearly describes your conception of the circulation department's information service role vis-a-vis technical functions including book circulation?

A service department in which the principal objectives embrace both technical functions and information service.

A service department in which the technical functions are of primary importance. It also, however, has a significant information service role although in-depth queries are usually referred elsewhere.

The same as above, only the information service function while recognized is more incidental than described in the preceding option.

Although service oriented, this department is primarily concerned with technical functions. Virtually all queries, other than those involving directional and other information of similar complexity, are referred elsewhere.

Other _____

2. In your judgement, which of the following are appropriate functions of the central circulation department of a major university library?

	NO	YES	NO OPINION
Interlibrary loans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reserve books	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Library instruction and/or orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assistance of readers in the use of the card catalog (assuming reasonable proximity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inventory of book collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special role in book selection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any additional comment you may wish to make on the subject of this questionnaire would be greatly appreciated. Please return the above form by May 15 to Mr. Laurence Miller, C/O School of Library Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306.

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

University of Alabama	Georgia Institute of Technology
American University	University of Georgia
Arizona State University	Harvard University
University of Arizona	University of Hawaii
University of Arkansas	University of Houston
Auburn University	University of Idaho
Boston University	University of Illinois
Brigham Young University	University of Illinois Medical Center
Bryn Mawr College	Immaculate Heart College
State University of New York at Buffalo	Indiana University
California Institute of Technology	Iowa State University
University of California, Berkeley	University of Iowa
University of California, Davis	Johns Hopkins University
University of California, Los Angeles	Kansas State University
University of California, Riverside	University of Kentucky
University of California, San Diego	Lehigh University
University of California, San Francisco	Louisiana State University
University of California, Santa Barbara	Loyola University
Carnegie-Mellon University	Marquette University
Catholic University (Washington, D. C.)	University of Maryland
City University of New York	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Claremont College University Center	University of Massachusetts
School of Theology at Claremont	University of Miami
Colorado State University	Michigan State University
Columbia University	University of Michigan
University of Connecticut	University of Minnesota
Cornell University	University of Mississippi
University of Delaware	University of Missouri
University of Denver	Joint University Libraries, Nashville
Duke University	University of New Mexico
Emory University	North Carolina State University
Florida State University	University of North Carolina
University of Florida	University of Northern Colorado
Fordham University	University of North Dakota
George Washington University	Northern Illinois University
	North Texas State University
	Northwestern University
	University of Notre Dame
	Ohio State University
	University of Ohio
	Oklahoma State University
	University of Oklahoma
	Oregon State University
	University of Oregon
	Pennsylvania State University

APPENDIX B - Continued

University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Polytechnic Institute of
Brooklyn
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
St. Louis University
University of South Carolina
Southern Illinois University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Tennessee
Texas A & M University
Texas Tech University
University of Texas
Tufts University
Utah State University
University of Utah
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of Virginia
Washburn University of Topeka
Washington State University
Washington University of St. Louis
University of Washington
Wayne State University
West Virginia University
Western Illinois University
University of Wisconsin
University of Wyoming
Yale University
Yeshiva University

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, main campuses only were included.
A number of replies were received too late for tabulation.
Those not included are not listed above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- American Library Association. A Survey of Libraries in the United States. Chicago: The Association, 1926.
- American Library Association. Board on Personnel Administration. Classification and Pay Plans for Institutions of Higher Learning. 2d ed. Chicago: The Association, 1948.
- American Library Association. Board on Personnel Administration. Subcommittee on Analysis of Library Duties. Descriptive List of Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries. Preliminary Draft. Chicago: The Association, 1948.
- American Library Association. Board on Personnel Administration Subcommittee on Job Analysis Manual and Classification and Pay Plan Manual. Position Classification and Salary Administration in Libraries. Chicago: The Association, 1951.
- American Library Association. Board on Salaries, Staff, and Tenure. Organization and Personnel Procedure of the Library: a Suggested plan. Chicago: The Association, 1940.
- American Library Association. Board on Salaries, Staff, and Tenure. Subcommittee on Budgets, Compensation, and Schemes of Service for Libraries Connected with Universities, Colleges, and Teacher Training Institutions. Classification and Pay Plans for Libraries in Institutions of Higher Education. 2d ed. Chicago: The Association, 1947.
- American Library Association. Committee on Classification of Library Personnel. Budgets, Classification, and Compensation Plans for University and College Libraries; Report of the Committee Chicago: The Association, 1929.
- American Library Association. Committee on Classification of Library Personnel. Bureau of Public Personnel Administration. Proposed Classification and Compensation Plans for Library Positions. Washington, D. C.: The Bureau, 1927.
- American Library Directory, 1970/71. 27th ed. New York: Bowker, 1970.
- Barnard, Chester I. Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Berelson, Bernard (ed.). Education for Librarianship. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949.

- Brown, Charles Harvey and Bousfield, H. G. Circulation Work in College and University Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1933.
- Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition: a History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636 - 1968. Rev. and enl. ed. New York: Harper, 1968.
- Bundy, Mary Lee and Wasserman, Paul. The Academic Library Administrator and His Situation. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1970.
- Canadian Association of College and University Librarians. Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries. Ottawa: The Association, 1969.
- Cannons, H. G. T. Bibliography of Library Economy. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.
- Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada. Committee on Position Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service. Position Classification in the Public Service. Chicago: The Assembly, 1941.
- Dale, Ernest. Management: Theory and Practice. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- _____. Organization. New York: The American Management Association, 1967.
- Davis, Ralph C. Fundamentals of Top Management. New York: Harper, 1951.
- District of Columbia Library Association. Committee of Government Librarians. Brief and Specifications for Library Service in the Federal Government. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1923.
- Dougherty, Richard M. and Heinritz, Fred J. Scientific Management of Library Operations. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1966.
- Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman, 1949.
- Flexner, Jennie M. Circulation Work in Public Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.

- Flippo, Edwin B. Principles of Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Joeckel, Carleton Bruns (ed). Current Issues in Library Administration; Papers Presented Before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago; August 1-12, 1938. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Koontz, Harold and O'Donnell, Cyril. Principles of Management: an Analysis of Managerial Functions. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Lindermann, A. J. et al. Dictionary of Management Terms. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1966.
- Lyle, Guy R. The Administration of the College Library. New York: Wilson, 1944; 2d ed, 1949; 3d ed., 1961.
- McCoy, Ralph E. Personnel Administration for Libraries: a Bibliographic Essay. Assisted by the Subcommittee on Bibliography and Personnel Administration of the American Library Association Board on Personnel Administration. Chicago: American Library Association, 1953.
- McFarland, Dalton E. Management: Principles and Practices. 2d ed. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- March, James G. and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Martin, Lowell (ed.). Personnel Administration in Libraries; Papers Presented Before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago, August 27 - September 1, 1945. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Mooney, James D. and Reiley, Alan C. The Principles of Organization. New York: Harper, 1939.
- Newman, William H. et al. The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior, and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Library Association (London). Membership Subcommittee. Professional and Non-Professional Duties in Libraries; a Descriptive List. London: The Association, 1963.
- Raffel, Jeffery A. and Shisko, Robert. Systematic Analysis of University Libraries. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1969.

- RandaIl, William M. and Goodrich, Francis L. D. Principles of College Library Administration. Chicago: American Library Association, 1936.
- State University of New York. New York State Division of the Budget. Library Manpower: a Preliminary Study of Essential Factors Contributing to Library Staffing Patterns. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY/N. Y. Division of the Budget, 1968.
- U. S. Civil Service Commission, Position Classification Division. Library Series. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1966.
- _____. Library Technician Series. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1966.
- U. S. Library of Congress. Representative Positions in the Library of Congress. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1948.
- U. S. Office of Education. Earned Degrees Conferred: 1967-68. Part A - Summary Data. Washington, D. C.: USOE, 1969.
- Vitz, Carl. Circulation Work. Rev. ed. Chicago: The American Library Association, 1927.
- Williamson, Charles C. Training for Library Service. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1923.
- Wilson, Louis Round and Tauber, Maurice F. The University Library. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945; 2d ed., 1956.
- Works, George Alan. College and University Library Problems; a Study of a Selected Group of Institutions Prepared for the Association of American Universities. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.
- Wyer, James I. Reference Work; a Textbook for Students of Library Work and Librarians. Chicago: American Library Association, 1930.

Articles

- Adelson, Marvin. "The System Approach: a Perspective," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 42 (March, 1968), pp. 711-715.
- American Library Association. Committee on Library Administration. Proceedings. ALA Bulletin, Vol. 3 (1909), pp. 208-215.

- American Library Association. Lending Department. Proceedings. Library Journal, Vol. 43 (August, 1918), pp. 614-615.
- American Library Association. Interdivisional Committee of the Library Education Division and Library Administration Division. "Sub Professional or Technical Assistant: a Statement of Definition," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 62 (April, 1968), pp. 387-397.
- Austin, Willard. "Efficiency in College and University Library Work," Library Journal, Vol. 36 (November, 1911), pp. 566-569.
- Babine, A. V. "Problems of a College Library," Public Libraries, Vol. 13 (November, 1908), pp. 340-342.
- Bauer, H. C. "Circulation Service and Public Relations," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 52-65.
- Beck, R. J. "Public Services in the University Library," Bookmark, Vol. 13 (December, 1960), pp. 47-49.
- Becker, Joseph. "Circulation and the Computer," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 58 (December, 1964), pp. 1007-1010.
- Bellomy, F. L. "Management Planning for Library Systems Development," Journal of Library Automation, Vol. 2 (December, 1969), pp. 187-217.
- _____ "The Systems Approach Solves Library Problems," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 62 (October, 1968), pp. 1121-1125.
- Bergen, Daniel Patrick. "University Library Organization as a Response to University Emphases," Library Quarterly, Vol. 32 (January, 1962), pp. 19-39.
- Bishop, William Warner. "The Amount of Help to be Given to Readers," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 2 (1908), pp. 327-332.
- Bostwick, Arthur E. "Conflicts of Jurisdiction in Library Systems," Library Journal, Vol. 39 (August, 1914), pp. 588-591.
- Bousfield, H. G. "Circulation Department: Organization and Personnel," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 6 (December, 1944), pp. 45-50.
- Brown, Helen M. "Personnel and Manpower Needs of the Future," Library Trends, Vol. 18 (July, 1969), pp. 75-84.

Bryant, Douglas W. and Kaiser, Boynton S. "A University Library Position Classification and Compensation Plan," Library Quarterly, Vol. 17 (January, 1947), pp. 1-17.

Bundy, Mary Lee. "Conflict in Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 27 (July, 1966), pp. 253-262.

California Library Association. Certification Committee. "Professional Versus Nonprofessional Positions in Libraries," CLA Handbook, Sacramento, Cal.: The Association, 1932.

California Library Association. Library Standards Committee. "Library Tasks: a Classified List," CLA Bulletin, Vol. 3 (September, 1941), pp. 21-27.

Cammack, Floyd and Mann, Donald. "Institutional Implications of an Automated Circulation Study," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 28 (March, 1967), pp. 129-132.

Carey, M. Patricia. "Books on Management," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 42 (March, 1968), pp. 716-720.

Clay, Sam. "College and University Circulation Systems: Time for a Change?" Virginia Librarian, Vol. 16 (Summer, 1969), pp. 14-17.

Coney, Donald. "The Last Word," Library Journal, Vol. 82 (December 15, 1957), pp. 3161-3164.

"Management in College and University Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 1 (July, 1952), pp. 83-94.

"Notes on the Library Organization at the University of Texas," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (June, 1943), pp. 228-232.

Review of Circulation Work in College and University Libraries, by C. H. Brown and H. G. Bousfield, Library Quarterly, Vol. 3 (October, 1933), pp. 432-434.

"Scientific Management and University Libraries," Management Problems, ed. by G. T. Schwenning. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1930.

- Cook, Olan V. "Some Unsolved Problems in Circulation Service," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 32 (October 15, 1938), pp. 846-847.
- Crunden, Frederick M. "Business Methods in Library Management," Library Journal, Vol. 12 (September, 1887), pp. 335-338, 435-436.
- Daniels, Joseph F. "Indeterminate Functions of a College Library," Library Journal, Vol. 32 (November, 1907), pp. 487-492.
- De Gennaro, R. "Development and Administration of Automated Systems in Academic Libraries," Journal of Library Automation, Vol. 1 (March, 1968), pp. 75-91.
- Dillon, Dorothy. "A Lending Assistant Looks at Her World," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 18 (1924), p. 318.
- Dunbar, Ralph M. "Status of Personnel," Library Trends, Vol. 2 (July, 1953), pp. 63-83.
- Fair, Ethel M. "Horseshoe or Millstone?" Library Journal, Vol. 59 (May 15, 1934), pp. 429-430.
- Fletcher, William I. "Open Shelves in a College Library," Public Libraries, Vol. 12 (June, 1907), p. 213.
- Gordon, C. R. "Functions and Services of the Circulation Desk," News Notes of California Libraries, Vol. 54 (Fall, 1959), pp. 329-332.
- Grazier, Robert T. "Classification and Pay Plan for University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 5 (March, 1944), pp. 176-181.
- Grider, Elmer M. "Reorganization of the Stanford University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 13 (July, 1952), pp. 246-252.
- "Growth Forces Library Reorganization; University of Michigan Reports on Changes," Library Journal, Vol. 91 (April 1, 1966), p. 1859.
- Gwynn, Stanley E. "Departmentalization and Circulation Work: Problems and Relationships," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 87-100.
- Hagler, Ronald. "Alienation, Apathy, or Antagonism?" Library Journal, Vol. 94 (February 1, 1969), 497-498.

- Hamlin, Arthur T. "Service Report from Pennsylvania," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 11 (January, 1950), pp. 63-68.
- Harlow, Neal. "Misused Librarians," Library Journal, Vol. 90 (April 1, 1965), pp. 1597-1599.
- Harrington, Roseanne H. and Lyle, Guy R. "Recruiting and Developing a Library Staff," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 8 (October, 1947), pp. 427-435.
- Henkle, Herman H. "Principles and Practice of Administrative Organization in the University Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (September, 1943), pp. 277-284.
- Hitt, Eleanor. "Classification and Pay Plans," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 32 (October 1, 1938), pp. 697-702.
- Hopkins, Anderson H. "Organization and Administration of University Libraries," Library Journal, Vol. 27 (Conference Number, 1902), pp. 10-16.
- Horn, Andrew H. "Personnel Factors in Administration," Library Journal, Vol. 88 (March 15, 1958), pp. 803-805.
- Howard, Paul. "The Functions of Library Management," Library Quarterly, Vol. 10 (July, 1940), pp. 313-349.
- Jesse, W. H. "Reader's Division Chief," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 6 (September, 1945), pp. 317-321.
- Kaiser, John Boynton. "Job Analysis in Libraries: Its Results and Techniques," Library Journal, Vol. 73 (January 15, 1948), pp. 113-115.
- Kaser, David E. "Modernizing the University Library Structure," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 31 (July, 1970), pp. 227-231.
- Kerr, Willis H. "Developing a College Library," Public Libraries, Vol. 12 (June, 1907), pp. 214-217.
- Kilpela, R. E. O. "Administrative Structure of the University Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 29 (November, 1968), pp. 511-516.
- Kipp, Laurence J. "Scientific Management in Research Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 2 (January, 1954), pp. 390-400.

- Koch, Theodore W. "Some Phases of the Administrative History of College and University Libraries," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 6 (1912), pp. 268-275.
- Koontz, Harold. "The Management Theory Jungle," Journal of the Academy of Management, Vol. 4 (December, 1961), pp. 174-188.
- Lamb, Louise. "Place of the Circulation Department in the Library Organization," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 32 (October 14, 1938), pp. 894-897.
- Leimkuhler, F. F. "Systems Analysis in University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 27 (January, 1966), pp. 13-18.
- Logsdon, Richard H. "Administrative Organization of Columbia University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 24 (May, 1963), pp. 219-222.
- _____. "Time and Motion Studies in Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 2 (January, 1954), pp. 401-409.
- McAnally, Arthur M. "Organization of College and University Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 1 (July, 1952), pp. 20-36.
- McCoy, Ralph E. "Personnel in Circulation Service," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 42-51.
- McDiarmid, E. W. "Current Concepts in Library Administration," Library Trends, Vol. 7 (January, 1959), pp. 346-355.
- _____. "Training of Clerical and Sub-Professional Workers," Education for Librarianship, ed. by Bernard Berelson. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949.
- McHale, C. J. "Lending Personnel," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 34 (August, 1940), pp. 139-143.
- _____. "Professional Duties in the University Library Circulation Department," Wilson Bulletin, Vol. 6 (January, 1932), pp. 359-360.
- McLane, S. A. "College Desk Assistant Looks at Her Job," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 23 (December, 1948), pp. 308-309.
- McNeal, Archie L. "Ratio of Professional to Clerical Staff," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 17 (May, 1956), pp. 219-223.

- McNiff, Philip J. "Administration of Circulation Services," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 13-18.
- Mercer, Eleanor. "Points of View in Circulation Work: at the University of British Columbia," Canadian Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 5 (July, 1948), pp. 33-40.
- Mitchell, S. B. "Personnel in Relation to Significant Trends," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 28 (September, 1934), pp. 503-509.
- National Conference on Library Manpower: Needs and Utilization, Washington, D. C., March 9-11, 1967. Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 41 (April, 1967), pp. 820-823, 855.
- Parker, Thomas F. "The Missing Stream: Operations Management in Libraries," Library Journal, Vol. 44 (January, 1969), pp. 42-43.
- Quigley, Margery Closey. "A Reporter at Large," Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 6-12.
- Richardson, E. C. "Open Shelves for University Libraries," ALA Bulletin, Vol. 2 (1908), pp. 323-327.
- Ridings, Lucile D. "Work Simplification Applied to Library Circulation," Alabama Librarian, Vol. 12 (October, 1961), pp. 93-95.
- Ryan Dorothy E. "Circulation Service in the University Library," Southeastern Librarian, Vol. 7 (September, 1957), pp. 9-12.
- Sargeant, D. W. "Professional or Clerical?" Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 25 (September, 1950), pp. 61-64.
- Shaw, Ralph R. "Scientific Management in the Library," Wilson Library Bulletin, Vol. 21 (January, 1947), pp. 349-352.
- _____. "Three Classification and Pay Plans," Library Journal Vol. 74 (June 1, 1949), pp. 874-877.
- Smith, Eldred. "Do Libraries Need Managers?" Library Journal, Vol. 44 (February 1, 1969), pp. 502-506.
- Smith, Helen M. Review of College and University Library Circulation Work, Library Journal, Vol. 58 (June 1, 1933), pp. 494-495.
- Strong, George F. "Student Access to Book Collections - Extent and Methods," Library Journal, Vol. 44 (July, 1919), pp. 437-439.

- Thomas, J. "Circulation Activities and Methods in the Research Library," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 20 (Winter, 1957), pp. 24-31.
- Timmerman, Hazel B. "Position Classification and Pay Plans," Library Trends, Vol. 3 (July, 1954), pp. 67-79.
- Tompkins, Marjorie M. "Classification Evaluation of Professional Library Positions in the University of Michigan Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 27 (May, 1966), pp. 175-184.
- "Traits of a Successful Circulation Assistant," Library Journal, Vol. 53 (May 15, 1928), p. 452.
- "Vassar College Library Sets Tentative Standards," Library Journal, Vol. 74 (December 1, 1949), pp. 1803-1804.
- Vatcher, M. R. "Circulation Services Librarian," Canadian Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 20 (Winter, 1957), pp. 24-31.
- Waldron, Rodney K. "Will Circulation Librarians Become Obsolete?" Library Journal, Vol. 84 (February 1, 1959), pp. 386-388.
- Wasserman, Paul. "Development of Administration in Library Service: Current Status and Future Prospects," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 19 (July, 1958), pp. 283-294.
- Wilder, David. "Management Attitudes: Team Relationships," Library Journal, Vol. 94 (February 1, 1969), pp. 498-502.
- Williams, Edwin E. "Administrative Organization of the Harvard University Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (June, 1943), pp. 218-227.
- "Who Does What: Unprofessional Personnel Policies," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 6 (September, 1945), pp. 301-310.
- Williamson, Charles C. "Efficiency in Library Management," Library Journal, Vol. 44 (January, 1919), pp. 67-77.
- Wilson, Louis Round. "Organization and Administration of the College Library," Library Journal, Vol. 36 (November, 1911), pp. 560-565.
- Yenawine, Wayne S. Introduction. Library Trends, Vol. 6 (July, 1957), pp. 3-5.

VITA

Laurence Miller
Born 19 January 1940 in Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

Education

B. S. Kutztown State College, Kutztown, Pennsylvania, 1962.
Major: Library Science. Minors: English, Social Sciences.

M. S. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1963.
Major: Library Science.

A. M. D. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1970.
Major: Library Science.

Ph.D Florida State University, 1971. Major: Library Science

Experience

Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Acquisitions Librarian, 5/63 - 12/65.

Bucknell University: Acting University Librarian, 7/65 - 8/65.

Inter American University of Puerto Rico, San German, Puerto Rico: Area Director of Libraries, 1/66 - 9/69.

Honors

Who's Who Among College Students in American Universities and Colleges; Kappa Delta Pi; Beta Phi Mu.

72

1005

MICROFILMED - 1971