

## The Junior College Impact on Academic Librarianship

*The author explains his enthusiasm for current trends in junior colleges. In their present experimentation with curriculum reform and media utilization, they are moving toward the universal higher education which society will soon require. He reviews the long history of this movement and contemplates the influence it will have on higher education practices generally. He urges academic librarians in both junior and senior colleges to be innovative in their work.*

**I**F I WERE an academic librarian again—university, senior college, or junior college—*innovation* would be the theme of my effort.

What I mean by this word is not what first comes into our professional minds these days. Automation has attracted me as much as the next librarian. I am captivated by the computer. The print-out catalog entered early into my library school teaching. I effected one of the first modulations from traditional reference to Information Science, at Florida State, as the cover of an issue of *American Documentation*, some years back, will attest.

My colleagues in Florida know the cross I bore in the forties and fifties convincing librarians there were no such things as "non-book" materials, and how finally, I effected what some called a "shotgun marriage" of librarians and

audiovisualists, with my book *Instructional Materials*.

Yes, I believe in computers, in telefacsimile, in video-corders, in 16mm projectors, in the overhead with its transparency overlays, in the tape recorder for oral history; in the whole repertoire of machines and electronics that will make us more efficient. I am not like the librarian who boasted, "It takes longer and costs more, but we are automated." I have passionately advocated taking advantage of every invention technology has blessed us with. But all of this is not what I mean by innovation.

What I mean by innovation welcomes improved hardware only as a means to a new dimensional education. But hardware is not the crux of my kind of innovation. The innovation I have in mind is on the drawing board in about one hundred experimental colleges. Mostly, these colleges are not the ones that head lists of outstanding institutions of higher education, that appear periodically, in such frequently cited media as the *New York Times*, or *Newsweek*, or even the education issue of the *Saturday Re-*

---

*Dr. Shores is Dean Emeritus of the Library School at Florida State University, and Editor-in-Chief, Collier's Encyclopedia. This paper was read to the Illinois Library Association, College and Research Libraries Section, on October 18, 1968.*

view. They are not necessarily Harvard and Yale and the Ivy League colleges, almost always followed by Chicago and California; and perhaps, more recently, including near the bottom, with apology, a few institutions from the South.

The innovating colleges I have in mind almost never make the academic counterparts of the Associated Press "Top Twenty" weekly football lists. For the innovation I have in mind, you would have to look at colleges like Antioch in Ohio; Florida Presbyterian; Kendall in Illinois; Monteith of Wayne, in Michigan; Oklahoma Christian; Stephens in Missouri; the University of California at Santa Cruz; Elmira of New York; and perhaps one hundred or more experimenting senior colleges like them. But increasingly, I believe, we will watch the junior college, that higher education phenomenon, the public version of which was born in Joliet, Illinois, hardly a half century ago.

Why the junior college? Because it is remaking higher education in America. In this phenomenon is emerging a prototype for the college to come. Call it community college if you prefer. It makes no difference now, since U.S.O.E. has established the two terms as synonymous.<sup>1</sup> The community college has dared to break with some sacred traditions of higher education.

The first affront is to *elitism*. Chicago is in hallowed country for the proposition that only 10 per cent of the people are higher educable. Not so far from here, the president of one of our state "multiversities" with some 40,000 enrollments was asked recently, "How many students do you now have?" He replied, "Oh, about 10 per cent." Clever as this may sound, it is nevertheless untrue. As far back at least as the 1948 Chicago Institute, I dissented with Dr. Faust's position that college is for the

"chosen few."<sup>2</sup> In my naive philosophy of higher education, college is for everyone. The junior college has had the courage to open its doors to all high school graduates. It has, in effect, said to the *Elitists*: "Sissy; anybody can educate the top 10 per cent, in your kind of education. Let's see you higher educate the dropout, and the rest of the 90 per cent who might never get the chance to go to college."

I agree with the junior college position. There is some support for the conclusion that violent revolution occurs in nations when the 10 per cent higher educated can no longer communicate with the 90 per cent not higher educated. Spearheaded by the junior college, the United States is about to accomplish another first in world history. While many of the other countries do not even yet have universal elementary education, and most do not have 100 per cent secondary education we are about to provide college for everyone.

By 1970, we are told, more freshmen will be entering junior college than any other type of higher educational institution. This is true in Florida now. To this point, junior colleges have tried very hard, at least in their college parallel program, to comply with the Ivy League rules. To enable their graduates to transfer to senior colleges and universities, junior colleges have followed unquestioningly the prescriptions of tradition. But there are now some signs of dissent among the junior college leaders. The thinking ones are unwilling to concede that the traditional colleges have a monopoly on liberal education, or on academic standards. Among some educational statesmen, there are a few who contend that the elite colleges are the opposite of liberal. Among the Ivy League institutions, for instance, the authoritarian curriculum of predatory

<sup>1</sup> U.S.O.E. *Library Statistics, 1966-1967*. G.P.O., 1967. p. 2

<sup>2</sup> Chicago University. *Preprofessional Education of Librarians*. 1949. p. 109-14.

subjects and a rigid teaching method describe a dogmatism that repudiates liberalism. Judging by the campus unrest, there is something less than satisfaction with what the leaders of elitism have defined as higher education.

What we must recognize is that today's campus revolt is proletarian. It is a protest against academic elitism by the new student masses which our American trend to universal higher education has created. The larger-than-ever before college population rejects the predatory curriculum which the academician flaunts as liberal. Students overwhelmingly are objecting to the lock-step of classroom-centered education. Young people everywhere resent the growing impersonality caused by numbers, and the faculty-administration persistence in enforcing the higher education folklore of the past, by introducing mob scene registrations in gymnasias, at the beginning of the term; and computerized evaluations at the end. This policing is far more brutal to them than any that has yet been used by municipalities to preserve peace in our streets.

No wonder our young people are looking increasingly to the community junior college. Like a breath of fresh air, these new institutions are reviving the true liberal education. Without abandoning the general education requirements that senior colleges and universities have made foundational for a bachelor's degree, the junior college has liberalized the curriculum by introducing new areas for study. Not deterred by the conventional hierarchy of disciplines that places a Berlin wall between so-called liberal and so-called vocational studies, the junior college has contended that all knowledge has potential for living, as well as for making a living. And the history of education is on their side. Subjects high in today's curriculum were very low in the middle ages; and vice versa.

So I return to my opening sentence:

if I were to come out of retirement to become an academic librarian again, I would experiment and innovate, not with library techniques and automation, but with library education. I would accept the challenge Chancellor Emeritus Harvie Branscomb hurled at us in *Teaching With Books*, back in 1940:<sup>3</sup>

To sum up, the fundamental need of the college library is to develop a distinctive program of its own . . . it has been too imitative of other institutions.

And I would seek my inspiration from the educational concept of the junior college, even if I happened to be librarian of a senior college or of a university. For the time has come to admit mutual reciprocity between the lower and upper undergraduate levels, without condescension, and with more than an outside chance that it has been the traditional institutions that have "watered down," and not been truly liberal.

And now let me explore library-centered educational innovation. Universal higher education means not only numbers, but the widest range of individual differences college has ever known. It is therefore hopeless to continue lock-step education in the classroom. More than ever before we must move to independent study. Contrary to the previous honors program assumption, independent study, properly conceived, prepared for, and guided is especially suited for the wider range of talents now found in our student population. Furthermore, individual independent study provides, as Winslow Hatch has indicated in his thoughtful little "New Dimension" booklet a real measure of quality education.<sup>4</sup> The first concomitant of a distinctive library-centered higher education, therefore, is a learning mode that is carrel-oriented, rather than classroom controlled.

<sup>3</sup> Harvie Branscomb, *Teaching With Books*. (Chicago: ALA, 1940.) p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Winslow Hatch, *New Dimensions in Higher Education*. U.S.O.E.

The second element is a teaching mode that is predominantly concerned with matching individual differences in students with individual differences in media. For the first time in the history of education there are now so many media, in a variety of formats, a range of levels, and an assortment of subjects that the individual differences Binet and Simon told us about a half century ago exist in humans can be found in the proliferation of media pouring out all over the world today. It is, therefore, hopeless to continue a type of classroom-centered, group teaching that was necessary when media were few and expensive, and when the range of individual differences was far narrower than now. Indeed, the phenomenon our orators like to refer to as "explosions"—of population and of knowledge—dictate abandoning the horse and buggy method of education we have known in the past, and to take up a new learning mode, an educational program that is in Dr. Branscomb's words, "the library's distinctive own."

In 1934, at Chicago's World Fair ALA convention, I read a paper in which I predicted the coming of this new educational dimension in the colleges and schools.<sup>5</sup> My colleagues have been good enough to credit the beginning of the current Library-College movement to that paper. But I acknowledge the origin of the idea in Thomas Carlyle's essay "The Hero as Intellectual," in his book *Heroes and Hero Worship*. From this essay comes the frequently quoted commencement line:

*The true university is a collection of books.*

But what is not so frequently quoted is the context. Carlyle's contention, as far back as the middle of the last century when books were not as plentiful as

now, was that there is little the professor can do for the students beyond teaching them to read. The rest the students must do for themselves, largely independently. This is the heart of the Library-College concept.<sup>6</sup>

When a college is a library and a library is a college it is a Library-College. Fundamentally, the Library-College reverses the present relation between classroom and library. Instead of meeting classes at regular hours and working in the library irregularly when time permits, the Library-College student is more likely to set for himself a regular schedule at his exclusive workbench, his very own library carrel, a carrel which thanks to the technology I applaud, is becoming "wet" with dial access to a variety of media. In this learning design the student speaks less of attending classes and more about reading.

There is a precedent for this in England, where there are a few colleges that might even make our top twenty with the Ivy League. During my Fulbright year in the United Kingdom I heard students and tutors constantly using such expressions as he is *reading* in physics; he is *reading* in economics; he is *reading* in philosophy; rather than that he was attending classes in those subjects.

Now, by reading, the Library-College means more than just reading in a hard cover book; or even a paperback, serial, or other form of print. The Library-College means reading in what I call "The Generic Book" in my editorial for the *Saturday Review* during the observance of the first National Library Week. Any medium of communication between man and his environment, between man and man, and between man and God is part of the Generic Book. Under this definition, a 16mm film is a book; so is a magnetic tape, or a transparency

<sup>5</sup> Louis Shores, "The Library Arts College," *School and Society*, XLI (January 1935).

<sup>6</sup> Louis Shores, et al. *The Library-College*. Philadelphia: Drexel Press, 1966.

overlay. Discs and dioramas; maps and microtexts, community resources, and computer assisted instruction are varying formats of the Generic Book. You can understand, perhaps, as my students have all of these years, why the term "non-book materials" causes a hayfever-like intellectual allergy in me. Philosophically, I have described the Generic Book as the sum total of man's communication possibilities. If I may push theory a little more in this pragmatic profession and world of ours, I speculated in the *Saturday Review*, as I have elsewhere in my writings, that communicability is the only real evidence of life, just as the French General in World War I had insisted that death is incommunicability.

I am not alone in this position that reading is related to all the means of communication. In a thoughtful little book published by Columbia University and titled *What Is Reading?*<sup>7</sup> Frank G. Jennings wrote:

reading . . . is not restricted to the printed page. Actually, it never was . . . throughout his history man has "read" many things: the flight of birds, the guts of sheep, sun spots, liver spots, and the life lines on the hand. He has read the lore of the jungle, the spoor of the beast, and the portents in a dish of tea. . . .

In all the furor and exhibitionism over Marshall McLuhan there is really only one fundamental truth: the format of a medium may affect communicability. Our individual differences are such that some of us may understand a subject better by viewing it on television, or hearing it on tape, or taking a field trip, or concentrating on a printed page. Learning is enhanced by the choice not only of the right subject and the right level of maturity, but also by the choice of the physical makeup of the medium.

Forgive this philosophical transgression. It is a preface to an understanding

<sup>7</sup> Frank Jennings, *What Is Reading?* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965), p. 11.

of the library's own, distinctive, educational program. I believe we are on the verge of realizing it in some one hundred experimental colleges. I believe that any campus where independent study is the learning mode not only for a select few, the so-called honors group, but for all of the students, an element of the Library-College is emerging. There are evidences that the liberalizing influence of the junior college through its extension of higher educational opportunities to all is spurring individual, independent study to universal acceptance as the new learning mode.

As a concomitant to this learning mode innovation, I see ahead some startling revolutions in academic librarianship. Considering the standard elements of stock, staff, facility, and services, the impact of the junior college mass higher education phenomenon can cause major professional innovations in college and university libraries. To meet the wider range in the individual differences of our student population, we will have to reorient book selection to media selection. That this has not yet been done is illustrated by the two new, fine junior college book lists that have appeared this year.

Dr. Frank Bertalan has compiled a *Junior College Library Collection*<sup>8</sup> of over 17,500 titles that is clearly curriculum related. He has maintained the high standard of selection that made his previous list the guide for so many beginning junior colleges. I daresay the new list will be just as helpful. But as it stands now, it is a list of print books. There is a promise of other media format lists to come.

Similarly, Dr. Helen Wheeler has restricted her *Basic Book Collection for the Community College Library*<sup>9</sup> to "the first five thousand book-titles," that is,

<sup>8</sup> F. J. Bertalan, *The Junior College Library Collection*, Newark: Bro-Dart Foundation, 1968.

<sup>9</sup> Helen Wheeler, *A Basic Book Collection for the Community Junior College*. (Hamden, Conn., The Shoe String Press, 1968).

print books. Although Dr. Wheeler advocates the concept of the Materials Center, which we originated and pioneered in Florida right after World War II, she accepts the boundary line we have drawn, professionally, between print and so-called audiovisual aids. Her appreciation of these latter formats, however, underestimates them educationally less than Marshall McLuhan underestimates print.

But selection aids of the future, I dare to predict, in the light of educational innovation, will erase the artificial boundary between so-called print and audiovisual formats. To illustrate the unity of media, and therefore of library materials, I cite the fact that both audiovisual and library professional literature claim at least these common formats: maps and globes; pictures (although the audiovisualist likes to use the term flat picture); museum objects, which the audiovisualist sometimes calls *Realia*; exhibits, bulletin boards and displays. Recall that the Carnegie Corporation donated a million dollars to libraries as early as 1928, to develop phonorecord collections. This was some time before the audiovisual movement renamed these formats *discs*. Librarians have been in the vanguard of oral history production and preservation, which rely heavily on the magnetic tape. And what will you say to the librarian-encyclopedia editor who crossed an audiovisual transparency overlay with a printed book. If the cross-media approach of which we have made so much of late, means anything at all, it means unity among all of the media of communication, and therefore a library obligation to balance selection not only by subject and level, but by format, as well. I predict the next selection aids will be media aids, rather than print-only lists.

#### STAFF

More carefully defined levels of library practice, in the future, will at long

last release the professional from semi-professional and clerical tasks for truly professional performance. Automation and even newer technological developments are helping. But even more promising is the growing recognition of the middle level paraprofessional, now officially renamed by the ALA committee the Library Technical Assistant. The impact of the junior college on this innovation in personnel is evidenced by the fact that almost all of the education for this new career has occurred in the two-year institutions. This month *Tex-Tec* will be published,<sup>10</sup> which represents the first state-wide syllabus for the training of library technical assistants. As libraries add paraprofessionals as well as clericals and take advantage of library technology, professional librarians will have released time to devote themselves to participation in the new learning mode of independent study, and assume full partnership in faculty research. Since the new type of Library-College education is dependent upon knowledge of media as well as of students, there is no faculty segment better prepared than the knowledgeable librarian. Just as the artificial line between print and audiovisual formats is being erased, so also is the separation of faculty who center their instructional effort in the classroom from faculty who teach with media in the library. Indeed, if the independent study trend continues, the time may soon come when the classroom instructor will have to fight for faculty status.

#### FACILITY

Library facility planning has already begun some spectacular innovation. As a countermeasure to the growing impersonalism on our multiversity campuses, which student revolters place at

<sup>10</sup> Louis Shores, *et al.* *Tex-Tec*. Syllabi for the Education of Library Technical Assistants in the Junior Colleges of Texas. Washington (Communication Service Corporation, 1967).

the top of their disaffections with American higher education, cluster college patterns are developing. Again, as a Fulbright Fellow to the United Kingdom, I have been taken with the British organizational plan. For example, Cambridge University has over thirty colleges, none of which has an enrollment of over five hundred, thus insuring faculty-student personal relations. The University of California at Santa Cruz, which will have an ultimate student population of 27,500, is organizing its campus into small colleges, each under one thousand. So also is the new Florida Technical University in Orlando. Michigan State has begun to organize colleges around individual dormitories. Here is a trend that will modify the classic site specification for the center of the campus into several sites each central to a cluster college campus.

The carrel-centered, independent study, learning mode suggests that we can no longer accept a standard that seats 25 per cent of the student body at one time. Already we have colleges that seat half of their student body at one time. Oklahoma Christian has 110 per cent seating, to insure an individual carrel for each student and provision for enrollment increase. Steadily, these carrels are becoming "wet" with dial access to a widening range of visual and audio media.

#### STOCK

When it comes to stock accommodation, it is no longer adequate to plan for so many volumes of print, hard and soft cover, with a general allotment for something called an audiovisual area. Now, definite provision for housing other media formats of the Generic Book, along with necessary equipment, is an integral part of total stock accommodation planning. Furthermore, something called a core, must be designed to handle dial access, possibly computer controlled.

But planning for staff accommodation will be most sensitive. The usual 100 square feet per full-time staff member to accommodate workers in technical processes, reader services, and other conventional library functions, will have to be augmented by office, seminar, and classroom space for instruction. For in the Library-College type of institution the library becomes the main instructional building. And the faculty to be accommodated teach more in the library than they do in the classroom.

An example of library architecture innovating in this direction is Dallas Baptist College. In an approximately square building, a central core accommodates the Generic Book stock. Around that core are student carrels to accommodate at least half the student body. And utilizing the outside wall space are service areas and technical processes; instructional areas housing faculty offices, seminars, classrooms.

#### SERVICES

Which brings us to the critical services. With the professional librarian relieved of most of the organizational tasks of the past, he can for the first time assume the major responsibility for developing a distinctive library education program such as Chancellor Branscomb challenged us to do. Curriculum-wise, we have two fundamental areas in which to contribute, areas we can hold our heads high about, because they are truly liberal and substantive. The first of these is what the prolific author "*anon.*" heralds on many of our campus buildings as the "half of knowledge"; that is, knowing where to find it. And who better than we can teach the use of media. In the past we have admittedly accomplished less in teaching the use of the library than we had hoped for. But now, with independent study as the dominant learning mode, the student is impelled by academic survival to understand me-

dia, to master the skills of information retrieval.

The other area I call simply *Knowledge*, a capstone synthesis of the separate predatory disciplines. Although we have now integrated at the general education level separate chemistry, physics, and geology courses into something called *phy sci*; botany, zoology, physiology into *Bi Sci*; sociology, political science, economics, and even history into *social sciences*; philosophy, art, literature, religion into *humanities*; a further integration of these three areas is called for; a bringing together of what C. P. Snow has called the "two cultures."

The librarian, as a natural generalist, is best equipped, of all faculty, to accomplish this. Through his professional concern with epistemology, with the classification of knowledge, with the provision for a *generalia* class; with his traditional impartiality toward all of the disciplines, he can be trusted, more than his colleague specialists, to represent the universes in perspective. In addition, through his own learning device of browsing, he can encourage a cross-subject approach to an understanding of the riddles of the universe. He can, indeed, introduce into the bloodstream of the learning life that phenomenon which science has but recently discovered, namely, serendipity.

Yes, if I were to return to academic librarianship today, I would devote myself to educational innovation. Because I believe that is part of the high role I see in our profession of destiny. To those of us who celebrate the "grass roots" and always being practical, what I have said will sound like a dream. But to quote the South Pacific song, how can our dreams come true if we never dream.

I know that our campus tradition will interfere with realizing much of what I have suggested. That is why I look to the experimental rather than to the Ivy League colleges for a breakthrough. Even more, I look to the junior colleges, who seem to have the courage to question all the folklore academicians have taken for granted. At any rate, whether we want to or not, campus revolts will force us to other less creative measures. Why not then experiment in newer directions? Why not experiment and innovate on our own.

I believe in this profession of ours. I have faith that what we know and are will point the way to a higher education more liberal and substantive than anything the world has known before. My faith in our next professional generation of librarians convinces me we will yet develop a prototype for the higher education to come.

■ ■

