Letters

To the Editor:

"Participative Management or Unionization?" These are not mutually exclusive if the bargaining unit of the faculty includes librarians.

Hans E. Panofsky
Curator and President
Assembly of Librarians
Northwestern University Library

To the Editor:

I have just read Mr. De Gennaro's editorial "Participative Management or Unionzation?" So, what else is new?!

May I welcome Mr. De Gennaro to the 20th Century?

Ted Alezizos
An Idealistic Associate
University Librarian
Harvard University Library

To the Editor:

Charles Martell's discussion of management theories (*CRL*, Mar. 1972) strikes home: a basic fact of administrative theories is that they work only so far—and never when they are needed most! However, I was disappointed that Martell should limit his discussion to the McGregor and Blake theories.

Clare W. Graves introduces a too-little known theory of personality behavior in "Deterioration of Work Standards" (*Harvard Business Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1966, p. 117–28). Graves believes that different individuals can be identified as falling into seven levels of human existence and that, at each level, a completely different set of motivations, values, and expectations occur. Hence, a theory of management which seems ideally suited for handling one person simply doesn't apply to another person.

A disadvantage inherent in Graves' theory is that not everyone can see different persons in a multilevel set of existences: to the authoritarian person only authority has any meaning or validity; the gregarious teamworker finds the loner equally inexplicable. Perhaps this is why Graves' work, although well accepted in some limited circles, is generally not well known or understood.

Larry Auld
Head, Technical Services
William Jasper Kerr Library
Oregon State University

To the Editor:

It is always with interest that I read articles and question librarians regarding the cost of duplicating cards on the Xerox and so I was happy to see James F. Anderson's article "Break-Even Point for a Proof Slip Operation" in the March issue. However, I was sad to see that his article gave no definite answers regarding labor costs or actual man hours used in reproduction. These are figures I have been unable to get from almost all librarians I have questioned regarding the cost of Xeroxing cards. Anderson "assumed that his [operator] time is offset by the time saved by typing the call number on the proof slip . . . eliminating the typing of the call number on each card in the complete set." He makes no effort to prove his assumption and he says nothing about labor time involved in cutting or tearing cards apart, sorting cards into sets, and time spent cleaning the machine. I would challenge the assumption that all this labor time equals the time to type four call numbers—and if his assumption is incorrect, his formula is not valid.

Anderson also states that there are three constants in his formula, one of which is the cost of Xeroxing a complete set of cards. The last rental costs I have from the local Xerox office, which was about a year ago, quoted a flat monthly rental for which an organization could get 3,000 copies per month; or, on another plan the organization could get 7,500 copies per month for 3 cents per copy, 7,501–20,000 per month for .026 and over 20,000 per month for

.020. While it is true that there might be variation in amounts depending on area, I have never heard Xerox costs described in any way except per copy or monthly rental fee. If Anderson knows of a different way of pricing, I would be happy to know about it. In line with my local quotations, in Anderson's example he could not qualify for the 7,500 per month since for 4,222 titles per year he will have with 6 cards up 704 units, run 5 times each or 3,520 copies per *year*. With 5 cards up he will have 1,056 units, run 5 times or 5,280 copies per *year*. At my local quoted monthly rental rate, spreading the cost of 4,222 titles out over the entire year, the cost per card would be more than 5 cents per card for rental costs alone. It must be remembered that Anderson states that "the reproduction of catalog cards from proof slips must defray the entire cost of the Xerox 914." It would be helpful to know if Anderson plans to rent his Xerox machine for one month to do his 4,222 titles per year; or, how he arrived at the .01 constant for his library for Xerox costs. According to my local information from the Xerox company, Xeroxing costs per copy depend on the number of copies reproduced and therefore becomes a variable and not a constant. Obviously if Xerox costs are a variable and not a constant, Anderson's formula is not valid.

Another reason I would question Anderson's figures is that there is a nonprofit, cooperative library project which reproduces catalog cards for any library at a cost of 3 cents per card. True, users may be defraying some overhead costs but the project is producing in great volume and hence Xerox costs would be cheaper.

Anderson must prove that Xeroxing costs, including *all* labor costs of reproduction, is a constant before his formula is valid.

Christina Landram
Head, Catalog Department
Georgia State University Library