

CONNIE R. DUNLAP

## Organizational Patterns in Academic Libraries, 1876-1976

**I**N THE LAST HALF OF THE 1800s, many of the large academic libraries of today were in fledgling institutions, and often the libraries were run by a part-time faculty member with the aid of a few students who kept the library open and circulated books—activities often limited to a few hours a week. Book collections were small and were often housed in a single room. In many libraries no formal classification system was used, and books were placed on the shelves with a fixed location by broad subject groups.

According to recent patterns of development, libraries, and hence library staffs, were slow to grow. Book ordering, handling of accounts, personnel, and other library functions were often managed by the librarian's office. The small staff that existed was concerned primarily with housekeeping tasks; and because the span of control was so limited, there was little need for formal organization.

In the early years of American academic library history, organization appears often to have been the result of happenstance or a consequence of institutional development rather than a careful analysis of the library's needs. In 1900 no library in the U.S. had a book collection of over 1 million volumes. By 1937 there were thirteen such libraries, and by 1951 there were twenty-eight and only half of these were academic libraries.<sup>1</sup> In 1975 there were thirty-nine libraries, twenty-six of them academic,

*Organization is the means by which management channels and directs work flow through operating units; establishes lines of authority, supervision, and controls; and coordinates relationships for the accomplishment of the goals for which the library exists.*

with more than 2 million volumes.<sup>2</sup>

The point at which organization begins to emerge as a problem and to be recognized as a separate element of administration can only be guessed at, but a fair estimate seems to be when a library collection reaches 200,000 volumes.<sup>3</sup>

In tracing library literature, little early reference is to be found concerning library organization or its problems. Not until the late 1930s and early 1940s was much attention given to a subject now considered to be one of the most important aspects of library administration. It is also interesting to compare successive editions of two of the "bibles" of university library administration and to note not only the amount of space given to library organization but more especially to the change in the treatment of the subject. The two editions of Wilson and Tauber (1944 and 1956)<sup>4</sup> show relatively little change as compared with the four editions of

Lyle (1944-1974).<sup>5</sup> The greater time span is doubtless due in large part to the more sophisticated treatment and indicates the growing recognition that a careful study of organization is essential to good library management.

Organization must be flexible enough to shift with changing conditions—a situation well known to librarians in 1976. An organizational pattern is effective only while the conditions for which it was designed exist, and organization alone will not assure attainment of library goals. Necessary corollaries to success of programs are the skill, expertise, and goodwill of the staff, understanding of the goals and the means necessary to attain them, supervision, and adequate training of staff.

Many factors influence library organization. Among the most important are the nature and purpose of the institution, size, growth rate, space, and cost. Community and small four-year liberal arts colleges are usually heavily committed to a multimedia instructional approach, whereas the largest of the universities emphasize graduate education and faculty research, relying almost totally on book resources. The organizational configurations of the libraries in each of these types of institutions, and all of the libraries in between these two extremes, will be determined in large measure by the kind of institution in which they exist and the special interests of that institution.

As the library grows, organizational changes must accommodate the increased span of control, greater complexity of operation, or geographically separate location of units. The space available will also affect operations. This is especially true where space results in severe overcrowding so as to separate related activities and hinder the smooth flow of work or where new buildings or enlarged facilities permit expansion of services or programs. Cost

is certainly one of the most important factors in library organization, and librarians continually try to develop systems which make the most efficient and effective use of all resources and to correct organizational patterns which result in expensive or inadequate service.

#### TYPES OF ORGANIZATION

E. A. Wight has identified six bases for departmental organization: (1) function (acquisition, circulation, reference, etc.); (2) activity (order, repair, extension, etc.); (3) clientele (children, adults, undergraduates, etc.); (4) geography (branches); (5) subject (fine arts, history, technology, etc.); and (6) form of material (serials, audiovisual, documents, etc.).<sup>6</sup> All six types are to be found in college and university libraries, and several types are frequently combined.

As recently as 1940, the average college or university library was organized along departmental lines. Work was divided among a number of departments depending on the size of the library, and the heads of these departments all reported to the chief librarian and were responsible to him or her alone. As the library grew and more departments were added, administration began to break down or the librarian became so immersed in operational duties that little time was left for the broader aspects of librarianship such as planning and institutional relationships. In the large libraries, a trend developed to divide the work into two or four major divisions, each of which contained a number of related departments. An assistant librarian was appointed for each division, and only the division heads reported directly to the chief librarian. Considerable difficulty with the new divisions was initially experienced, and at least three different forms of divisional organization were tried at Columbia, Harvard, and Illinois between 1941 and 1950.

By 1952 one particular plan for divisional organization had been widely accepted in large libraries. This is a bifurcated functional organization in which all library activities are considered either reader services or technical services.<sup>7</sup> This type of organization is still the most prevalent plan today in large libraries, even though a number of variations to it exist. Many smaller libraries continue to be organized on a departmental basis; and since the span of control is smaller, it is probably completely satisfactory.

Another popular form of organization, especially in smaller or medium-sized libraries, is the subject divisional plan commonly found in public libraries. Johns Hopkins and the University of Chicago libraries, however, had a subject division type of organization before it was applied in public libraries. In 1939 a divisional arrangement was developed at Colorado by Ralph Ellsworth in a new building, and a four-division plan was almost simultaneously initiated at Brown according to a projected regrouping in the course of study. At Brown eighteen departmental libraries were consolidated into the four major groups of physical sciences and mathematics, biological sciences, history and social studies, and humanities. Shortly after, Frank Lundy expanded the idea of divisional organization to the point of having a divisional staff responsible for acquisitions and cataloging.<sup>8</sup> A number of other libraries, especially small and medium-sized ones, have also followed this type of plan.

A third type of organization is the open or interspersed plan, which came into being in the late 1940s and early 1950s. It is basically a subject organization with reader space scattered throughout the stacks with controlled exits. A library using this plan can be kept open with minimal staffing. McAnally notes that such a plan places an

unusual dependence on the scheme of physical classification of books and that the library, if it is large, may be difficult for undergraduates to use.<sup>9</sup> Among the libraries using this plan are Princeton, Duke, Iowa, and Oklahoma A&M.

In the late 1930s Coney reported a trend toward the unification of all acquisitions and cataloging functions under one division head.<sup>10</sup> This practice has since been widely implemented in libraries of all sizes. J. R. Lund suggested, in 1940, a plan to combine certain services to readers with technical processes.<sup>11</sup> Under this plan, ordering and descriptive cataloging were in one unit and subject cataloging and reference (or bibliography) service to readers in the other. A number of universities have drawn their bibliographic resources together and have placed them near the card catalog. Libraries which have adopted this plan include UCLA, Illinois, Duke, and Stanford.<sup>12</sup> In cataloging, the usual bases for division of work are form of material, subject, language, level of difficulty, level of cataloging to be given, and copy cataloging. Auxiliary services such as typing, card reproduction, marking, and filing are frequently combined into a single unit to provide a pool for all cataloging functions.

In a recent essay Doralyn Hickey observed that library services are designed to move materials through the system and on to storage shelves, there to be interpreted by a group of people who have had little or nothing to do with the procedures which put the material into storage. She suggests that a fairly obvious solution to such a dilemma is to reorient the library systems around the concept of direct and effective service to the clientele. What currently exists is an orientation toward *indirect* service; and if any direct service is involved, it is aimed at the preservation and storage of materials rather than the solution of



users' problems. Thus the library might consider whether its services should become client centered rather than material centered. If librarians take seriously the responsibility to focus upon users' needs, they might be forced to a totally different pattern of work organization.<sup>13</sup>

#### DEPARTMENTALIZATION

Understandably, the degree to which departmentalization occurs is a direct function of size and complexity of operation and is usually based on function. The primary function of any library is to provide books and other materials to readers and the services necessary to make them readily available. In some small libraries, departments consist of as few as two or three staff members, but departmental status is accorded because the work is considered important or distinct enough to warrant the designation. Where departmentalization occurs, the most common services to fulfill the primary function are circulation and reference; and in small libraries these two departments are often the only service units needed. Larger libraries, of course, find it necessary to have additional service departments, often with several subunits. Secondary to the primary function, but hardly less important, are, among others, selection, acquisitions, cataloging, budgeting, and personnel management.

A survey conducted by the American Library Association in 1926 indicated that many small libraries recognized certain department heads but had no rigid departmental organization of the staff. An assistant in one department was frequently called upon for other work in another. Among the thirty-three libraries of more than 100,000 volumes surveyed, some degree of departmental organization was reported by thirty-one. Only two reported that they had no departmental distinctions at all and that all staff members were assigned to work as needed. In other libraries the number

of departments varied from one to eight, with only two having fewer than three departments and nine having more than five.<sup>14</sup> Even large libraries today rarely have more than a dozen departments, although each department may have a number of subordinate units reporting to it.

Functional arrangement, while administratively efficient and economical, has many critics because it is often difficult to effect close coordination of the various departments. One of the most frequent objections to it involves the length of the span of control, but this has been effectively met by the consolidation of technical and reader services under two assistant librarians.<sup>15</sup> The most severe criticism of the functionally organized library and the kind of building constructed for it is their inflexibility to meet changing needs.<sup>16</sup>

#### DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIES

As the central library became more crowded and the geographical spread of the campus became greater, departmental or branch libraries were a natural and necessary development. At the beginning of the century, many departmental libraries were separate from the central library and were administered and developed by the academic departments they served. According to Lawrence Thompson, the development of departmental libraries was the common pattern in most American universities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This was especially true at several prominent institutions such as Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and the Universities of Chicago, Michigan, and Iowa.

In the period between World War I and World War II, the trend away from departmental collections became apparent and was due, in large measure, to the construction of new buildings in the 1920s and to the increasing interdependence of all branches of knowledge.<sup>17</sup>

While this kind of arrangement still exists to some extent, it is far less common today, with departmental libraries being integrated into a central system.

The early history of The Ohio State University Library saw the rapid development of the departmental collections on campus. Several decades passed before the administration realized that the cost of duplication and the lack of bibliographic control was undesirable and put them under the control of the library council. By then, however, the pattern had been set, and the lack of space in the general library led to the growth of a great number of departmental libraries. In part, these libraries were created because of the lack of a strong general collection.

Not until 1903 did the trustees place all departmental collections under the administrative control of the library. By 1926 there were nine official departmental libraries but still many special libraries or office collections varying greatly in size. In 1938 the thirteenth departmental library was established.<sup>18</sup> According to the *American Library Directory*, Ohio State now has twenty-two departmental libraries, including law and medicine.<sup>19</sup>

At Berkeley departmental libraries existed before 1900. They were not planned but evolved over a period of years in response to the particular needs of faculty and students. In 1881 an attempt was made to consolidate all library materials in a single building, but within a few years books were being charged out to department heads for departmental libraries. In time these collections contained books purchased with departmental funds as well as those borrowed from the general library. In 1904 the regents ruled that departmental libraries were considered part of the working equipment of the departments to which they were attached but that the funds assigned to the general library were not to be used for departmental

library book purchases. Although the university librarian was empowered to make both temporary and permanent deposits of materials to the departmental libraries, these collections were under the administrative control of the department heads.

In 1913 the regents ordered that all books purchased for departmental libraries be cataloged as part of the general library and that the librarian inventory the collections each year. In 1916 only seven of approximately thirty-two departmental libraries contained over 1,000 volumes, and as many as twelve collections had fewer than 1,000 books each. When in 1917 the chemistry department requested transfer of a large number of periodical and journal files to the departmental library, the academic senate voted to approve the general policy of maintaining a comprehensive central collection of books and limiting the withdrawal of books to departmental libraries. By 1932 there were seventy-one departmental collections at Berkeley; and by the late 1930s the need to consolidate many of these collections into branch libraries was recognized.<sup>20</sup> At present Berkeley has twenty-two branch and eight departmental libraries.<sup>21</sup>

#### CENTRALIZATION VERSUS DECENTRALIZATION

The question of centralization or decentralization and the problems attendant to it have probably created as much controversy as any other organizational problem in libraries. The question has been debated from all sides, but the problem seems no closer to the solution than it ever was. In an attempt to clarify the issues, Robert Miller summarized and grouped the arguments into seven categories of accessibility, cost, efficiency, adequacy, use, interrelation of subject fields, and educational significance and separated the arguments *pro* and *con*. He concluded that

centralization had the best of the arguments on a margin of four to one.

The cause of the central library was in terms of cost, interrelationships, efficiency, and educational significance. However, the arguments on efficiency and educational significance could be made to serve decentralization if the institution had the budget to afford good service for both general and separate libraries and the maintenance of a general collection of books for the correlation of the library needs of the collegiate departments. The cause for the separate library was best supported by the argument of accessibility. There were two categories for which no conclusion was drawn: those of adequacy and use of books.<sup>22</sup>

Tauber identified three types of centralization: *administrative centralization*, which generally means control of a number of library units by a central officer; *physical centralization* of a system in which all units are located in a single building or a restricted number of locations; and *operational centralization*, in which certain operations are performed in a single place by one group of personnel for the various units of the system. There are various combinations of these types of centralization, depending on local conditions.<sup>23</sup> A number of factors complicate decentralization, such as communication, adherence to personnel standards, unevenness of collection development, dependency on separate financing, duplication of library materials, hours of opening, and varying regulations for circulation and use.

Harvard is the most highly decentralized system of all American academic libraries, and the separate units enjoy more autonomy than is generally the custom. The library system comprises some ninety units which are coordinated through the director of the university library, whose relationship to libraries other than Harvard College Library is

that of influential counselor rather than direct administrator. The librarians of the decentralized units maintain relationships with the director, but their primary lines of authority are to the deans, department chairpersons, or directors of institutions. The director of the university library is a member of all of the administrative committees of the other libraries, and this permits effective participation in the affairs of those libraries. There are many informal contacts between the staffs of the various libraries as well. The most important single means of communication among all units is the *Harvard Librarian*, which provides information on personnel, collections, and matters of common interest.

The importance of coordination within the Harvard system was emphasized by the corporation when in 1959 it was voted that before any significant new library operations were begun, the matter should be discussed with the director of the university library and that the director should be notified when discontinuation of any library collection was proposed. In a symposium on centralization and decentralization held in 1960, Douglas Bryant enumerated many advantages to Harvard's decentralized system and concluded that the policy of coordinated decentralization, like walking a tightrope, required constant alertness; there must be continuous adjustments if balance is to be maintained.<sup>24</sup>

Cornell presents a unique situation in that its libraries combine those of a private institution with those operated as contract colleges of the State University of New York. The colleges of Cornell receive support from a variety of sources, and this necessarily affects the administration of the library system. Although Cornell receives funding from various sources, it has moved toward centralized administration of the libraries and has consolidated in one



budget the library support for all the endowed divisions of the university except for the medical school located in New York City, which is operated as a completely separate division. A single budget for the state-supported colleges, however, has not been effected since that would remove library support from the concern of the several deans, and it is felt that this might have an adverse affect on support.<sup>25</sup>

#### UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARIES

Although the idea of a special library for undergraduates was not new even when Harvard's Lamont Library was built in 1949, Lamont is generally credited with being the first separate library in a large institution dedicated to serving undergraduates. The next undergraduate library in a major institution was opened at Michigan in 1958.

These two libraries served as models for the many undergraduate libraries established in the 1960s and early 1970s designed to provide specialized library support for the undergraduate curriculum. These separate facilities were provided to relieve the pressure on the overcrowded main libraries and to give the undergraduate student an opportunity for enrichment in a less forbidding atmosphere than the complicated large research library.

Two of the largest libraries, Chicago and Princeton, however, do not have separate facilities for undergraduates. Chicago had a separate undergraduate library in 1931 but abandoned it in 1942. Chicago's Stanley Gwynn called the establishment of undergraduate libraries "departmentalization by age group."<sup>26</sup>

Louis Shores views the development of undergraduate libraries as a trend to place more responsibility for acquiring an education on the students and less upon the faculty. He credits the undergraduate library with being the first tangible evidence of an educational break-

through in universities with the potential far beyond the simple purpose of providing assigned course readings and optional enrichment materials. Its real strength lies in the provision for individual differences, the balance of overspecialization, and the creation of a true learning climate. The generalist librarian is in the best position to stand guard over the undergraduate's true liberal education.<sup>27</sup>

Gwynn and Dix opposed the establishment of separate undergraduate libraries at Chicago and Princeton, feeling that undergraduates were better served by learning to use the whole library.<sup>28, 29</sup> Frederick Wagman made a strong case for the undergraduate library on the grounds that providing adequate physical facilities could be solved more efficiently and economically by a separate library and that the role of the library and the librarian in the education of the undergraduate student was enhanced in such an environment.<sup>30</sup> Arguments in favor of the separate undergraduate library were apparently persuasive, judging from the number of such libraries constructed during the 1950s and 1960s.

Most undergraduate libraries are open-stack collections and duplicate titles found in other libraries on campus. Services offered follow traditional patterns with the addition of certain specialized facilities such as audio rooms and computerized carrels. Reference assistance is frequently geared to helping students locate materials and guiding them as they progress rather than to directing them to sources and assuming they will find the needed information.

#### SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

In most libraries certain types of materials are segregated into special collections housed separately from the general collections to provide maximum security or other special treatment. Such collections most commonly include rare

books, manuscripts, archival materials, maps, and other nonbook items. Collections gathered by private collectors and donated to the library are often retained in special collections to attract scholars to the campus or to encourage similar donations by other collectors.

Special collections are almost always staffed by experts in the given area who can assist researchers in the use and interpretation of these materials. The development of specialized subject or rare book collections in academic libraries is of considerable historical importance, since these collections have served to strengthen the library and to increase the prestige of the institution.

The introduction of area studies programs following World War II caused the establishment of a new kind of special collection to deal with materials in exotic languages. Although a few collections, especially in Chinese and Japanese, existed before this time, it was not until the Public Law-480 programs were instituted that such collections became fairly common in research libraries. Since the materials in these vernacular collections were in languages not generally known by librarians, special staffs to deal with them had to be assembled, and these staffs were usually required to handle all aspects of developing the collections from acquisition and cataloging to reference.

Materials requiring special bibliographic control or those needing equipment for use are also often segregated into special collections. Microforms, phonorecords or tapes, computer tapes, and videotapes are types of materials frequently so segregated. Staff must be specially trained in handling both materials and equipment.

#### STAFF ORGANIZATION

One of the most significant developments affecting library organization and management in recent years is the increase of advisory committees and staff

participation in the decision-making process to promote cooperation, to provide advice, and to develop middle management expertise. In many libraries bureaucratic organization is being replaced by a collegial system. Bureaucratic organizations tend to produce conformity and generally stifle creativity. Participative systems, on the other hand, generally produce staffs which are not only more interested in the whole library and are more productive, but also staffs which are more flexible and more readily adaptable to change.

There are differences between participative management, committee consultation, delegation, self-governance, and other forms of staff involvement. The basic distinction is between involvement in an administrative-hierarchical model and a more democratically oriented collegial system. The impact of a collegial governance is beginning to have far-reaching effects, and the results are sometimes mixed. For some librarians it has meant accelerated advancement, while for others it has caused professional dislocation. The focus of collegial activity is a reorientation toward the needs of library users bringing library service back to its proper source, the user.<sup>31</sup>

#### SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

By the 1950s considerable attention was being directed toward scientific management. The January 1954 issue of *Library Trends*<sup>32</sup> was devoted entirely to this subject, monographs such as Dougherty and Heinritz<sup>33</sup> applied scientific management to libraries, and in 1971 the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago held a conference on operations research in libraries.<sup>34</sup> Citations on this subject are now frequent in the literature.

In the introduction to the *Library Trends* issue, Ralph Shaw quoted a statement which defines scientific management as a concept in mental attitude



toward achievement. It exercises a basic systematic technique for discovering and establishing objectives, plans, standards, methods, schedules, and controls of an enterprise. It exemplifies the best use of human and material energy. Shaw went on to say that, stated in its most fundamental terms, scientific management is really little more than organized common sense.

As is true of the scientific method itself, it follows the dictum that man's judgment can be no better than the information upon which that judgment is based. It seeks, therefore, to establish the facts of any given situation, taking into consideration all of the factors which must or should influence opinion. It uses careful methodology to make certain that the facts are a reliable sample of the pertinent data, and then, wherever feasible, wherever the facts deduced are conclusive, it follows them to their logical conclusions.

Although scientific management uses mechanical and statistical methods and measures in planning, it is not a mechanical process. Rarely—except where procedures and systems are paced by machines, which is almost never the case in libraries or offices—can the judgment resulting from the fact finding be completely objective. So, at best, the method provides a firmer base for conclusions, and the basis for determining, both in advance and after an alteration has been made, whether or not a change is an improvement.<sup>35</sup>

#### MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Advanced planning is necessary to the achievement of library goals and to the effective use of personnel. Faced with continued great change, dwindling funds coupled with a high rate of inflation and with exponential increases in the number of publications of all types, and with demands for more service both in kind and depth, librarians in the 1970s placed renewed emphasis on

planning. The evolution of the library from a passive to an active organization which is more directly involved in the educational process has had considerable influence on the organization of public service units in particular. Management has also come to recognize that staff has a vital role to play in the realization of library goals and the success of library programs.

Yavarkovsky compares recent attitudinal changes in librarianship with commercial and industrial environmental changes of the past twenty years. While corporations are motivated by profit, libraries attempt to maximize service. Planning reduces the risks of lost service opportunities, wasted or misdirected resources, and diminished access to resources. He points out that the greatest potential return in planning is in the areas of highest cost such as collection development, technical processing, and stack operations and that these areas are frequently overlooked in planning efforts that emphasize new or added services and facilities.<sup>36</sup>

Although once a function limited to top management, the involvement of staff at all levels in the planning process has become the accepted norm. Not only does such involvement assure greater cooperation of the staff in the implementation of changes; but it also stimulates creativity, increases commitment to the library, and promotes better working relationships among all levels of staff.

A number of libraries have recently undertaken major planning studies which have resulted, in many cases, in massive reorganization. In 1969-70 Columbia made a preliminary investigation of problems in university library management. As a result of the findings of this investigation, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) sponsored a case study at the Columbia University Libraries with the cooperation of the American Council on Education and the

Council of Library Resources. The study team included representatives of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, Inc., and the University Library Management Studies Office of ARL. The study resulted in a significant restructuring of the organization and in the implementation of a planning process for evolutionary change.<sup>37</sup>

In 1970, with a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Cornell entered into a contract with the American Management Association to undertake a long-range planning project. The overall goal of the project was to develop an effective and unified planning team in addition to a meaningful long-range plan. Project documents provide considerable insight into the organization. Participative management by all levels of staff was an important factor in the planning. At the end of that project, the planning team was replaced by a smaller planning council to continue the planning process.<sup>38</sup>

More than twenty libraries have participated in the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP), sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries, which is designed to guide the systematic internal review of management functions. The program involves a liaison with study teams of other libraries, emphasis on staff involvement, and the use of a comprehensive structured and problem-oriented manual.

The Management Review and Analysis Program came into being as a result of the conviction that research libraries needed to develop more effective ways of coming to grips with organizational problems. While MRAP focuses on management issues, the key aspects in major successes of the program relate to the management skills and techniques developed in addressing these issues. MRAP examines the operational decision-making process and assesses organizational changes that are needed to im-

prove the day-to-day requirements of library operations. At the same time the program raises some questions concerning major long-range decisions for change which involve significant commitment in reorganization of library resources.

In this process of reviewing analysis, librarians learn some of the intricacies in decision making and gain insight into refining and improving management.<sup>39</sup> This program has resulted in a considerable change in the libraries using it. A similar program for small and medium-sized libraries is under development at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

#### AUTOMATION AND NETWORKS

The application of computerized systems to library processes has had a major impact on organization. By the late 1960s a great many libraries had implemented automated systems for acquisitions and circulation. The introduction of machine-readable cataloging (MARC) in 1966 was responsible for major change in technical processing operations, and the widespread development of network systems in the 1970s resulted in a massive reorganization of many technical services departments.

Some libraries added computer or systems specialists to their staffs to develop automated programs, while others retained existing staffs who were experienced in working with technical aspects of the library operations to design and implement the new systems. With the increased availability of cataloging copy, it became possible to assign a much larger proportion of the routine processing to paraprofessionals, leaving professional librarians free to do the more difficult original cataloging or for other assignments.

Information storage and retrieval systems are having a significant effect on public service operations as well. In ad-

dition to using the bibliographic data bases of the networks for public services purposes, a number of libraries provide access to indexing and abstracting data banks produced by societies and governmental agencies through specially trained subject specialists.

On a very limited scale, computers are also used for management purposes in academic libraries. Mathematical models and computer simulation techniques are used to measure physical situations. Such research has been reported at Purdue, Chicago, and UCLA. The computer makes it possible to use a model for testing a hypothesis in compressed time. A director can exercise the model on the computer, observe the consequences of a decision, alter the strategy accordingly and repeat the process until the desired results are obtained.<sup>40</sup>

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT

Although a certain amount of conflict in any organization can be attributed to personality differences, it has long been recognized that organization itself can also contribute to disharmony. One of the most frequent causes of conflict is the failure to recognize common goals or the subordination of the primary goal of getting books to readers to the secondary goal of acquiring and processing them. Librarians have traditionally placed great emphasis on the organization of library materials, and certainly no less attention should be given to the organization of the staff.

Library organization creates tension with its professional and nonprofessional staffs in which parts of the staff sometimes feel less than full-fledged members, even though no library could operate effectively without the very valuable and very significant contribution they make.

The greatest conflict is most frequently between public and technical service staffs on a departmental level. On the personal level, clashes frequently occur

between the specialist and nonspecialist, the established staff and the beginner, and between those with territory to protect and those who seek change.

To meet changing demands, libraries will have to find new ways to resolve conflict and to establish new relationships between individuals and groups. Involvement of the staff in setting goals and establishing priorities creates a climate in which the individual frequently makes a greater commitment to the achievement of those goals and priorities. Under such conditions, conflict is generally considerably reduced.

#### FUTURE ORGANIZATION

Recent trends in higher education and the economic crisis of the 1970s have had serious implications for library management, and organizational structure will have to be adapted to provide expanded and more specialized services. As libraries grow in complexity, greater language expertise, subject specialization, and knowledge of the systems and methods of information access, storage, and retrieval will be needed; and the organization must be flexible enough to accommodate these changing needs.

Continued growth and tighter funding will underscore the need for more thorough planning to make the most effective use of both physical and human resources. To compensate for increased personnel costs, new ways will have to be found to increase the efficiency and productivity of the staff wherever possible. The increased application of automated systems will permit the reassignment of staff from work connected with acquiring and processing materials to work directed toward assisting the user. Planning must be action oriented, and the organization created by it must be flexible enough to shift with changes in the institution or to accommodate needs that cannot be anticipated.



## REFERENCES

1. Arthur M. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," *Library Trends* 1:20-36 (July 1952).
2. *World Almanac* (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Assn., 1976); and *ARL Statistics, 1974-75*: (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1975).
3. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," p.20.
4. Louis R. Wilson and Maurice F. Tauber, *The University Library: The Organization, Administration, and Functions of Academic Libraries* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1945; 2d ed., New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1956).
5. Guy R. Lyle, *The Administration of the College Library* (New York: Wilson, 1944; 2d ed., 1949; 3d ed., 1961; 4th ed., 1974).
6. Edward A. Wight, "Research in Organization and Administration," *Library Trends* 6:141-46 (Oct. 1957).
7. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," p.22-23.
8. Archie L. McNeal, "Divisional Organization in the University Library," in *University of Tennessee Library Lectures*, no.12 (Knoxville, Tenn.: Univ. of Tennessee, 1961).
9. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," p.30.
10. Donald Coney, "Administration of Technical Processes," in C. B. Joeckel, ed., *Current Issues in Library Administration* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1939), p.163-80.
11. J. R. Lund, "Cataloging Process in the University Library: Proposal for Reorganization," *College & Research Libraries* 3:212-18 (June 1942).
12. McAnally, "Organization of College and University Libraries," p.31-33.
13. Doralyn Hickey, "Public and Technical Library Services: A Revised Relationship," in Norman D. Stevens, ed., *Essays for Ralph Shaw* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1975).
14. American Library Association, *A Survey of Libraries in the United States*, Vol. 1 (Chicago: American Library Assn., 1926), p.196.
15. Wilson and Tauber, *The University Library*, 2d ed., p.144.
16. Ralph Ellsworth, *Planning the College and University Library Building* (Boulder, Colo.: Pruett Press, 1960), p.5-9.
17. Lawrence Thompson, "The Historical Background of Departmental and Collegiate Libraries," *Library Quarterly* 12: 49-50 (Jan. 1942).
18. George Schoyer, *History of Ohio State University Libraries, 1870-1970* (Columbus: Office of Educational Services, The Ohio State University Libraries, 1970), p. 5-14.
19. *American Library Directory, 1974-1975* (New York: Bowker, 1974), p.761.
20. Kenneth G. Peterson, *The University of California Library at Berkeley, 1900-1945* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Pr., 1970), p.139-43.
21. *American Library Directory, 1974-1975*, p.41-42.
22. Robert A. Miller, "Centralization versus Decentralization," *ALA Bulletin* 33:75-79, 134 (Feb. 1939).
23. "Centralization and Decentralization in Academic Libraries: A Symposium," *College & Research Libraries* 22:328-40, 398 (Sept. 1961).
24. *Ibid.*, p.328-34.
25. *Ibid.*, p.334-38.
26. Stanley Gwynn, "Departmentalization and Circulation Work," *Library Trends* 6:89 (July 1957).
27. Louis Shores, "The Undergraduate and His Library," in *University of Tennessee Library Lectures*, no.11 (Knoxville, Tenn.: Univ. of Tennessee, 1961).
28. "Library Service to Undergraduates: A Symposium," *College & Research Libraries* 14:266-72 (July 1953).
29. William S. Dix, "Undergraduates Do Not Necessarily Require a Separate Facility," *College & Research Libraries* 17:148-50 (March 1956).
30. Frederick H. Wagman, "The Case for the Separate Undergraduate Library," *College & Research Libraries* 17:150-55 (March 1956).
31. Evert Volkensz, "Library Organization in Academia: Changes from Hierarchical to Collegial Relationships," in E. J. Josey, ed., *New Dimensions for Academic Library Service* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1975), p.80-81.
32. Ralph Shaw, ed., "Scientific Management in Libraries," *Library Trends* 2 (Jan. 1954).
33. Richard M. Dougherty and Fred M. Heinitz, *Scientific Management of Library Operations* (New York: Scarecrow, 1966).
34. Don R. Swanson, ed. *Operations Research: Implications for Libraries* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1972).
35. Shaw, "Scientific Management in Libraries," p.359-60.
36. Jerome Yavarkovsky, "Management Planning to Achieve Academic Library Goals," in E. J. Josey, ed., *New Dimensions for*

- Academic Library Service*, p.221-27.
37. Columbia University Libraries, *The Administrative Organization of the Libraries of Columbia University: A Detailed Description* (New York: Columbia Univ. Libraries, 1975).
  38. William E. McGrath, *Development of a Long-Range Strategic Plan for a University Library* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Libraries, 1973).
  39. Duane E. Webster, "Development and Use of the Management Review and Analysis Program," in "Management Review and Analysis Program: A Symposium," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1:6 (Jan. 1976). See also his "The Management Review and Analysis Program: An Assisted Self-Study to Secure Constructive Change in the Management of Research Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 35:114-25 (March 1974).
  40. Mohammed M. Aman, "Computer Applications in Academic Library Operations," in E. J. Josey, ed., *New Dimensions for Academic Library Service*, p.86-99.

---

*Connie R. Dunlap is university  
librarian, Duke University,  
Durham, North Carolina.*

#### ON OUR COVER

Williams College's Stetson Hall, in the tradition of the classic American college library building, is a red brick Georgian structure. Although this colonial style failed to satisfy the nineteenth century's preference for ornate decoration and complex design, its simplicity and grace had regained favor by the time Williams constructed its new library. Planned by the librarian, Christine Price, the building was designed by the architectural firm of Cram and Ferguson. The four-story structure, 128 by 104 feet, has the unusual feature of two designedly separate fronts intended to reflect in the exterior the two major separate collections of the college, the college library itself and the rich Chapin Library of rare books and manuscripts.

Constructed at a cost of \$750,000, the building was planned to house 220,000 volumes, about twice the size of the collection in January 1923 when it was opened for use by the 650 students and sixty-five faculty members. By that time, Christine Price had been succeeded as librarian by W. N. C. Carlton. An addition in 1957, also designed by Cram and Ferguson, provided expanded stack space that enabled the building to serve until August 1975, when the new Sawyer Library was completed. Stetson Hall will continue to house the Chapin Library, the Williamsiana Collection, manuscripts, and special collections, as well as offices and other facilities particularly to serve the faculty.—*W. L. Williamson, Professor, University of Wisconsin-Madison.*

Acknowledgments: Lawrence E. Wikander and Nancy G. MacFadyen, Williams College.