

E. J. JOSEY

Community Use of Junior College Libraries—A Symposium*

IN THE FALL OF 1965, the Committee on Community Use of Academic Libraries of the ACRL surveyed the extent to which library service is given to community users. More than 1,000 college and university libraries were queried. After the results had been tabulated, it was discovered that very few junior colleges or two-year colleges were included in the survey.¹ In order to obtain a comprehensive picture of library service to community users by all types of academic libraries, the committee decided that it was necessary to survey the two-year college libraries.²

In order to determine the extent of the community use of junior college libraries, it was the committee's opinion that the questionnaire used in the first survey should be revised. The revised questionnaire, while designed like its predecessor to probe various facets of community use of junior college libraries, also included questions which would give in-depth information on the junior colleges. Possible conclusions or assumptions could not be reached without relevant institutional data. Thus the participants in this survey were asked questions relative to the size of the library collections, the number of persons on the library staff, student enrollment, size of the faculty, and population data of the geographical area in which the particular junior college was located.

In March 1968 a questionnaire was sent to 689 junior college libraries in the

nation; 308 or 45 percent of the libraries responded.

The findings are presented in symposium format utilizing the expertise and assistance of all members of the committee. Barbara LaMont, librarian, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York, assumed the responsibility for machine tabulating the responses to the questionnaires. John E. Scott, librarian, West Virginia State College, discusses questions 3 and 4. Questions 5 through 7 are analyzed by John B. Smith, assistant director of libraries, Texas A. & M. University. Richard C. Quick, director of libraries, State University of New York College at Geneseo, reviews questions 8 through 11 as well as institutional data. Questions 12 and 13 are discussed by Edward C. Heintz, librarian, Kenyon College. George C. Elser, librarian, Chaffey College, analyzes questions 14, 15, and 17. A consideration of the significance of the findings to two-year colleges and an analysis of questions 1, 2, and 16 are the province of this writer who serves as chairman of the committee.

Use of Library Materials by Outsiders

The first question attempted to discover if junior college libraries permit in-building use of library materials by persons other than students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families. Most of the respondents replied affirmatively, 282 or 91 percent marked yes, nineteen or 6 percent answered no. Seven or 2 percent failed to answer.

*The results of a survey of junior college libraries conducted in March 1968.

If the respondent answered yes to the first question, in the second question part *a*, he was asked if he permitted quick reference only, and in part *b*, if he permitted unrestricted use of study space. The largest number of respondents, 139 or 45 percent, gave no answer; the next largest group, 122 or 39 percent, marked no, and forty-seven or 15 percent indicated that they offered quick reference only. One can deduce from these responses that the overwhelming number rejected the provision of reference service only, if we may be presumptuous enough to combine the number of those who failed to answer with those who rejected the offering of only quick reference service.

Turning to the unrestricted use of study space, most of those reporting, 259 or 84 percent, allowed unrestricted use of study space in their libraries. Only nineteen or 6 percent did not permit unrestricted use of study space. Thirty or 10 percent elected not to answer. An analysis of the responses to parts *a* and *b* of question 2 leads us to conclude that by and large the community user is given more than just quick reference service in these junior college libraries. The truth of the matter is that the "outsider" is welcomed and is given, for the most part, use of study space in the libraries of these institutions.

Circulation of Library Materials to Outside Borrowers

JOHN E. SCOTT

While 91 percent of the responding junior college libraries permit use of library materials inside the building by persons other than students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families, the story is somewhat different when the libraries are asked, "Do you *circulate* library materials to persons other than

students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families?" Two hundred and seventeen respondents said yes, but this amounts to only 70 percent of the libraries which allow library materials to be taken out of the building by outside borrowers as compared with 91 percent which permit inside use of materials. Eighty-eight respondents or 28 percent replied no, they do not circulate library materials to others; three respondents did not answer.

Question 4 was directed to the institutions that indicated they did not circulate library materials to persons other than students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families. It asked, "If the answer to question number 3 is negative, what is the reason for this decision?" Respondents were given a choice of six reasons. Results are given in parentheses.

- a. Insufficient library materials for other than college personnel? (75 yes, 6 no)
- b. Inadequate staff to administer extra service? (55 yes, 16 no)
- c. Basic belief that materials should be used only by college personnel, even though the college program would not suffer through circulation to others? (14 yes, 46 no)
- d. Belief that service to the general public would be a disservice to the community in view of the fact that public and/or school library development may be curtailed? (21 yes, 36 no)
- e. Difficulties relating to control: getting books back, collecting fines. (72 yes)
- f. Other? (Only twenty-two libraries listed other reasons, such as "there has been no demand for it," and "community has such an excellent public library that service from college library is unnecessary." One junior college in Florida noted, "Private institution, community support is not requested or expected; therefore,

community use cannot be encouraged." The longest and probably the harshest comment on this question came from a junior college librarian in Texas who wrote: "If we librarians continue to blur our true functions—each type of library has its own 'public' that supports it and for which it shall supply resources—how can we blame the public and our budget authorities for the confusion on which libraries are supposed to do what, with which, for whom? We have sabotaged ourselves by all of this talk of 'free library service.'")

Policy Statement and Extent of Service to the Community

JOHN B. SMITH

The junior college, more than any other type of institution of higher education, stands in close relationship to its surrounding community. It seems reasonable, therefore, that the junior college library should have a particular interest in community service and that library resources should be made freely available to the community. This does, in fact, seem to be generally the case as analysis of questions 5 through 7 shows.

Question number 5 was designed to find out how many libraries actually have a firm written policy statement regarding community use. It reads as follows: "Do you have a written policy concerning library use by persons not connected with the college?" Tabulations show 29 percent answered yes, 69 percent answered no, and 2 percent did not answer. At first glance, one might interpret this response as lack of interest. But after studying some of the unsolicited comments appended to the question, it seems more likely that libraries have not felt the need to prepare a written statement. Some typical comments are:

"We have never felt the need of a written policy . . . the few requests that are made are usually from alumni or friends."

"An excellent Carnegie Library makes these requests very infrequent."

"We have very few requests."

Several comments also indicated that a written policy was under consideration but had not yet been formulated. From this we might speculate that more institutions feel the need of a written statement and that we will see more of these in the future.

Although we did not specifically ask for copies of the written policy statement, several libraries did send them. A typical one is from Clatsop Community College, Astoria, Oregon, which reads in part:

In the belief that Clatsop Community College should also contribute to the community's education, borrowing privileges are extended to any resident of Clatsop County. Student needs will come first and the library reserves the right to call in any book for which there is an immediate student need. . . .

Question number 6 sought to learn how many libraries permit relatively free use of their facilities by members of the general public. It reads as follows: "Do you extend the borrowing or in-building use privilege to all members of the general public?"

Of the total, 60 percent answered yes, 38 percent answered no, and 2 percent did not answer. This shows that well over half of all junior college libraries answering the questionnaire permit relatively free access, at least for in-building use, by all members of the general public. There were, however, a few comments indicating that the meaning of the term "general public" was limited in that case to residents of the local community and that persons from other towns or counties were not served.

Question number 7 included six sub-

questions, and was intended to find out to what extent six critical groups are served by those libraries that do not offer service to all members of the general

public (those answering question number 6 negatively). Because of the length and complexity of this question, results are shown in the following table:

EXTENT OF SERVICE TO SIX CRITICAL CATEGORIES OF OUTSIDE USERS

Group	Percent of Libraries Serving This Group	Percent of Libraries Not Serving This Group	Of Libraries Serving This Group, Percent That Permit Borrowing	Of Libraries Serving This Group, Percent That Permit In-Building Use
A. High School Students	65	35	41	92
B. Students from Other Colleges	85	15	51	84
C. Teachers and Clergy	93	7	66	56
D. Other Professional People	88	12	56	59
E. Residents of the College District	77	23	43	68
F. Alumni	89	11	51	61

In considering question 7, it is significant to note that very nearly all of the libraries surveyed offer some sort of service, at least to some segment of the community (see also question number 1). Groups such as teachers, clergy, other professional people, and alumni fare extremely well, while others, such as high school students and residents of the college district, are sometimes excluded, but do receive some sort of service in the vast majority of junior college libraries.

Analysis of all three questions can be summarized briefly as follows: relatively few junior college libraries now possess written statements concerning library use by members of the community. This does not seem to be an indication of lack of concern, however, but simply an indication that, in many cases, no problem is caused by community use of these libraries. There is some evidence that more junior college libraries will be formulating written policies on community use in the future.

A large percentage permit relatively free use of their facilities by all members of the public, although the word "public" is sometimes defined as residents of the local community. Of those libraries that do not offer service to the entire public, service is offered to various spe-

cial groups under varying restrictions. Only in a very few cases was there an indication that community use was actively discouraged.

High school students, students from other colleges, teachers, clergy, professional people, residents of the college district, and alumni are given some sort of service in the majority of libraries that do not offer service to the public at large. Of these groups, high school students and residents of the college district seem to be the most likely to be excluded.

The Outside Borrower— What Limits?

RICHARD C. QUICK

Questions 8 through 11 were designed to determine the conditions under which qualified outsiders are permitted partial or total use of the community college library. The response pattern, especially as shown in answers to the subparts of question 9 concerning specific restrictions, is surprisingly similar to that which developed when the same question was asked of 783 college and university libraries in the committee's survey of 1965.³

In question number 8, respondents were asked to indicate whether a fee or

deposit is charged to outsiders for the privilege of borrowing, and if so, to indicate the amount of the deposit or fee. Among 308 respondents, nineteen or 6 percent indicated a fee or deposit. Two of these noted both a fee and a deposit. More than 80 percent of those responding indicated no fee or deposit. In thirty-nine instances, the question did not apply.

In eight instances where a fee is charged, these range from a low of fifty cents in a Texas college to a high of \$15.00 in an Alaskan institution. The average fee reported was \$3.80. The average fee charged by institutions reporting amounts between the minimum and maximum is \$2.50.

In thirteen institutions where a deposit is required, the amounts ranged from a low of \$1.00 in one Missouri college to a high of \$25.00 at an Alaskan institution. The average deposit required among thirteen libraries is \$6.40. The average deposit among eleven libraries reporting amounts between the minimum and maximum is \$5.27.

One respondent in Texas reported that a deposit of \$5.00 is required for each two books borrowed. Another Texas community college requires a \$5.00 deposit, but specified that it does not apply to high school students and public school teachers.

It seems probable that those libraries requiring fees or deposits do so in an attempt to discourage use by outsiders which would add to an already heavy work load being borne by a very few people. The average fee or deposit, however, presents only a token obstacle and should not constitute a real deterrent to the determined outside user. As the committee found in its 1965 survey of college and university libraries, the number of libraries requiring fees or deposits is so few that the practice cannot be viewed as evidence of widespread denial of access.

Question 9 asked, "What modification, if any, is placed upon borrowing privileges extended to qualified outsiders?" This question included eight subparts, permitting respondents to answer *None*, or to indicate any of seven common library restrictions.

Among the respondents to the questionnaire, sixty-seven or 21 percent indicated that no restriction was placed upon the borrowing privilege for outsiders.

Subpart *b* asked whether outsiders could "check out reserve materials." One hundred and fifty respondents or 48 percent indicated that outsiders were not permitted to check out reserve materials. One library permitted overnight use of reserved books by outsiders, and one permitted borrowing of reserve books by high school students. But these were the only exceptions.

Subpart *c* asked if "high school students must have a slip from their school librarian each time they wish to check out materials." Of the total respondents to the questionnaire, thirty-seven or 11 percent indicated that this restriction applied.

One respondent noted that a high school student "must have a slip from his school librarian or teacher the first time . . . then we issue them a card for one year." Another responding library indicated that the high school student "must have a slip from his principal to take out a library card." Another accepts "verbal permission from their school librarian," still another issues a library card good for one semester. Other respondents noted such variations as "or an accompanying parent must sign," "student must present student activity card," "ALA interlibrary loan form is required," or "for overnight use only."

Subpart *d* of question 9 asked if a shorter loan period applied for outside borrowers. Nineteen or 6 percent indicated that qualified outsiders were given a shorter loan period. Of the com-

munity college library respondents reporting a shorter loan period, one commented that this restriction applied to high school students only.

Subpart *e* asked if outside borrowers were granted a renewal privilege. Twenty-four or 7 percent indicated that outside borrowers had no renewal privilege.

Subpart *f* asked if outsiders were permitted to check out journals. Ninety-nine or 32 percent reported that outside borrowers could not check out journals.

One community college library responding to subpart *f* added "This depends upon the imperative need, regardless of the person," while another indicated that journals could be checked out if they were bound.

Subpart *g* of question 9 asked if the library required "in-library use only" by outsiders. Seventy-two or 23 percent permitted in-library use only for outsiders. One library indicated that this restriction applied only to students from other colleges and not to other outsiders. Another said this restriction did not apply "to students of other colleges who live in bordering towns and have identification." One community college excepted alumni from this restriction; another excepted professional people.

The last subpart to question 9 provided space for respondents to indicate restrictions other than those specified. Responses here varied as follows: "May not check out more than three books at one time"; "Only material not needed by students may be borrowed"; "No books borrowed on ILL for outsiders"; "Cannot use phone/tape collection"; "Special personal application to head librarian needed in most cases"; "Must sign address and phone number"; "Material must not be available from other sources, i.e., public library, high school, university"; "Depends on who, why, what"; "Must be resident of college service area"; and "May limit number of items to people under 18 or not gradu-

ated from high school."

Question 10 asked: "Do you require qualified outsiders to complete an application or registration form?" Of the total respondents to the questionnaire, ninety-four or 30 percent answered yes, and 183 or 59 percent answered no. Thirty respondents or 9 percent indicated that this did not apply.

One respondent indicated that outsiders seeking the borrowing privilege "must be introduced by college personnel." Another that students from two neighboring universities did not need to apply or register. Still another indicated that the application had to come "via the business office."

Question 11 asked: "Is the qualified outsider provided with a copy of the regulations by which he is expected to abide?" To this, ninety respondents or 29 percent said yes, 168 or 54 percent said no, and for forty-eight the question did not apply. Some of those responding in the negative indicated that the applicant was given verbal instruction.

Community college libraries attempt, as do their college and university counterparts, first to satisfy the needs and requirements of their own academic clientele. And rightly so. In the few instances where fees or deposits are levied on outside borrowers, charges are, for the most part, negligible. As might be anticipated, many community college libraries do not permit borrowing of reserve books or journals by outsiders. These strictures are understandable, ". . . in view of the academic library's primary responsibility to students, faculty, and staff, who need some assurance that reserve materials will be available to support class assignments and that scholarly journals will be on the shelves for study and research purposes."⁴ Where other restrictions exist they seem to derive from an honest consideration of limited staffing and extraordinary work load.

Findings from responses to questions 8 through 11 suggest a variety of lending services are provided the noncollege user among the 308 community college libraries which participated. A climate of permissiveness prevails and, if the outsider is not always accorded full-use privileges, neither is he fully denied.

Controls and Interlibrary Loans

EDWARD C. HEINTZ

Of the 217 junior college libraries which noted that they circulate books to the community at large, the survey does not reveal that recovery of the books is a problem of any magnitude. Although eight respondents or 3 percent checked legal action as a method of recovery, none specified the kind of legal action. Possibly because many are community colleges, some might be protected in this respect by municipal, county, or even state statutes. In contrast, only one of the 783 respondents to the college and university survey of 1965 on nonacademic use indicated legal action as a last resort.

Other methods of recovery reported hardly reveal more than might have been expected. Telephone calls are used most widely, with 191 or 62 percent suggesting that the telephone is an effective instrument for recovering material. Postal cards are also used extensively: 133 or 43 percent of the libraries use them, though one uses letters only, and another states "letter if outside local call range." As for sending a messenger, twenty-two or 7 percent said yes, which is about half the percentage of college and university libraries who indicated use of messengers. In neither case do we know whether the delinquent borrower is charged for this relatively expensive measure.

Other measures to retrieve delinquent materials are used by twenty-four or 8

percent of the responding libraries. Only ten of these specified the nature of "other" and some of these reveal the smallness of the community served, such as "word of mouth," "request when I see the person," "personal contact—community." Blacklisting, expressed as "withdrawal of loan privileges," is employed by only two libraries, and only two undertake to notify school authorities. One can only conclude that nascence is the state of one library whose comment is, "Haven't had to use any device so far."

At this point it may be of some interest to refer back to question 4, where seventy-eight libraries or 25 percent indicated that they did not lend to persons not in some way associated with the institution because of difficulties relating to control, *i.e.*, book recovery and collecting fines. Will this percentage become larger as library collections grow and as the population increases, or will it of necessity decline as state and federal aid expands? It is unlikely that librarians alone will determine the answer to this question.

Twelve respondents did not answer the question, "Do you check out materials indirectly through interlibrary loan to other libraries in your area (instead of directly to an outside borrower)?" Of the remainder, 157 or 51 percent said yes, and 123 or 40 percent said no. Sixteen or 5 percent wrote both, presumably as a result of choice on the part of the borrower.

The Number of Outsiders and the Materials Borrowed

GEORGE C. ELSER

Question 14 requested respondents to estimate the number of outside users that might be expected on a typical day. Nearly one-third replied that they had no outside users or not more than one on a typical day. Another third estimated that their libraries were visited daily by

one to four persons not connected with their institution, while 14 percent replied that between five and nine outsiders used their libraries. Only 10 percent said that their libraries were visited by more than ten outsiders on a typical day. Another 10 percent did not answer the question. It would appear that the typical junior college library is not flooded by outsiders.

Question 15 related to the number of books borrowed by outsiders or the number of books used in the library by outside users on a typical day. Answers to this question indicate that few books are borrowed by outsiders. Forty-eight percent of the libraries did not check out any books, or not more than one book, on a typical day. Twenty-two percent checked out one to four books, 13 percent five to nine books, and only 10 percent of the libraries checked out more than ten books to outsiders on a typical day. Outsiders made their greatest use of junior college libraries by using books in the library. Twenty-seven percent indicated that outsiders used no books or not more than one book on a typical day, 11 percent said that only one to four books were used, 18 percent responded that their in-library use amounted to only five to nine books, 12 percent reported an in-building circulation of ten to nineteen books, and 10 percent indicated that on a typical day outsider use approximated twenty to twenty-eight books. It seems likely, considering the statistics above, that even the smallest junior college library could support the limited use of its facilities made by outsiders.

A large majority of the respondents, 85 percent, replied in the negative to question 17, which asked if there were any legal strictures, such as the Education Code or institutional regulations which would prevent them from serving persons not connected with their institution. Only 5 percent said that they could

not legally serve outsiders. Nine percent did not reply.

Since so many junior colleges feel that there are no legal restrictions to prevent them from serving outsiders and since 70 percent stated that they circulated materials to persons other than students, faculty, and staff (Question no. 3), it seems strange that so little outside use is being made of community college libraries by outsiders. There may be factors which militate against community use (such as the location of the college in relation to population centers), but it would seem that the community college could serve a great many more persons not connected with their institutions than they are now serving, thus raising the level of library service in their communities.

Publicly and Privately Supported Institutions

E. J. JOSEY

Since there is a growing number of publicly supported community colleges being established in the country, it was decided that information on financial support should be included in the survey.

Of the 308 institutions participating in the survey, 194 or 62 percent are publicly supported institutions while 105 or 33 percent are private institutions. Five or 1 percent of the reporting institutions indicated that they enjoyed both private and public support. Only three respondents did not answer this question.

In examining the extent to which library service is offered by both the publicly and privately supported institutions, no real discernible pattern emerged which would indicate a trend or indicate anything statistically significant which would show a greater response to sharing library resources with the community by either the publicly or the privately supported two-year col-

leges. On some questions the privately supported institutions were more community oriented than the publicly supported institutions. On others the reverse was true.

An illustration of this fact may be seen in question 3 relative to the circulation of materials to persons other than students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families. Surprisingly about one-half of the respondents who answered affirmatively were equally divided between the public and private institutions. Those who answered negatively were almost equally divided.

An examination of the question of charging user fees revealed that in more than 249 or 80 percent of the replies, no fee is required for using library collections. Of the nineteen that require a borrower fee, most are private. From this small sample it may be reasonable to assume that the public institutions are cognizant that their funds come from the public and are not likely to charge the local citizen for extramural service.

In a close scrutiny of a third question in this random selection of three questions to compare the publicly supported institutions' policies with those of privately supported institutions (question 17, which considers legal strictures as embodied in Educational Codes or institutional regulations), it is interesting to note that an overwhelming number, 263 or 85 percent, stated that no legal restrictions existed. On the other hand, upon a careful study of the small number, seventeen, that indicated that legal restrictions existed, more than one-half were private two-year colleges. If this sample truly represents the national picture and if conjecture is permitted, an evolving hypothesis may very well be that the minute number of two-year college libraries that have restrictions are the private institutions.

For the most part, the data do not emphasize conclusions which are statis-

tically significant. Nevertheless, the answers to two of the three questions randomly selected and discussed above possibly show that the average publicly supported institution is less restrictive in its service to the community than privately supported institutions.

Institutional Characteristics of Junior Colleges Participating in the Survey

RICHARD C. QUICK

In addition to questions concerning services and privileges accorded by junior college libraries to persons not connected with the college, the committee's survey questionnaire also requested certain institutional data which might indicate the libraries' state of preparedness for service beyond the prior needs of the academic community.

Specifically, the questionnaire asked the number of volumes in the library, the number of full-time students and faculty (FTE), and the numbers of professional and clerical staff. The questionnaire also asked the population of the community in which the college is located.

Three hundred and seven libraries responded to the questionnaire's Institutional Data section. In terms of numbers of students and faculty served, size of staffs, and size of book collections, these responses indicate that a majority of the junior college libraries surveyed are not sufficiently prepared to satisfy the service obligations to their own academic communities. It would appear that where services and privileges are offered to outside users, such accommodations represent an expenditure of staff time and dispersal of book resources that may not be justified. Where library services and privileges are not extended to the outsider, it is probably because there are not adequate personnel or material

resources to support such an accommodation.

Collections and Enrollment Data

The *Standards for Junior College Libraries*, developed by the ACRL Committee on Standards (1960), recommend that a junior college library of up to 1,000 students should have a book collection of at least 20,000 volumes. The *Standards* suggest that the collection should be increased by 5,000 volumes for every 500 students (FTE) beyond 1,000.⁵

Of the respondents supplying information on the number of volumes in the library, 50 percent reported collections of less than the ACRL's recommended 20,000 volume minimum. Of those libraries supplying data on the number of students enrolled, 54 percent reported student bodies in the range of 1-999. In an institution-by-institution comparison of book-stocks and enrollments, it was found that 119 libraries reported serving student enrollments of up to 1,000 students with less than the recommended minimum 20,000 volumes. Thirty-four other libraries were found to be serving student enrollments of more than 1,000 students with collections below the recommended minimum 20,000 volumes. In addition, roughly three-quarters of the libraries with subminimal collections were also called upon to satisfy study and research needs and services to faculties numbering from thirty to fifty.

Staff Data

The ACRL *Standards* recommend two professional librarians as the minimum number required for effective service in a junior college with an enrollment up to 500 students (FTE), and that there should be at least one non-professional staff member.

Three hundred and five junior college libraries responding to the questionnaire reported professional staffs ranging from

one to nine members. Of the respondents, 117 or 38 percent indicated one professional staff member: sixty-four reported serving student bodies ranging from 500-999; and eight reported serving student bodies ranging from 1,500-2,000 students. Two libraries reported one professional librarian serving student bodies numbering in excess of 3,000 students.

Eighty-five responding junior college libraries reported two professional staff members. In this group an institution-by-institution comparison of numbers of staff and numbers of students enrolled revealed: eighteen professional pairs serving student bodies ranging to 499 students; twenty-eight professional pairs serving student bodies ranging from 500-999 students; sixteen professional pairs serving student bodies ranging from 1,000-1,499 students; twenty professional pairs serving student bodies ranging from 1,500-2,999 students; and three pairs serving student populations in excess of 3,000 students. Three libraries specified no professional staff.

Two hundred and seventy-nine libraries reported clerical staffs ranging to fifteen members. Of these, seventy-four indicated one; sixty-seven indicated two; forty-five indicated three; fifty-eight indicated four-five; and thirty-five indicated more than six clerical staff members. Twenty-five libraries reported no clerical assistance.

Of the 117 libraries reporting only one professional staff member, 14 percent indicated no clerical assistance, 33 percent indicated one clerical assistant, 26 percent indicated two clerical assistants, and 14 percent reported clerical staffs ranging from four or more.

Of the eighty-five libraries reporting two professional staff members, 8 percent indicated no clerical assistance, 22 percent indicated one clerical assistant, 31 percent indicated two clerical assistants, and 16 percent indicated three

clerical assistants. The remaining eighteen libraries reported clerical staffs ranging from four or more.

Population Data

Two hundred and ninety-nine junior college libraries supplied population totals for the communities in which they are located. Of these, ninety-three or 30 percent reported populations of less than 10,000; ninety-three or 30 percent reported populations of 10,000-50,000; thirty-six or 11 percent reported populations of 50,000-100,000; sixty or 19 percent reported populations ranging from 100,000-1,000,000; and seventeen or 5 percent were located in communities in excess of one million.

Responses to the questionnaire indicate that more than sixty-two of the junior college libraries surveyed are located in communities of less than 50,000 persons. In the case of ninety-three libraries reporting populations of less than 10,000, theirs may well comprise the only significant book collections within easy reach of the community at large, and there may be unusual pressures upon these to assist with community library services. It should be noted that thirty-seven of the libraries shown to be understaffed and understocked, in terms of the ACRL *Standards*, are located in communities of less than 50,000 persons. Both groups, while not fully prepared to supply the library needs of the academic community, do render community services in varying degree, either as a substitute for nonexistent public library resources, or to supplement a limited public library resource.

Responses to the questionnaire's Institutional Data section showed that a significant number of the junior college libraries surveyed are disadvantaged in terms of staff and collection sizes as compared to numbers of students and faculty serviced. Where full or partial access is granted to outsiders, it would

seem that this accommodation could impose a further strain on the library's already inadequate personnel and material resources.

Significance of the Findings to Junior College Libraries

E. J. JOSEY

When it was reported that the State Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale, New York, would become the first college on Long Island to open its library to general public circulation, some community-minded citizens felt that this new policy was just a natural extension of community service by a two-year college. Residents had always been allowed to use library facilities, but they had not enjoyed the privilege of borrowing library materials. Generally, community colleges or junior colleges in recent years have become anxious to extend services to the wider community. Naiman and Konneim support this view when they declare that "with the growth of the community college there may be more and more opportunity for such extension of the college beyond its campus at little cost to itself and at considerable benefit to the larger community for which it can be a valuable source of information."⁶ There can be no quarrel with such objectives; however, in terms of extending library service to the larger community, while most institutions offer some kind of service, a varied and multicolored picture emerges.

Scott's analysis of the question on the circulation of materials disclosed that although 91 percent of the respondents allow in-building use of materials, only 70 percent permit borrowing privileges. Various reasons were cited for not granting circulation privileges; the largest group responding indicated that their libraries possessed insufficient material. The most acrimonious comment came from a Texas librarian, who declared

“. . . we have sabotaged ourselves by all of this talk of ‘free library service.’” Obviously he has not moved far from the concept of each little library working in isolation attempting to serve its public without any desire to join the emerging cooperatives and networks intended to strengthen library service to all types of libraries and library users. One wonders what his reaction is to the heavy burden that college students place on the public library. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries in its report has strongly recommended that libraries join networks. Hence, it is essential for libraries of all types, and especially two-year college libraries to join cooperatives in order to strengthen total library service in their region.⁷

By and large, most of the two-year institutions have not formulated policy statements which govern the use of their libraries by outsiders. Smith found that some evidently do not feel the need for a written statement, and more than half of the reporting libraries permit free access by the general public. Of the various categories of users, it appears that high school students are not welcomed at junior college libraries, and this finding coincides with the survey of community users of college and university libraries mentioned earlier.

In his investigation of the conditions under which unaffiliated users may use junior college libraries, Quick reported that more than 80 percent do not charge a fee for the use of library materials. This fact may mirror the parent institution's philosophy to extend itself into the greater community beyond the college. It can be assumed that the small number that charge fees do not do so in order to deny library service, for the fee is too small. If one would assume that the fee is to be a deterrent to outsiders, ambitious researchers—faculty and/or students—will pay to acquire the highly desired materials for study or research,

thus, the fee will never constitute an insurmountable barrier.

This discourse could very well close with a quote from two authors who are considering another important service to the community and seems quite applicable to libraries. “Here, it would seem, is an example of one of the real challenges to the community college: namely, relating to its neighbors not only by offering formal education to the young but also by providing a resource to the adult and professional populations in need.”⁸

The enforcement of adequate controls over materials loaned and correspondingly the sending of materials via interlibrary loan in lieu of direct loan are matters that are in the hands of librarians. The telephone seems to be the most effective communications medium for recall of materials from local outside borrowers. With reference to interlibrary loan, Heintz reveals that 51 percent indicate that materials are sent on interlibrary loan rather than given directly to an outsider, and 40 percent disavowed using interlibrary loan in this manner. The results here do not correspond to question three in which it was found that 70 percent extend circulation privileges to persons other than students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families. There is the possibility that the respondents extend materials to outsiders via interlibrary loan under certain conditions. The results do not warrant assumptions. This dilemma points up the major weakness of the questionnaire method—the differing interpretations of questions by respondents.

The opening of the floodgates and being inundated by masses of outside users “syndrome” is, of course, played down by the respondents, for Elser points out that 32 percent replied that they served no outsiders or less than one on a typical day. Another 32 percent reported serving from one to four outsiders and an

examination of the amount of materials borrowed reveals that this is negligible. In terms of legal restrictions, only 5 percent reported having such regulations. From the foregoing facts it appears that the libraries of two-year colleges are not suffering from the demands of unaffiliated users. When two-year colleges become part and parcel of a national informational system, their present outside clientele will not prevent other newcomers from tapping their resources as well.

Library service from publicly supported two-year colleges versus library service from privately supported two-year colleges, as this writer stated earlier, is not statistically significant to report except in a couple of instances where it appears that publicly supported institutions may be a few degrees more progressive in terms of community service.

In his characterization of the junior colleges participating in the survey, Quick shows very tellingly and graphically that most of the institutions surveyed do not meet ALA standards in terms of collection and staff. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries corroborates his findings in these words: "As college enrollments have increased since World War II, we have witnessed an almost phenomenal increase in the number of junior and community colleges. In no other type of institution serving higher education are library shortcomings so glaring. The great majority of library collections of junior colleges are considered substandard. . . ."⁹ The next question that should be posed is the following: why should junior col-

lege libraries attempt to serve the general public with such meager resources? One possible answer may very well be the revelation from the National Advisory Commission on Libraries that "more than two-thirds of all public libraries fail to meet American Library Association (ALA) standards as to the minimum adequate size of collections, and not one in thirty meets ALA standards for per capita support."¹⁰ Therefore, out of necessity, townspeople flock to the libraries of two-year colleges hoping to find what they do not find in their public libraries. The problem is further compounded, because a majority of the two-year colleges surveyed are located in towns of less than 50,000 population and, in too many instances, access to the junior college library is necessary for reference and research.

Finally, without a doubt, this survey clearly shows that most two-year college libraries permit some degree of access to their library collections and resources. Even the concept of legal restriction in itself is not a barrier to outside users. Even the one librarian who contended that "each type of library has its own 'public' that supports it and for which it shall supply resources" constitutes an infinitesimal minority.

What does the future portend for community use of junior college libraries? As library networks and informational systems emerge, the dividing lines between library jurisdictions will continue to erode, and the junior college library will play a vital role in providing materials to all qualified users.

REFERENCES

1. E. J. Josey et al., "Community Use of Academic Libraries: A Symposium," *College & Research Libraries* 28:198-202 (May 1967).
2. In this symposium, the authors will refer to the junior college intermittently as junior college, community college, or two-year college; whatever term is used it refers to an institution providing two years of college-level work

equivalent to the freshman and sophomore years of college.

3. E. J. Josey et al., "Community Use of Academic Libraries."
4. *Ibid.*, p.199.
5. American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for Junior College Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 21:200-206 (May 1960).
6. Dorothy N. Naiman and Beatrice G. Konneim, "The College and the Extra-Campus Community," *Adult Leadership* 118 (Oct. 1963).
7. U.S. National Advisory Commission on Libraries, *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. Library Services for the Nation's Needs; Toward Fulfillment of a National Policy* (Washington, D.C. 1968), p.3.
8. Moses S. Koch and Priscilla M. Woolley, "The Economic Opportunity Act: An Opportunity for Community Colleges," *Junior College Journal* 36:28 (Oct. 1965).
9. U.S. National Advisory Commission on Libraries, *Library Services for the Nation's Needs*, p.22.
10. *Ibid.*, p.24.