

Letters

To the Editor:

If we librarians are to "come to grips with the decade of the seventies" we must first come to grips with reality—not with one author's vision of reality. In reading your editorial, "The Greening of the Library," [Jan. 1971] I was amazed that you, who work in a university, had swallowed whole the picture of the young as seen by Charles Reich.

I also work at a university (as an academic adviser) and have noticed that students share characteristics and assumptions which differ from ours. I also know that some of these characteristics and assumptions are those which have always gone with youth, that the individuals who are students are as different from one another as we oldsters differ from each other, and that students are not the only young people in the world. What is more demeaning and more closely allied with treating people as "mere numbers" than grouping an entire generation together?

Suppose, however, that Charles Reich is right? Well, we'd better bring back the "little old librarian" because she was interested in the people who came to the library. We'd better keep the "hard-working drones" because they will get the tools the new people will need in order to get "high on self-awareness." We'd better find people who see individuals rather than people as members of Consciousness I, II, III, or a soon-to-be-discovered IV. We'd better keep out the megalomaniacs who think they can help "explain mankind to man" rather than help men find their own explanations of mankind and themselves.

I agree we need to ask relevant questions. They must be relevant to our community, our individual patrons (sorry about using that no-no word but it is difficult to put "people" there and have it mean anything), and to what is, not to

what is relevant to the latest mass-media "in" idea. I sometimes think librarians would be more "relevant" if they refused to read anything published later than twenty-years ago and instead looked around the world on their own and through their own eyes. By seeing the people they serve rather than an abstracted vision of the mass, they would ask the right questions and possibly even come up with the right answers.

Dorothy E. Wynne
Buffalo, New York

To the Editor:

In the long run, the ability of a library to serve people on any basis (as people, patrons, clients, or numbers) depends on the resources available to back up service. Without resources, people-to-people contacts in a library become a happy social hour and the need for librarians as such disappears, for any person willing to relate to another person will qualify.

Charles Reich's (*The Greening of America*) Consciousness III people may hold new insights into the relationships that exist between people, but by denying the accumulated knowledge of Consciousness I and II people, the III's have entered a blind alley leading back to Consciousness I, for the corporate state (and its attendant accomplishments and failures) did not appear by magic nor through evil intent. It grew out of need and it is continuing to grow; while individuals may be concerned about pollution, only the corporate state has the necessary technology to adequately feed, clothe, and house the world's population and eliminate pollution.

A more realistic appreciation of the levels of awareness among people is the pattern, described by Clare W. Graves ("Deterioration of Work Standards" in *Harvard Business Review* 44:117-28 (Sept.-

Oct. 1966).) of seven levels of human behavior. Reich's three consciousness groups are roughly analogous to levels three, four, and five in Graves' scheme; however, there is an important difference: Graves, concerned with the evolutionary development from level to level and the interrelationships between the various levels, does not see the level five (Consciousness III) person as anything more than one point in an ongoing series of levels of human behavior. Therefore, while it is appropriate to develop library services to meet the particular needs of Consciousness III people, the groundwork for the succeeding levels must be laid at the same time.

Larry Auld
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

To the Editor:

Perhaps *CRL* readers will be interested in the findings of a less comprehensive study which reinforces the findings of the 1968-69 Nebraska reserve book circulation study ("The Library Reserve System—Another Look," *CRL*, March 1971). The data of this less detailed study, which appeared in one part of my qualifying paper last year, were tabulated during a twelve-week period in the second semester of the 1969-70 academic year at another midwestern university.

The purpose of the study was to assess the use of art books in the university library. Among other suppositions, it was assumed that the reserve books, which had been placed on limited circulation for the use and convenience of the students enrolled in art courses, would be used and used extensively.

Just as the Carmack-Loeber statistics reveal little use of reserve books, so do the data in my art book study. The reserve book system employed in the university library was an operation similar to the one in Love Memorial Library; the method used in the study was less thorough, however. Data in regard to the reserve books were tabulated once a week from filled charge cards. At the end of the twelve weeks, information from a sampling (every sixth title) supplemented the weekly tabulations. The statistics were surprising and did not support

the hypothesis that reserve books figure largely in the art students' use of library art books.

Despite the limitations of this less extensive study, some statistics do reinforce those of the Nebraska team. The filled charge cards showed 667 circulations; the cards of the sample titles showed 269 circulations. Total reserve loans recorded were 936. There were 700 titles (1,060 volumes) on reserve, a fact which suggests that each title (but certainly not every volume) could have been circulated once.

Comparable to the Nebraska study are the statistics tabulated from the sample examined. In the sample (every sixth title), cards of 117 titles provided information. These 117 titles, as I have said, circulated 269 times or 2.3 per title. Compare 2.3 with the 6.4/7.7 checkouts per title as can be calculated in Table 1—here, however, extrapolation makes a truer comparison bringing the 2.3 close to the 6.4 when the length of the period is extended to an academic year.

Sixty-three of the 117 (or 53.8 percent) had not been charged during the twelve weeks. Compare 53.8 with the average 37.5 percent in Table 3 of the Carmack-Loeber report. Of the fifty-four sample titles that did circulate only fifteen were charged over five times (27.7 percent as compared with the 13/14 percent that circulated 4-8 times as in Table 2 of the Nebraska study).

The data from the art book reserve investigation disclosed so little use that I concluded (as did Frank Lundy in his brief early report in *Library Journal* of the Nebraska study) that there is a huge gap between the professors' teaching methods and his students' study habits; that placing 1,060 volumes on reserve is an expensive process, one that should be revised or perhaps discontinued; and that faculty members not only should be more selective but also should encourage greater use of their reserve requests.

I would say the findings of the 1968-69 Nebraska use study are *not* unique, and I would agree that library reserve programs do need reevaluating.

(Mrs.) Mary Jane Gibson
Head of the Library
Rochelle Township High School
Rochelle, Illinois