

Sarah K. Vann
Professor, School of Information and
Library Studies
State University of New York
at Buffalo

COOPERATION BETWEEN DIFFERENT TYPES OF LIBRARIES IN TECHNICAL SERVICES

The potency of the melding of the terms *cooperation*, *between types of libraries*, and *technical services* requires some awareness of the ingredients before a comment can be made concerning the effect of such a melding. It seems appropriate, therefore, first to formulate some definitions, and then to survey statewide centralized processing services and state library involvement—in action and as anticipated through some of the recommendations and plans being made.

Definition of Terms

Cooperation in technical services has tended to be identified with centralized processing which is essentially a coined phrase combining two quite distinct concepts, processing and centralization, the latter of which is generally dependent on cooperation. The words to be defined are: processing, centralization, cooperation, and human resource involvement.

Processing designates services relating to acquisition and analyses of resources and the recording of data for the use of a library's public. It may encompass one or more of the following phases of service: a) selection (in an advisory or almost compulsory plan); b) acquisition/ordering (of all or certain kinds of materials); c) analyses of content, descriptive and subject (whatever the format); d) recording of data (whatever the technology employed); and e) finishing details (pocketing, pasting, etc.).

When processing services are limited to analyses of content, descriptive and subject, and the recording of and dispersal of appropriate data, a more precise definition is information flow or information data services.

Centralization implies unification of variants of some kind for the anticipated achievement of a common goal—and in the present definition—a goal of processing centrally within the limitations of one or more of the phases of services earlier identified.

The recipients of such processing services may include one or more types of libraries such as public, school, academic, special, and/or information centers and/or also may be:

- a) Part of one autonomous library and its array of branches, units, special departments, etc.
- b) One of a cluster of autonomous libraries of uni- or multi- type which share a common product.
- c) A library within a system/district/county/regional structuring of public libraries as in California, New York, and Pennsylvania.
- d) A library, local or regional, wherein the state has assumed a responsibility for technical services as in Georgia and Hawaii.
- e) A library in one state reaching across state boundaries and barriers to participate in a centralized processing program in another state, as in Delaware.

Cooperation, according to *The Random House Dictionary*, is defined as: "1. an act or instance of working together for a common purpose or benefit; joint action. 2. more or less active assistance from a person, association, etc. . . . 3. willingness to cooperate."¹

Also it is inevitable, because of its elusiveness, that personalized definitions will continue to be given for cooperation. With less ambiguity than that illustrated in the dictionary, an experienced director of more than one centralized processing program has offered the following view: "I have found that the word 'cooperation' is one with which all librarians profess to agree, but to which, in reality, they render only 'lip service.' Cooperation is fine for the other fellow but 'in my library it just can't be done that way.' "

Equally difficult to define is the spirit of cooperation with which the search for and acceptance of centralization are imbued—both the responsibility assumed by an agency offering centralized services and the responsibility accepted by the recipient of the services. This may be called the human resource aspect in contrast to the technical resource aspect. It is, in the end, far more pervasive, far more deterministic than any other factor involved, however sophisticated the technology.

The human resource involvement in centralized processing and response to that involvement have been reported in a 1967 study of the view of seventy-five member/recipient libraries.² Of the total, sixty-two or 82.7 percent, indicated that upon joining the center with which each was associated, each had agreed to accept the centralized services as defined in agreements, manuals, and the like, prepared by the center. In twelve instances the agreement had been principle only while one indicated that no agreement had been made.

Yet, of the sixty-two libraries, thirty-seven, or 60 percent, reported that they accepted the data on catalog cards without change. The multiplicity of reasons given for the necessity for making changes were divided into those relating to local adaptations and to criticisms of cataloging by centers. With such evidence, it seems timely to inquire if there has not been a bit of self-delusion in identifying a library's association with a processing center as truly cooperative.

SURVEY OF STATEWIDE CENTRALIZED PROCESSING SERVICES AND STATE LIBRARY INVOLVEMENT

Centralized Processing Services in States

Because of the need for the latest information on activities within states, a letter was sent in the summer of 1968 to forty-nine of the fifty state libraries. The fiftieth state, Illinois, was represented at this Institute by Margaret Shreve, administrator of the Book Processing Center, Oak Park, who offered some penetrating and practical observations. The extraordinary response to the inquiry by forty-two of the states, or 87 percent, implies a nationwide interest in the program of this Institute and in the decisions yet to be made by the librarians of Illinois.

The Profile. The profile of centralized activities within the technical services area is limited to thirty-four states since eight indicated that they offered no centralized processing services. The centralized activities of the thirty-four states are as follows:

<i>Centralized activities</i>	<i>Number of states</i>
Centralized processing services for:	
College libraries only	1
School libraries only	2
Public libraries only	12
Regional libraries only	3
Centralized processing services for more than one type of library.	16
	Total 34

The profile, if further delineated, would reveal variations among the centralized processing programs. For such information, Illinois librarians are invited to make a thorough and critical study of the data included in the *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study*, published by the Pennsylvania State Library in 1967.³ It is an appraisal, accurate as of 1966, of the then known existing programs and/or centers and includes data relating to characteristics such as: 1) legal and financial, 2) internal organization and activity, 3) membership, 4) physical environment, and 5) internal activities within a center.

Multi-type Library Membership

The sixteen states which noted in their responses that centralized processing centers in their states have multi-type library membership can be identified readily but without comment on the extent or quality of the services as follows: California, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

This represents a significant increase when compared to the four which included public and school libraries in their membership in 1965. In that year

the Missouri State Library made a "Survey of Processing Centers" to which twenty-five centers responded. Of that number, thirteen centers identified their membership as public library only while four, as earlier stated, included public and school libraries.⁴ Membership in the twenty-three centers as of the date of the Missouri survey follow:

<i>Type of library membership</i>	<i>Number of centers (as of 1965)</i>
Public (including city, county, and regional)	13
Public and school	4
Public and state agencies	2
Public and college/university	2
Public, school, and academic	1
Public and some institutions	1
Total	23

Thus, while the majority of those responding included only one type, the reality of multi-type library involvement is evident. The responses support the view of Mary Lee Bundy's 1962 study on *Public Library Processing Centers: a Report of a Nationwide Survey* wherein fourteen centers "commented on the desirability of keeping membership limited to similar types of libraries."⁵

Among centers which have included public and school libraries as recipients of their services are: the Pinal County Free Library of Arizona, the State Catalog Service of Georgia, the State Library of Hawaii, the Wayne County Library System of Michigan, and the Library Services Center of Eastern Ohio.

There has been some objection to such an extension of service, for example, one member library expressed resentment to "non-member" participation by school libraries because:

non-member schools receive custom cataloging—in that their children's books are cataloged more according to Wilson headings and numbers I believe that members' orders should take precedence over non-members.⁶

Although a few college libraries have contracted for processing services, they have for the most part thus far expressed little enthusiasm for such projects. Examples of college libraries which are or have been participants may be found in Ohio, where the State Library reported that its processing services had been extended to the Dayton Branch of the Ohio State University and Miami University; in California, where the Monterey Peninsula College Library participates in the Monterey County Library program and, as of 1968, the Black Gold Cooperative Library System of Ventura which welcomed one college library; and in New York, where the Nioga Library System contracted with two local academic institutions and found itself compelled to implement policies which differed from those for its public library membership. As of 1968 the future of the Nioga relationship was reported as uncertain.

Of the centers which include multi-type library membership, two, Georgia and Hawaii, represent statewide programs. Brief extracts from their recent annual reports suggest the contributions each is making. In Georgia, the scope of services, while not so identified, is information flow in that catalog data—sets of catalog cards only—have been furnished for library books purchased through the State Department of Education if the titles are requested on current purchase orders from school or public libraries. In the annual report of 1967/68 of the *Georgia State Catalog Service*, the statewide service was

<i>Distribution by type of library</i>	<i>Number of sets of catalog cards distributed, 1967/68</i>
To public libraries	71,292
To school libraries	298,131
Total sets distributed	369,423

Of the total sets distributed, 6,432 were for titles cataloged during the year of the report.⁷

In Hawaii, the Hawaii State Library, under the direction of James R. Hunt, formerly of the Wayne County Library System, has introduced a statewide program which includes all the book requests from forty-five public libraries and about 250 school libraries. In the annual report for 1966/67, the Centralized Processing Center reported that 49,132 titles were processed for the two types of libraries with the following distribution:

<i>Type of library</i>	<i>New titles processed</i>	<i>Added titles processed</i>
Public	11,186	15,658
School	5,372	16,916

Both musical scores and phonorecords were included as new and added titles. Because of duplication of titles acquired by both types of libraries, the total of new and added titles was actually 34,059. Of that total, 9,338 were identified as new adult and juvenile titles.⁸

The State Librarian has made the following evaluation of his program:

We believe our Centralized Processing Center is the largest in the country. We also believe that we are the most efficient. . . . We do anticipate that for the current fiscal year the Centralized Processing Center will handle over 400,000 volumes. We had hoped to reach that figure last year, however, we had many setbacks—the most critical being a flooding of the entire Center which destroyed approximately \$85,000 worth of material. Therefore, our production only reached 318,000 volumes.⁹

State Library Involvement

While the profile as sketched has noted the multi-type library membership of two state programs, little reference has been made to the rapid

involvement of state libraries with centralized processing programs. Yet, so extensive is its participation, that the time is seemingly near for the inevitable demise of the autonomously structured or the neo-departmentally structured center unless such a program can become a part of a statewide systems program being financed in part or in whole by state and federal funds. While state libraries have not sought the responsibility—indeed many have had such “greatness” thrust upon them—the position of strength has resulted from the routing of federal monies for library services through state libraries.

The *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study* noted that the range of participation of state libraries in centralized processing extended, “From the nothingness of some states to the recently launched ambitious program of the Texas State Library which as of July 1, 1965, inaugurated an automatic data processing program as a pilot project of the State Library under the Libraries Services and Construction Act.”¹⁰ Brief references to the activities of fourteen additional state libraries—in the states of California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wyoming—are made in the *Study*. Of these, only the State Library of Idaho reported the dissolution, as of 1965, of its centralized book processing because the service, according to the state plan, would be dispersed among the proposed six regional library systems.¹¹

Such assignment to the proposed system libraries was, at the time, imitative of the existing systems program in New York State. Even at that time, however, New York State was seeking a solution to the excessive fragmentation of duplicative processing activities among its systems by the possible creation of one cataloging and acquisition center for all its public libraries.

Though the Texas State Library soon after the completion of the *Study* phased out its centralized processing center, the observation in the *Study* that “the State Library towers currently . . . as a centrifugal force in coordinating a processing program” continues to characterize statewide planning. That some concern about the future was being expressed can be found in the slightly prescient warning that accompanied that observation: “Even as State Libraries assume more active roles, one State Library staff member has cautioned about and questioned the wisdom of centering the program in a State Library because of the political structure and budgetary pressures which generally affect processing before [it affects] public service functions.”¹² As of 1968 similar warning signals have emanated from two additional states wherein the state library has been offering some form of centralized processing services.

That state libraries have become involved has thus been demonstrated. Of historical importance may be the factors which have invited or compelled such action and, of current import, whither the multi-type library membership commitment.

Origins of State Library Involvement

Originally centralized and widely varied processing centers and/or programs emerged as valiant, determined efforts to achieve what has been called a “calculated interdependence.”¹³ In many of these, survival was made possible

by the timely assistance of the federal government which routed monies through an intermediary—the state library—rather than directly to the indigent.

Activated by such pressures and incentives as instant affluence, broadened but ill-defined responsibilities for planning, and by personnel crises, state librarians requested the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education to sponsor a conference on statewide planning. Such a conference was held in 1965, the papers and discussion of which may be found in *Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries*.¹⁴

An obvious corollary to the concept of statewide planning is the extension of that planning to all types of libraries. This would be particularly reflected in planning, which is always futuristic in contrast to implementing, which is always present, and sometimes perfect, although occasionally imperfect. Thus, in Lowell Martin's paper on "Principles of Statewide Planning," the librarian advised that "A statewide library plan by definition and by necessity should look forward to an interrelated program among all types of libraries."¹⁵ Such an omni-principle might have sounded somewhat ominous had the word cooperative been used rather than interrelated, though the latter clearly implies a reciprocal relationship. While it has been shown earlier that some centralized processing centers/programs had extended their services to more than one type of library, the reasons for so doing had rarely been accompanied, other than at the state library level, by meditations on statewide responsibilities, interrelated programs among the types of libraries, or, indeed, on cooperative goals. Nevertheless, whether recent emphasis on statewide planning has been a casual or a concomitant factor, recommendations are being made for statewide centralization of aspects of technical services for multi-type library membership.

Statewide Recommendations

The contents of *Statewide Library Surveys and Development Plans: An Annotated Bibliography, 1956-1967*¹⁶ attest to the continuing search by state libraries and other agencies for solutions to the problems inherent in statewide planning. The bibliography was designed purposefully for the following two reasons: (1) to indicate the present status of statewide library planning, and (2) to serve as a guide for those who are involved in statewide planning or who might wish to see examples of what has been done.¹⁷

While the studies vary in scope, perception, and recommendations, the commonality both of the problems identified and of the surveyors used is readily apparent. There is at least one study cited for forty-four of the fifty states and for New York State, twenty-eight studies are cited. The six states not represented are Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Minnesota, Mississippi, and New Mexico. Since the bibliography was compiled, a study on *Centralized Processing for the State of Florida*¹⁸ has appeared. Therefore, as of November 1968, only five of the fifty states had not made available their recommendations, if any, for statewide development.

The availability of the comprehensive, annotated bibliography on *Statewide Library Surveys and Development Plans* eliminated the need for adding to this paper an inventory of the studies pertaining specifically to centralized

processing. Instead, recommendations as found in officially sponsored studies are to be used as illustrative of the current syndrome. The recommendations, with additional data and observations, have been extracted from studies made for the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Massachusetts, and Florida, all of which were published between 1966 and 1968.

Recommendations for New York State. Studies for New York State, the first major ones to be published following the 1965 conference on statewide, long-range planning, were made by Nelson Associates, Inc., in 1966, when that firm was presumably at its apogee of influence within the state. Among the many Nelson studies are the following three concerned specifically with technical services: *Feasibility of School and College Library Processing Through Library Systems in New York State*; *The Feasibility of Further Centralizing the Technical Processing Operations of the Public Libraries of New York City*; and *Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State*.

While there was an original hypothesis concerning multi-type library involvement in a common centralized processing program, the findings of the *Feasibility of School and College Library Processing* were less than supportive of such an hypothesis or of the encompassing recommendation finally made in *Centralized Processing for Public Libraries* for the creation of one center. The findings and/or recommendations of the three studies are listed below:

1) In the *Feasibility of School and College Library Processing*, of the forty-three systems expressing a preference as to type of processing facility, thirty-three, or 77 percent, chose one which would serve school libraries alone. Forty-seven public school systems responded to the question concerning an advantage in centralization on a statewide basis as follows:

<i>Response</i> ¹⁹	<i>Public School Systems Responding</i>	
	Number	Percent
Saw an advantage in centralization of acquisition and processing on a statewide basis	34	72%
Saw no advantage	12	26%
Said any advantage would depend on the way in which such an operation was organized	1	2%

Similarly, of the forty college libraries indicating a preference for the scope of membership for a centralized processing program, thirty-three, or 82.5 percent, preferred a center for college libraries only. Of the eighty-nine colleges to which the Nelson inquiry was sent, forty-nine, or 60 percent, responded to the question concerning an advantage in centralization on a statewide basis. The response was as follows:

<i>Response</i> ²⁰	<i>College Libraries</i> Number	<i>Responding</i> Percent
Saw an advantage in centralization of acquisition and processing on a statewide basis	28	72%
Saw no advantage	21	43%

On the basis of these preferences, it can only be concluded that neither school nor college libraries were seeking an alignment or an interrelationship with a multi-type library centralized processing program in New York State.

2) In the *Feasibility* study relating to the three vast public libraries of New York City, the major recommendation was that "a single cataloging center is proposed to meet the needs of the three public libraries of New York City."²¹

3) Meanwhile, almost simultaneously, the third Nelson study appeared on *Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State* which recommended that, "For cataloging and acquisitions, one center is proposed to meet all the public library needs of the state, including those of New York City."²²

The confusion which the apparently contradictory recommendations could have generated was lessened by the addition of a final recommendation in the New York City study that, "The proposals contained in this report should not be construed as a recommendation that the three libraries of New York City exclude themselves from plans for further centralization of processing among the 22 public library systems of New York State."²³

There was lacking, then, in the first major recommendation for one center in New York State that it serve multi-type libraries. Despite the preferences indicated both by school and college libraries, however, Nelson Associates recommended without reference to its own findings that, "The reorganized processing and cataloging arrangements should at first serve only the public libraries of the state. Only after the system is operating smoothly should consideration be given to accepting the added volume and other complications implicit in serving other constituencies such as the school libraries."²⁴

Since 1966 the systems and State Library have moved quickly toward exploring the formation of one center through the creation of the Association of New York State Libraries for Technical Services, for which a director was appointed in 1968. Deliberate speed seemingly will characterize the implementation of the recommendation that one center be established to meet all the needs of the public libraries in the state.

Currently Arthur D. Little, Inc., looms large in making New York State Library studies, one of which, *A Plan for a Library Processing Center for the State University of New York*, appeared in 1967. While at least one review advised rejecting the plan because of its superficial qualities, the future of the recommendations remains speculative.²⁵

A second Arthur D. Little study also appeared in 1967 and was again limited to a uni-type library. The study, *A Centralized Processing System for School Libraries in New York State*, endorsed the findings of the Nelson study

that school libraries should be involved in a centralized program involving more than one type of library. The recommendation made, however, was that "administrative responsibility for a School Ordering, Cataloging, and Processing (SLOCAP) System" be assigned to the Bureau of School Libraries, New York State Department of Education.²⁶ The study outlined alternative methods of implementation which could relate the school programs with those either of the public libraries (Association of New York State Libraries for Technical Libraries) or the as yet indeterminate program for the State University of New York.

Amid a bewildering array of such studies and recommendations, to which others could be added, the New York Library Systems structure continues to be remarkably vital, flexible, self-critical, and adventurous, but not yet ready for a commitment to a statewide centralized processing center serving multi-type libraries.

Recommendations for Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania, at the same time the Nelson studies were being made for New York State, the Free Library of Philadelphia had requested that a feasibility study be made, the main purpose of which was, "To consider acquisition and centralized processing specifically in terms of service to the Philadelphia Library District, and the potentials for service on a larger service area basis."²⁷

The study, which was adopted as a project under the approved Pennsylvania State Plan for the use of Federal Library Services and Construction Act funds, and completed in 1966, includes as a major part an appraisal of some existing programs and/or centers, the findings of which influenced directly the conclusions, the recommendations made to the Philadelphia District Library, and the supplementary recommendations made for a statewide program.

The conclusion was that the Philadelphia Library District should not create a centralized processing center for its district alone but rather "That a coordinated plan for a state-wide centralized cataloging and classification program for public libraries should be initiated."²⁸

The major recommendation, implying that progress toward such a coordinated plan could be made rather promptly, suggested that the Philadelphia District Library propose that the Pennsylvania State Library: "(A.) Create and subsidize two centralized cataloging and classification centers for public libraries in specified geographic areas. . . (and,) (B.) Designate each District choosing to contract for the service, as an arterial unit of the cataloging and classification center."²⁸ Among the duties delineated for each district was the completion of the physical processing of all materials cataloged and classified for the libraries in each district.

While it was beyond the scope of the study to make recommendations to the State Library, two supplementary recommendations proposed that centralized cataloging and classification service or a full processing program be created for academic libraries throughout the state and that a similar centralized processing program be created for school libraries. Since it would have been premature to proceed further with the supplementary recommendations, no procedures for their implementation and no patterns of interrelationships among the programs were proposed in the *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study*. From the recommendations themselves, however, it can be

concluded that the creation of one center serving multi-type libraries was not envisioned as an immediate panacea for the state.

Responses to the recommendation concerning centralized processing for the districts of Pennsylvania have been guarded. Meanwhile, even as a special committee within the state has been considering the recommendations, some of the district libraries, far less prepared than the Philadelphia District Library (the Free Library of Philadelphia) as to resources, staff, and services, have proceeded to offer centralized processing to their member libraries.

In contrast, then, to the developments in New York State where the original plan which fostered centralized processing programs for nineteen of the twenty-two systems has been appraised and found wanting, in Pennsylvania the opposite view has emerged. While the major recommendation for the creation of at least two information flow centers with arterial outlets for the completion of processing details was made to avoid the duplicative programs found in New York State by serving as a deterrent to unilateral district decisions, a preference for district structuring of processing centers has tended to flourish. As of 1968, however, according to the Pennsylvania State Library, the question was not *if* the recommendations were to be implemented but *how best*.

Recommendations for Louisiana. A comprehensive evaluation of the total program of library service and library education made for the Louisiana Library Association by John A. Humphry and James Humphry III, appeared in 1968. Specific recommendations in the technical services area can be extracted for the three types of libraries: parish and public, school, and academic.²⁹

For parish and public libraries the consultants endorsed a feasibility study made earlier by Marvin W. Mounce that a centralizing processing service for parish and public libraries be established by the State Library. They presented, however, an alternative plan differing from that of Mounce who had recommended a center performing complete processing in that they envisioned decentralization of final processing operations to the library centers of the seven systems which they had recommended for the state.³⁰

For school libraries the consultants recommended that: "There be established a state-wide cataloging center for the school libraries under the supervision and administration of the State Supervisor of School Libraries."³¹

For academic libraries the recommendation for college and university libraries including the special libraries of the state was similar to that for school libraries in that it proposed the establishment of a statewide cataloging center. In addition, the consultants anticipated that the "Materials processing centers recommended for each of the seven Library Systems could be utilized by academic libraries as well as by parish libraries."³²

Like the Pennsylvania recommendations, these for Louisiana envision at least three centers for cataloging and classification by type of library and specifically recommend decentralization of actual processing services to the seven systems when established. The Louisiana recommendation for a coordination of processing services for both academic and parish libraries represents a minimal level of multi-type library service not identified in the Pennsylvania study.

As of late 1968, the Louisiana State Library had assumed the initiative in seeking to implement the recommendation for a centralized processing program for a few parish libraries on an experimental basis.

Recommendations for Massachusetts. A recommendation for a total library network challenged the Bureau of Library Extension of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with the appearance in 1967 of a report entitled *Library Planning Study*.³³ More encompassingly, the report concluded with a projection into the future for the establishment of a New England Regional Library Center. Among the recommendations was that the proposed network: "Create a State Library Service Center, responsible for centralized ordering, cataloging, and processing and the maintenance of a union catalog and union list of serials, which would serve all libraries in the state."³⁴ It was further recommended that three regional headquarters be created for cataloging and processing services "under the direct supervision of the Bureau of Library Extension and coordinated with the State Library Service Center"—the latter of which would centralize all ordering.

Clarification of the responsibilities of the State Library Center and regional headquarters was made in relation to public libraries through a recommendation outlining the procedures in the following manner:

libraries send book orders to the State Library Service Center, which, in turn, will send orders to the vendors. Because of geographical considerations, vendors will be asked to deliver to the three regional service centers. While the regional service centers are waiting for the books, the state center will prepare catalog cards (using MARC tapes when they become available) according to acceptable library standards. . . . These cards will then be either sent to the regional service center or, more likely, printed out on small supporting units at the regional service centers. When the books arrive, they will be processed by the regional service center, matched with the appropriate cards, and sent to the ordering libraries.³⁵

With an extension of the services to "all libraries," a commitment to a multi-type library technical service program was thus proposed for the state. Beyond the initial proclamation, however, the report is vague about the attainment of such a service. The following generalized comments from the report concerning college and university libraries, school libraries, and special libraries suggest instead an aura of futurity with such phrases as "will probably want to be encouraged," and "may take part."

Regarding college and university libraries the report states: "Small colleges with limited staff and funds will probably want to take part in this aspect (centralized ordering, cataloging, and processing) of the state library network. Participation would be coordinated through regional offices of the State Library Service Center."³⁶

Concerning school libraries the report states: "In school libraries, use of time for book processing is a critical factor, since the library staff often consists of one librarian and, perhaps, one or two student aids." Consequently, a recommendation was made that, "School libraries be encouraged to use the State Library Service Center. The three regional processing centers for all types of

libraries will serve the schools. Orders again would be sent to the state center; books would be received, cataloged, processed, and sent out from the appropriate regional office."³⁷ It was advised that the service be limited to book materials only until the procedures had been tested; later non-book materials were to be added.

The report states that, "Special libraries may take part in the processing activities of the State Service Center, but this would probably be only for standard publications."³⁸ The report noted, however, that "in its later stages, the center may be able to handle government publications and other specialized material, which would be of value to special libraries."³⁸

Other Types of Libraries

Recommendations for involvement of other types of libraries in the centralized processing program, specifically libraries for the institutionalized and the handicapped were less readily made because the need was less evident when balanced against other internal difficulties and limitations. Since the report surveyed the services of these libraries, however, the following extracts indicate the attention given to technical services and the recommendations that appeared realistic.

Library Services to the Institutionalized. While problems of definitions of function; administrative authority; budgets; staff; collections and continuing acquisitional programs; non-written materials and special equipment; and reference services and bibliotherapy required extensive analysis, technical service problems were minor because many of the collections consisted of donations and discards from other institutions for which minimal cataloging must have been done. Moreover, the thousands of paperbacks which characterize many institutional collections were not cataloged.

Because of the reality of the situation, it was recommended that professional guidance be offered at the state level. The report specifically recommended that two staff positions be created for specialists in institutional libraries within the Bureau of Library Extension. Among the duties delineated for the specialists was: "Maintain liaison with the State Library Service Center to make available to institutional libraries the materials available through the ILL network and reference program."³⁹

Library Services to the Handicapped. While many organizations serve the handicapped, there are in Massachusetts only two involved with library services: the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind, and Perkins Institute, Watertown. The report concentrated, therefore, on a survey of the handicapped in Massachusetts and of their unique needs for materials and resources. Again, as for the institutional library, technical services were of minor consequence; instead, the following recommendations were made:

That all special materials, other than Braille, be located at the three regional resource centers in the state, which now serve public libraries but will eventually serve all types of libraries. . . .

The Bureau of Library Extension should maintain a catalog of all library resources for the handicapped which are held in the state. . . .

This catalog should be reproduced and distributed to all local librarians.⁴⁰

The Massachusetts study recommended in a somewhat more cavalier fashion than did the New York State study that a centralized processing program be created for multi-type library service. There was throughout the report, however, a lessening of emphasis on such a scope and, finally, in the suggested time schedule proposed, centralized processing would begin on a limited basis in the third year after the initial implementation, if any, of the report. Such planning would permit the state to "build staff at Bureau of Library Extension and newly created State Library Center" and to "build system design and program for computer operations."⁴¹

Recommendations for Florida. Unlike the situation in the states previously described, Florida has had a Book Processing Center administered by the Director of the Albertson Public Library of Orlando under a contract between the Orlando Public Library Board and the State Library Board dated November 30, 1961, and amended July 1, 1965. The Center, as of 1968, was serving seventeen library systems in thirty-two of Florida's sixty-seven counties. While the State Library has subsidized processing costs on a decreasing scale for new county and regional libraries, many libraries were not using the services of the Center. The Florida State Library, therefore, financed a study to explore these questions:

Is the present center efficient?

What are the needs—present and future in regard to centralized processing in the state?

How many centers should there be? If more than one appears necessary, what relationships should exist between or among the centers?

What relationships will the State Library have to whatever processing complex is adopted?⁴²

While the conclusion was that "the present Center is operating about as efficiently as can be expected of it,"⁴³ the following recommendations were made that:

- 1) The Center should be administered by the State Library or be incorporated as a separate agency from the Orlando Public Library with the State Library acting in an advisory position.
- 2) There is need for a much larger centralized processing effort to be mounted in the State of Florida.
- 3) The Center should offer the following services:
 - cataloging only
 - full processing
 - ordering but no processing.⁴⁴

As in the Massachusetts study, a recommendation for multi-type library processing services was added: "Processing should be offered to all public libraries and after an initial growth period has elapsed, school libraries and community colleges as well."⁴⁴ While no further reference is made in the study to the

possible length of "an initial growth period" or to the actual involvement of school and community college libraries, the consultant firm estimated that with the administrative system proposed, the Center would be able "to cope with 500,000 volumes per year—ordered, cataloged, and processed."⁴⁵

As of December 1968, the State Librarian chose between the two obvious and commonly known alternatives concerning the future administration of the Center and endorsed the recommendation that the Center "be administered by the State Library."⁴⁶ In so doing, the State Librarian reversed a decision made by one of his predecessors which had predestined the structuring of the Center in Orlando as it had existed.⁴⁷

THE FUTURE AS VIEWED BY STATE LIBRARIES

The responses being made in the five states to the recommendations and the recommendations themselves, briefly summarized in the preceding section, imply that the trend is indeed toward statewide centralization of technical services. Of the forty-two state libraries which provided data on centralized processing developments within their states, thirty-one, or 74 percent indicated that they were concerned with planning for the future. Twelve of the state libraries noted that they had had some kind of feasibility study made or were currently involved with such a study.

The following developments, reported by six state libraries, typify the variant approaches being made to the rapidly solidifying concept of statewide centralized processing. The innovative and personalized adaptations which characterize the approaches offer assurance that, despite the conformal and repetitive recommendations found in many of the surveys and feasibility studies, the state libraries assert individualized and viable leadership in planning both as to scope of technical service programs and to type of library or libraries for which the service is to be available.

While the California State Library Processing Center now serves public libraries only, plans are being made for the establishment of an automated center for cooperative cataloging and for serials control. The services of the center are to be available to any type of library. A pilot project is scheduled to begin in 1970.

The Connecticut State Library is planning the establishment of a centralized processing center initially for public libraries only. Ultimately, the services of the center are to be available "to any in-state library."⁴⁸

The Hawaii State Library, in part because of unique environmental factors, has been more successful than any state in its near instant implementation of its plans for centralization of complete processing of materials, book and nonbook, for public and school libraries. Aware of the success, the State Librarian, having concluded that "cooperation is at its maximum" within his state boundaries, seeks to extend his program beyond Hawaii's shores, for, according to him, he has been actively

negotiating with the Territory of Guam, the American Trust Territory, and with American Samoa to see if we cannot cooperate with them, or they with us, in the purchasing and processing of books. . . . Hopefully,

in fiscal 1969, we will have a Pan Pacific processing center in operation.⁴⁸

Should the plan become operative, Hawaii will be able to demonstrate to the mainland states the potential of planning within flexible geographical perimeters—beyond inflexible state boundaries.

The Minnesota State Library is contemplating the development of statewide cooperative activities between types of libraries, especially through the use of a union catalog and book catalogs.

The Nevada State Library now has as one of its divisions in operation the Nevada Center for Cooperative Library Services. The Center encourages multi-type library participation through its services to public, school, and institutional libraries. The services are available to any library to the extent that facilities permit.

The Washington State Library plans to produce book catalogs of member libraries within designated geographical areas. Acceptance of centralized cataloging services is, however, to be optional.

While it would be possible, though perhaps presumptive, to make recommendations to the state of Illinois on the basis of the evidence presented, it is necessary that the self-appraisal be made by Illinois librarians themselves. It seems appropriate, therefore, to conclude with questions which, it is hoped, will generate answers and further probing by a state exploring its commitment to a multi-type library membership in a centralized technical services program.

The following questions relate to: 1) establishing an inquiry concerning statewide centralization of technical services, 2) characteristics of centralized technical service programs, 3) the member library in a statewide network, 4) the center/centers in a statewide network, 5) membership, 6) human resource adaptability/technological feasibility, and 7) beyond statewide involvement.

QUESTIONS

1. *Toward an inquiry concerning statewide centralization of technical services*

a. What can be learned from a study of statewide library surveys and recommendations that have already been made?

b. What has been the repetitive pattern both in selection of the surveyors and of the recommendations made thus far?

c. Has the time come for librarians in a state to challenge the traditional acclamation for the objectivity represented by impersonalism? Is it better to be biased for sound reasons than purposefully vacuous?

d. Should a self-analysis—not just for technical services but for a comprehensive statewide program—be made by librarians within a state, by consultants within the profession, or by commercial firms?

2. *Characteristics of centralized technical service programs*

a. *Scope* — What should be the scope of services to be offered?

1) Acquisition

- 2) Acquisition and cataloging data (information data)
 - 3) Acquisition, cataloging data, processing, and delivery
 - 4) Cataloging data (information data)
 - 5) Cataloging data, processing, and delivery
 - 6) Other
- b. *Kinds of materials*
- 1) Should the center assume responsibility for all materials whatever the format?
 - 2) Should the center limit its services to *book* format?
 - 3) Should there be a progressive extension of services to include all formats?
 - 4) What is the consequence if the center does not assume responsibility for all formats?
 - 5) If a local library must or does retain a catalog department, what should be its relationship with the center?
 - 6) What kinds of materials could be acquired by member libraries without the necessity of maintaining a separate catalog department?
- c. *Selection of library resources*
- 1) To what extent should the center become involved with selection?
 - 2) Is there any advantage of simultaneous ordering of the same title by member libraries? Does the advantage outweigh the possible disadvantages?
- d. *Analysis*
- 1) Should a new level of analysis of content be considered or is the present level satisfactory?
 - 2) Does the computer make possible—for the first time—the reality of more detailed analysis of the content of resources for multi-type use?
 - 3) If member libraries are not willing to accept a common policy for descriptive analysis, subject headings, and classification, should further self-appraisal be made by such a member library before participating?
- e. *Catalog data*
- 1) Enumerate the advantages and disadvantages of book and card catalog formats.
 - 2) Should a book catalog format be preferred as a psychological deterrent to the compulsion to tinker with data on a 3" x 5" catalog card?
 - 3) What new formats for recording and making data available are emerging which may make obsolete both the book and card catalog formats?

- 4) Should emphasis in member libraries be first on the data and secondly on the techniques for recording?

f. *Responsibility for resource availability*

- 1) Does the center or the member library assume responsibility for maintaining the card catalog, the book catalog, or the inventory of local resources?
- 2) Does statewide planning assume statewide availability of resources?
- 3) What liaison relationships can be established between/among member libraries and the center?

3. *The member library in a statewide network*

a. What are the advantages and disadvantages inherent in the acceptance of centralized technical services by an autonomous local library? By a local library as a member of a system?

b. If abandonment of certain local policies is considered a disadvantage, to what extent is adhering to such policies a fetish rather than reasonable?

c. What responsibilities could be transferred readily to a center and what must the member library retain?

d. What relations would involvement in a statewide network foster between a local library and the State Library?

e. What would be the new administrative structuring and new positions created within a library which could abandon completely or re-design its technical services department?

f. What new or expanded services are to be offered by a local library which can allocate time formerly devoted to technical services to such new services? If none have been anticipated, is a library ready for participation?

g. What are the philosophical and pragmatic reasons which would prompt or deter a library's participation in a centralized processing program?

4. *The center/centers in a statewide network*

a. What effect will the decision concerning the scope of centralized services have on the organization and administration of a center or centers?

- b. Does technological expertise make passé' the necessity of *total* processing within a center?
 - c. Would one center performing complete processing be preferable to one concerned with acquisition and information flow?
 - d. If processing outlets/depots are scattered throughout a state, what should be the administrative relations to the center and to each member library?
 - e. In a state with a developed library systems structure, what problems emerge if each system which originally offered centralized processing to its members seeks to implement a recommendation for fewer—perhaps one—center in a state?
 - f. What problems, administrative, organizational, financial, staffing, are to be encountered in statewide planning for one or more centers?
 - g. What are to be the responsibility and involvement of the state library in statewide planning such as for centralization of technical services?
5. *Membership*
- a. What factors contributed to the original planning of centers for uni-type libraries?
 - b. Does statewide planning invite/compel consideration of multi-type library membership? Why?
 - c. Have the problems thus far encountered in centralized processing programs limited to *uni*-type library membership been solved?
 - d. Would they have been more readily solved with a *multi*-type library membership?
 - e. Should *multi*-type library membership be sought simultaneously or as the services are proved effective through an extension beyond one type?
 - f. Should *uni*-type library membership centers be created simultaneously but so designed and administered that unification could be attained through progressive phases of interaction?

- g. Could there be centralized administration within a center having divisions for *uni*-type membership sharing common resources, such as bibliographies, MARC tape, computers, etc.?
6. *Human resource adaptability/technological feasibility*
- a. Is technological feasibility enough?
 - b. Should not technological feasibility, however sophisticated the technology, be accompanied by the conventional wisdom that the staffs of member libraries not only be receptive to changes engendered by technology but also creative in exploring new dimensions of reader/user services?
 - c. Should there be a preliminary period for the breaking of barriers, often encrusted with compliance and complacency, which could impede the most brilliantly conceived statewide program?
 - d. If such barriers prove invulnerable, if there is no receptivity, no readiness for a new concept of library services emanating from a local library, can a centralized program really succeed?
7. *Beyond statewide involvement. . .*
- a. Identify the existing subject information network services in the United States.
 - b. Should there be continuing recognition of the potential nationwide linking of information data sources in any current statewide planning?

Some contribution to the "beginnings of a state plan for library services in Illinois" may result from the responses to these and other questions. Whatever the plan, those librarians of Illinois who encounter impediments to its development or are impediments themselves will recognize the enduringly perceptive and pragmatic appraisal of the librarian's readiness for involvement made long ago by Melvil Dewey:

The simple explanation is that many librarians have not yet wakened to understand how great a movement is going on and how rapidly old conditions and standards are giving way to new. They are carried forward by the tide, but not without kicking and splashing; and yet curiously sum of these very people are most self-satisfied to find themselves so far advanced and quite oblivious that every step was taken not from pressure within impelling them to go forward and help the workers but from pressure without. Their hands were tied to the car of progress but other hands gave it its momentum and they instead of dragging it have been

dragged by it. Every great movement is handicapt in this way and we ar happy abuv the average in having only opposition that like a brake on a hevly down grade simply insures that our car runs more stedily, safely, and surely to its goal. We ar stong enuf now to signal "brakes off" or, like the baloonist, to throw out sand bags when we no longer need their ballast.⁴⁹

References

1. "Cooperation." In *Random House Dictionary of the English Language*. New York, Random House. Vol. 3, 1967, p. 321.
2. Vann, Sarah K. "Evaluation of Centers: the Views of Members," *Library Trends*, 16:23-45, July 1967.
3. *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study. Final Report* (Pennsylvania State Library Monograph No. 4). By Sarah K. Vann. Sponsored by the Philadelphia District Library Center (Free Library of Philadelphia. Harrisburg, Department of Public Instruction. Pennsylvania State Library, 1967.
4. For a copy of the questionnarie for the "Survey of Processing Centers in the United States," see *Ibid*, pp. 156-159. For data on membership as noted, see *Ibid.*, p. 57.
5. Bundy, Mary Lee. *Public Library Processing Centers: a Report of a Nationwide Survey*. Troy, N.Y., 1962, p. 40.
6. Quoted in *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study*, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
7. Georgia. State Catalog Service. *Annual Report, 1967-68*. Atlanta, 1968. (Typed copy.)
8. Data from James R. Hunt, State Librarian, Honolulu, Hawaii.
9. Letter of August 12, 1968, from James R. Hunt, State Librarian, Honolulu, Hawaii.
10. *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

13. U.S. Office of Education. *Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries*. Report of Conference (September 19-22, 1965) Chicago, Illinois. Sponsored by Library Services Branch. Edited by Herbert A. Carl. Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1966, p. 50.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

16. Rike, Galen E. *Statewide Library Surveys and Development Plans: an Annotated Bibliography*. Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1968.

17. *Ibid.*, p. v.

18. Florida. State Library. *Centralized Processing for the State of Florida*. Boston, Arthur D. Little, 1968.

19. New York. State Library. *Feasibility of School and College Library Processing Through Public Library Systems in New York State*. A Report for the New York State Library. New York, Nelson Associates, 1966, p. 3.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

21. *The Feasibility of Further Centralizing the Technical Processing Operations of the Public Libraries of New York City*. A survey conducted for the Brooklyn Public Library, the New York Public Library and the Queens Borough Public Library. New York, Nelson Associations in collaboration with the Theodore Stein Company, 1966, p. 1.

22. New York. State Library. *Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State*. A survey conducted for the New York State Library. New York, Nelson Associates in collaboration with the Theodore Stein Company, 1966, p. 1.

23. *The Feasibility of Further Centralizing the Technical Processing Operations of the Public Libraries of New York City*, *op. cit.*, p. ii.

24. New York. State Library. *Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

25. Critical appraisal made by Sarah K. Vann, November 26, 1967. (Unpublished.)

26. New York. Education Department. Bureau of School Libraries. *A Centralized Processing System for School Libraries in New York State*. Report to Bureau of School Libraries, New York State Education Department. Boston, Arthur D. Little, 1967, p. 2.

27. *Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study*, *op cit.*, p. ix.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
29. Louisiana Library Association. *Library Service in Louisiana; Keeping Pace with Progress in the State*. A Report prepared for the Louisiana Library Association, by John A. Humphry and James Humphry III. New York, 1968. For background information on the development of parish libraries, see Chapter iii, "Parish and Public Library Service."
30. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
33. Massachusetts. Bureau of Library Extension. *Library Planning Study*. Report to the Bureau of Library Extension, Department of Education, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Boston, Arthur D. Little, 1967.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
42. Florida State Library. *Centralized Processing in the State of Florida*. Boston, Arthur D. Little, 1968, p. 1.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
46. Telephone conversation with F. William Summers, December 5, 1968.

47. Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study, *op cit.*, p. 35.
48. Responses, slightly paraphrased, to a letter of July 15, 1968.
49. Dewey, Melvil *Library Notes*, 2:288, March 1888.