

NEW ZEALAND Libraries

Volume 43, Number 10

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
June 1982
LIBRARIES

Contents

- 153 Qualified staff in New Zealand libraries 1951-1980
W. J. McEldowney
- 158 Library service at Lincoln College
John A. Frampton
- 160 Serials — who needs them?
K. I. Porter
- 166 Public libraries and recreation management
George Lovell
- 171 Technology and librarians
M. D. Coleman
- 173 Books received
- 174 Reviews

Hon. Editor: Simon Cauchi, Department of Librarianship, Victoria University of Wellington, Private Bag, Wellington.

Editorial contributions (articles, letters, book-reviews, &c.) and books for favour of review should be sent to the Hon. Editor. For further details, see the 'Notes for contributors' in *New Zealand Libraries*, v.43, no.1 (Mar. 1980), p.18.

All opinions expressed in *New Zealand Libraries*, whether in articles, letters, editorials or book-reviews, are those of the individuals concerned. They are not official views of the New Zealand Library Association or of the institutions with which authors are associated unless this is stated.

Published by the New Zealand Library Association (Incorporated), 20 Brandon Street, Wellington (P.O. Box 12-212, Wellington North); typeset by John van Hulst Ltd., Willis Street, Wellington; and printed by Whitcoulls Ltd., Miramar, Wellington.

New Zealand Libraries is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. It is indexed by *Library Literature* and the *Index to New Zealand Periodicals*, and abstracted (selectively) by *Library and Information Science Abstracts*.

All subscription and advertising enquiries should be addressed to the Association's Executive Officer, P.O. Box 12-212, Wellington North.

ISSN 0028-8381

Qualified staff in New Zealand libraries 1951-1980

W. J. McELDOWNEY
Librarian, University of Otago

The most complete, readily available source of information about qualified staff working in New Zealand libraries is contained in the eight successive issues of *Who's Who in New Zealand Libraries*, dated 1951, 1954/5, 1958, 1962, 1967, 1975, and 1980. In 1968 T. B. O'Neill and J. E. Traue published a paper, 'Qualified Librarians in New Zealand', in *New Zealand Libraries* 31: 143-52, in which they tabulated a great deal of information which was useful in depicting trends to that date and confirming or refuting impressions of the kind that are relevant to many aspects of manpower planning. I have recently extended the O'Neill/Traue tables to 1980 and produced a few of my own as well. The complete document is deposited with the Education Committee of the NZLA, from which copies may be obtained. This paper includes the more important tables and some references to others.

The following definitions, assumptions, and caveats should be borne in mind in interpreting the tables:

(a) 'Diploma level' means 'Dip. or Cert.NZLS or equivalent'. 'Equivalent' includes FLA, ALA plus degree, and other overseas qualifications at graduate

level. NZLA Cert. plus degree is not included here.

(b) Where Dip. or Cert. NZLS is dealt with separately, it is shown as 'Dip.NZLS.'

(c) 'Certificate level' means 'NZLA Cert. or equivalent' and includes overseas qualifications which are not at graduate level.

(d) Where NZLA Cert. is dealt with separately, it is shown as 'NZLA Cert.'

(e) Where a person holds more than one library qualification, only the higher one is counted.

(f) Not included are persons without any library qualification and persons not working in libraries in New Zealand.

(g) 'Government' means the National Library and libraries in government departments.

(h) 'Tertiary' covers university, teachers' college, community college, and polytechnic libraries. It also includes the medical libraries in Christchurch and Wellington since the date of their incorporation into the University of Otago system.

(i) The accuracy of the information is affected by the extent to which staff members have complied with requests

Table 1: Qualified librarians working in NZ libraries
Totals by type of library

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
<i>Government</i>								
Diploma level	66	53	6	71	74	100	129	133
Certificate level	11	19	33	49	89	107	115	146
<i>Tertiary</i>								
Diploma level	22	30	27	45	82	114	140	151
Certificate level	5	8	14	19	44	65	80	92
<i>Public</i>								
Diploma level	33	51	52	53	55	67	98	100
Certificate level	19	36	55	71	116	134	165	199
<i>Other</i>								
Diploma level	2	6	5	3	10	24	23	48
Certificate level	—	3	4	9	14	40	48	51
<i>All Libraries</i>								
Diploma level	123	140	150	172	221	305	390	432
Certificate level	35	66	106	148	263	346	408	488

Table 2: Proportion (%) of each group in each type of library

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
<i>Diploma level</i>								
Government	53.7	37.9	44.0	41.4	33.5	32.8	33.1	30.8
Tertiary	17.9	21.4	18.0	26.1	37.1	37.4	35.9	35.0
Public	26.8	36.4	34.7	30.8	24.9	21.9	25.1	23.1
Other	1.6	4.3	3.3	1.7	4.5	7.9	5.9	11.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Certificate level</i>								
Government	31.4	28.8	31.1	33.1	33.9	30.9	28.2	29.9
Tertiary	14.3	12.1	13.2	12.8	16.7	18.8	19.6	18.9
Public	54.3	54.6	51.9	48.0	44.1	38.7	40.4	40.8
Other	—	4.5	3.8	6.1	5.3	11.6	11.8	10.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3: Rates of increase in staffing (Percentages)

	'51- '54/5	'54/5- '58	'58- '62	'62- '67	'67- '71	'71- '75	'75 '80
<i>Diploma level</i>							
Government	-19.6	24.5	7.6	4.2	35.1	29.0	3.1
Tertiary	36.4	-10.0	66.7	82.2	39.0	22.8	7.9
Public	54.5	2.0	1.9	3.8	21.8	46.3	2.0
Other	200.0	-16.7	-40.0	233.3	140.0	-4.2	108.9
Total	13.8	7.1	14.7	28.5	33.5	27.9	10.8
<i>Certificate level</i>							
Government	72.7	73.7	48.5	81.6	20.2	7.5	27.0
Tertiary	60.0	75.0	35.7	131.6	47.7	23.1	15.0
Public	89.5	52.8	29.1	63.4	15.5	23.1	20.6
Other	*	33.3	125.0	55.6	185.7	20.0	6.3
Total	88.6	60.6	39.6	77.7	31.6	17.9	19.6
<i>All qualified staff</i>							
Government	-6.5	37.5	21.2	35.8	27.0	17.9	14.3
Tertiary	40.7	5.3	56.1	96.9	42.1	22.9	10.5
Public	67.3	23.0	15.9	37.9	17.5	30.8	13.7
Other	350.0	—	33.3	100.0	166.7	10.9	39.4
Total	30.4	24.3	25.0	51.3	34.5	22.6	15.3

*nil to 3

to fill in the forms, and also on snap interpretations made in analysing the information. There will be some degree of error, but the trends that emerge are probably not invalidated by it.

Anyone who wishes to do a detailed study of any aspect of professional library manpower will of course need to probe further into more complete records, but the information presented here might be helpful to suggesting profitable lines of enquiry.

Totals and rates of increase

Table 1 gives the number of respondents at each level employed in each group of libraries, and in Table 2 these are converted into percentages, year by year. Table 2 shows the distinctive patterns of staffing development in each group of libraries. The graduate course of the Library School, for instance, was sustained in its first years by positions made available in the National Library Service, which accounts for the high 53.7% of Diploma-level staff in government libraries in 1951. Acceptance of the Diploma lagged a bit in public libraries, while tertiary-education libraries did not begin their burst of development, and hence their need for staff, until the 1960s. The latest growth area is in 'other' libraries, which include business firms and other special libraries outside the public sector.

The early dominance of public libraries at the Certificate level has been modified, mainly by acceptance of the

Certificate in tertiary-education libraries and by the growth of 'other' libraries.

The rates of increase, shown in Table 3, reinforce these conclusions. Note, for instance, the increases, at both Diploma and Certificate levels, in tertiary-education libraries between 1962 and 1967, and the strengthening of Diploma-level staffing in 'other' libraries between 1975 and 1980, when the government, tertiary-education and public libraries were drawing in their belts.

Table 3 shows increases occurring at four or five-yearly intervals. The rates of increase, and variations in them, are shown more dramatically in Table 4, which gives the numbers and the rates of increase from 1962 to 1980.

Table 4: Increases, 1962-1980

	1962	1980	No.	%
<i>Diploma level</i>				
Government	71	133	62	87.3
Tertiary	45	151	106	235.6
Public	53	100	47	88.7
Other	3	48	45	1500.0
Total	172	432	260	151.2
<i>Certificate level</i>				
Government	49	146	97	198.0
Tertiary	19	92	73	384.2
Public	71	199	128	180.3
Other	9	51	42	466.7
Total	148	488	340	229.7
<i>All qualified staff</i>				
Government	120	279	159	132.5
Tertiary	64	243	179	279.7
Public	124	299	175	141.1
Other	12	99	87	725.0
Total	320	920	600	187.5

This period is chosen because it is, for many more senior librarians, the period in which they made their own mark, so that in it they can see the results of their own actions and decisions.

The balance of staff, Diploma: Certificate

One interesting point that emerges from the tables is that the number of Certificate-level staff has increased much more rapidly, in most periods, than the number at the Diploma level. In 1951, there were 123 at Diploma level and 35 at Certificate level, but in 1980 the totals were 432 (Diploma) and 488 (Certificate); this despite the fact that the rate of loss of Certificate-level staff is higher (see Table 15). Tables 5 and 6 are designed to show the changes that have occurred in the balance between the two levels of staffing in the different types of library. An examination of Table 4 shows that between 1962 and 1980 the increase in Certificate-level staff was 1.5 times that of Diploma-level staff. This breaks down as follows:

	Diploma	Certificate
Government	1.0	2.3
Tertiary	1.0	1.6
Public	1.0	2.0
Other	1.0	0.3
Total	1.0	1.5

The Certificate was very much a minority qualification in 1951, but since the mid-1960s numbers at Certificate level have been slightly greater than those at Diploma level. In public libraries, however, Certificates now outnumber Diplomas by two to one, while in tertiary-education libraries they have settled at about three-fifths the level of Diplomas. What constitutes a reasonable balance is likely to vary from one type of library to another. On the one hand, there is a need to ensure that middle levels of responsibility are assigned to people with a good qualification which incorporates solid experience. This would be the level at which many Certificates would be found, and it could be that tertiary-education libraries are not yet making enough use of Certificate-level qualifications. On the other hand, the dominance of Certificates in public libraries suggests that there might be something wrong with public library salary scales and staff classification plans.

The changes that have occurred in the balance between the two levels of qualification are of much more than passing interest. They probably lie at the root of the tensions that have occurred in various places, and at various times, between holders of the different types of qualification, and the type of work that is assigned to each type of staff member can have repercussions elsewhere. It is difficult, for instance, in salary negotiations, to argue for levels of remuneration that imply that high academic qualifications are needed for particular positions if the unkind people with whom one is

negotiating are able to point out that many of them are filled by people who have a library qualification for which the prerequisite is University Entrance, presumably (they would say) to everyone's satisfaction. To make a point of this kind is often taken as evidence of one's prejudice, but it is the kind of point that must be made. I doubt whether very many library managers have given much thought to the consequences of the change of balance that has occurred, or to whether future changes should be controlled.

In saying this, I do not wish to imply that the changes that have occurred so far are all to be deplored. The Certificate level of qualification is, I think, an extremely valuable one, but its value can be tarnished if it is misused. What I am suggesting is that much more thought needs to be given to the type of qualification that is needed at each level of work, and that recruitment programmes might need to be adjusted to ensure that a proper balance is maintained. At the same time, salary scales and staff classification plans also need to be examined critically, because it is no use, for instance, specifying a higher qualification for a particular type of position if the salary has been set with a lower qualification in mind.

Certificate-level staff are generally thought of as being young, but the age structure has changed, and solidified, steadily over the years, while the increased output of the graduate course of the Library School in the last decade or so, coupled with the retirements of older people, has caused a marked change in the age structure at the Diploma level. The proportion (percentage) of respondents aged approximately 40 or over in each return, shown in Table 7, for both the Diploma and Certificate levels, indicates that more than one-third of the staffs at each level have reached their twilight years. This is important, because decisions that are made on the employment and conditions of Certificate-level staff must take into account the fact that many of them do in fact have life-long careers.

Ladies and gentlemen

Tables 8 and 9 show that, at the Diploma level, the balance of the sexes varies markedly from one type of library to another. The increase in the proportion of women is most noticeable in government libraries, while there has been a reversal of earlier trends in public libraries. University libraries have been fairly steady, with a slight margin in favour of women, except for the 1971 count.

The continuing overwhelming predominance of women at the Certificate level raises questions about the public image of librarianship. While a proportion of two to one at the Diploma level is probably a fair indication that professional librarianship is in good heart, it is clear that library assistants' jobs are seen as women's (or girls') work.

Table 5. Ratio of Certificate-level to Diploma-level staff in each type of library
(No. of Certificates ÷ no. of Diplomas)

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
Government	.17	.36	.50	.69	1.20	1.07	.89	1.10
Tertiary	.23	.27	.52	.42	.54	.57	.57	.61
Public	.58	.71	1.06	1.34	2.11	2.00	1.68	1.99
Other	—	.50	.80	3.00	1.40	1.67	2.09	1.06
Total	.28	.47	.71	.86	1.14	1.13	1.05	1.13

Table 6: Balance between Diploma and Certificate levels

In this table, the figures in Table 3 are used to show shifts in the proportions of Diploma-level and Certificate-level staff, in the following way: an increase of 72.7% is taken to be 172.7; a decrease of 19.6% is taken to be 80.4; the figures for Certificate-level staff are then expressed as percentages of the figures for Diploma-level staff. A score of 100 then indicates that the balance has been maintained exactly. More than 100 means that Certificate holders have increased as a proportion of qualified staff. Less than 100 means that the proportion of Diploma holders has become higher.

	'51- '54/5	'54/5- '58	'58- '62	'62- '67	'67- '71	'71- '75	'75- '80
Government	214.8	139.2	137.9	174.3	89.0	83.3	123.2
Tertiary	117.3	194.4	81.4	127.1	106.3	100.2	106.6
Public	122.7	149.8	126.7	157.4	94.8	84.1	118.2
Other	—	138.4	375.0	46.7	119.0	125.3	50.9
Total	165.7	150.0	121.7	138.0	98.6	92.3	107.9

Table 7: Proportion (%) of staff aged approximately 40+

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
Diploma level	11.5	17.8	38.2	51.7	56.0	41.6	39.5	37.0
Certificate level	6.6	8.7	20.2	24.4	30.0	30.1	34.4	36.5

Table 8: Numbers of women and men on library staffs

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
<i>Diploma level</i>								
Government								
Women	41	27	37	39	46	67	90	104
Men	25	26	29	32	28	33	39	29
Tertiary								
Women	10	15	16	24	49	76	81	85
Men	12	15	11	21	33	38	59	66
Public								
Women	21	37	33	38	42	45	60	62
Men	12	14	19	15	13	22	38	38
Other								
Women	—	6	3	3	7	19	18	38
Men	—	—	2	—	3	5	5	10
Total								
Women	74	85	89	104	144	207	249	289
Men	49	55	61	68	77	98	141	143
<i>Certificate level</i>								
Government								
Women	11	18	31	45	82	101	108	134
Men	—	1	2	4	7	6	7	12
Tertiary								
Women	5	8	14	18	42	63	77	89
Men	—	—	—	1	2	2	3	3
Public								
Women	17	34	52	67	111	129	159	191
Men	2	2	3	4	5	5	6	8
Other								
Women	—	3	4	9	14	39	46	51
Men	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—
Total								
Women	33	63	101	139	249	332	390	465
Men	2	3	5	9	14	14	18	23

Table 9: Proportion of women to men
(No. of women ÷ no. of men)

	1951	1954/5	1958	1962	1967	1971	1975	1980
<i>Diploma level</i>								
Government	1.64	1.04	1.28	1.22	1.64	2.03	2.31	3.59
Tertiary	.83	1.00	1.45	1.14	1.48	2.00	1.37	1.29
Public	1.75	2.64	1.74	2.53	3.23	2.05	1.58	1.63
Other	—	*	1.50	*	2.33	3.80	3.60	3.80
Total	1.51	1.55	1.46	1.53	1.87	2.11	1.77	2.02
<i>Certificate level</i>								
Government	*	18.00	15.50	11.25	11.71	16.83	15.43	11.17
Tertiary	*	*	*	18.00	21.00	31.50	25.67	29.67
Public	8.50	17.00	17.33	16.75	22.20	25.80	26.50	23.88
Other	—	*	*	*	*	39.00	23.00	*
Total	16.50	21.00	20.20	15.44	17.79	23.71	21.67	20.22
<i>All qualified staff</i>								
Government	2.08	1.67	2.19	2.33	3.66	4.31	4.30	5.80
Tertiary	1.25	1.53	2.73	1.91	2.60	3.48	2.55	2.52
Public	2.71	4.44	3.86	5.53	8.50	6.44	4.98	5.50
Other	—	*	3.50	*	7.00	9.67	9.14	8.90
Total	2.10	2.55	2.88	3.16	4.34	4.81	4.02	4.54

*all women; no men.

O'Neill and Traue had separate figures for married and single women. Equivalent figures cannot be derived from more recent issues of *Who's Who*, which might or might not be a good thing — it is certainly a reflection of current mores. From a statistical point of view, it would be interesting to see whether there has been any change in the job-histories of the two groups.

Tables showing the numbers of men and women in the different groups of libraries do not, of course, tell the full story, because equally important are the levels at which they are employed. In order to see to what extent the commonly held view, that women are kept from the higher jobs, is correct, I have examined more closely, in the 1980 lists, professional staff working in university libraries, a group which has a fairly well defined grading and salary structure, and the results are shown in Table 10. All professional staff are shown under one of the following four headings:

- Librarian — the six University Librarians.
- Deputy — the six Deputies and the Librarian of Lincoln College.
- Head of Dept./Associate Librarian, including Senior Librarians who are heads of units.
- Assistant Librarian/Senior Librarian, including some who are designated Senior Library Assistant.

Table 10: Women and men in university libraries in 1980 (professional staff)

	Proportion of women to men			%
	Women	Men	Total	
Librarian	1	5	6	16.7
Deputy	2	5	7	28.6
H. of D./Assoc. Libn.	23	21	44	52.3
Asst/Senr Libn.	55	25	80	68.81
	81	56	137	59.1
Distribution among grades				
	Women	Men	Total	%
Librarian	1.2	8.9	4.4	
Deputy	2.5	8.9	5.1	
H of D./Assoc. Libn.	28.4	37.5	32.1	
Asst/Snr Libn.	67.9	44.7	58.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	

The information shown in Table 10 will not be news to many people, though it is interesting to see that equality has almost been achieved at the Head of Department/Associate Librarian level — there are a few more women at this level, but a smaller proportion of them have reached it. The crucial point, though, is that the top 11 jobs are still very imperfectly balanced.

Age structure

A further count of professional staff in university libraries throws some light on possible reasons for the distribution of men and women among the job levels. Of the 137 professional librarians listed in *Who's Who*, 126 gave their dates of birth, and the age structures are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Ages of women and men in university libraries 1980 (professional staff)

Age in 1980	Women		Men	
	No.	%	No.	%
60+	2	2.8	2	3.6
50-59	10	14.1	15	27.3
40-49	8	11.3	11	20.0
30-39	30	42.2	22	40.0
20-29	21	29.6	5	9.1
	71	100.0	55	100.0

Average ages: women 36.7; men 42.8.

The number of respondents at the Diploma level who gave their dates of birth has varied from issue to issue: 1951, 84.6%; 1954/5, 80%; 1958, 78.5%; 1962, 82%; 1967, 87.3%; 1971, 85.2%; 1975, 81.8%; 1980, 78.7%. The effect of abstentions, and of the variation in the rate of abstention, is hard to judge because there can be a number of reasons ranging from maidenly modesty to bloody-mindedness. Information derived from *Who's Who* therefore has to be read with a certain amount of caution. There is, however, a pattern in tables which have been deposited with the Education Committee which confirms impressions that library administrators will have formed. In particular, the difficulties in recruiting in the late 1950s and early 1960s, caused partly by the inducements offered to students to commit themselves to teaching, are reflected in a markedly small age-group which has been working its way through the system.

Table 12 shows the percentages of the professional group that made up two approximate age groups at the time of each issue of *Who's Who*.

Table 12: Key age groups, professional staff

	Age 30-40	Age 40-50
1951	23.1	11.5
1954/5	38.4	14.3
1958	43.2	28.0
1962	41.9	31.2
1967	25.9	34.7
1971	18.4	28.4
1975	24.4	23.2
1980	38.0	16.4

If we assume that the 30-40 age-group is the one that supplies staff for middle-ranking professional positions, it is easy to see why it was so difficult to find heads of departments in the 1970s. This situation should now be changing, but the effect will carry on for a while yet as libraries try to find people with sufficient experience for their top jobs.

Certificate-level people are less coy about their dates of birth. Dates were given by from 85% to 89% of respondents except in 1962 (79.7%). At this level there is not the kind of trough that formed at the Diploma level.

Places of birth

It might be of some interest to note that in 1980, 22% of Diploma-level staff, and 24.4% at the Certificate level, were born in the Auckland province (9% and 5.6% in Otago). More to the point, perhaps,

the percentage born in New Zealand has been fairly steady over the whole period. At the Diploma level it was between 77% and 82% until 1980, when it fell to 73.1%. At the Certificate level the highest percentage was in 1962 (90.2%) and the lowest in 1971 (79.8%).

An intriguing fact is that very few of the foreign-born, at any time between 1951 and 1980, have come from Australia. This is shown by the following figures for 1980, which are not unrepresentative:

Table 13: Places of birth, 1980 staff

	Diploma level %	Certificate level %
New Zealand	73.1	80.4
Australia	1.7	1.6
United Kingdom	14.8	14.7
United States	2.9	—
Elsewhere	7.5	3.3

The drop in the percentage of New Zealand-born at the Diploma level in 1980 is almost entirely accounted for by a sharp increase in the number coming from the United Kingdom, though it should be noted that some of these have been educated in New Zealand.

New Zealand and foreign qualifications

In 1980, 12.3% of Diploma-level staff and 3.7% of Certificate-level staff had foreign qualifications. These include, of course, New Zealanders who have graduated from overseas library schools, just as those who have New Zealand qualifications include a number who came from overseas.

It is necessary for a country like New Zealand, with a small population and a lack of variety in opportunities for education, to receive the regular stimulus of ideas and expertise from elsewhere. It is therefore a healthy sign that, at the Diploma level, the proportion of staff with foreign qualifications, which was 19.3% in 1954/5 and dropped to 9.2% in 1971, has risen again to 12.3% (though this is lower than the 13.1% recorded in 1975). There is now (1980) a fairly regular spread of foreign qualifications at the Diploma level among the different types of libraries (government 11.3%; tertiary 12.6%; public 11%; 'other' 16%), which contrasts with a very uneven spread in the early days (1951: government 10.6%; tertiary 40.9%; public 6.1%; 'other' 50%; total 15.4%).

In 1951, 17.1% of those at the Certificate level had foreign qualifications, mostly the ALA which has since been swamped by the NZLA Certificate.

NZLA Certificate and degree

The proportion of NZLA Certificate holders who are also graduates was fairly high (13.8%) in 1951, because many of them had started on the Certificate

Table 14: NZLA Certificate + degree

	1951	1967	1980
<i>Government</i>			
NZLA Cert. total	8	84	142
with degree	—	1	28
% with degree	—	1.2	19.7
<i>Tertiary</i>			
NZLA Cert. total	5	39	86
with degree	3	9	22
% with degree	60.0	23.1	25.6
<i>Public</i>			
NZLA Cert. total	16	111	193
with degree	1	4	23
% with degree	6.3	3.6	11.9
<i>Other</i>			
NZLA Cert. total	—	12	49
with degree	—	1	8
% with degree	—	8.5	16.3
<i>All libraries</i>			
NZLA Cert. total	29	246	470
with degree	4	15	81
% with degree	13.8	6.1	17.2

Table 15: Rates of loss
(NZ qualifications)

	No. qualified	No. in employment	Left	Loss p.a. as % of average labour force
<i>Dip. NZLS</i>				
1951-4	61	104 (1951)		
1955-7	37	113 (1954)	52	12.0
1958-61	57	128 (1958)	22	5.2
1962-6	101	150 (1962)	35	6.2
1967-70	138	199 (1967)	52	6.0
1971-4	153	277 (1971)	60	6.3
1975-9	195	339 (1975)	91	7.4
<i>NZLA Cert</i>				
1951-4	65	29 (1951)		
1955-7	50	59 (1954)	32	18.2
1958-61	130	95 (1958)	12	5.2
1962-7	241	139 (1962)	83	17.8
1968-70	199	246 (1967)	133	13.8
1971-4	261	333 (1971)	112	9.7
1975-80	394	387 (1975)	207	14.4
		470 (1980)	311	14.5

course before the graduate Library School was established. It declined steadily until it reached 5.7% in 1971, then rose to 9% in 1975 and again, more sharply, to 17.2% in 1980. This pattern is shown more clearly in Table 14, in which the years 1951, 1967, and 1980 are selected as being typical of the three phases.

Rates of loss (New Zealand qualifications)

Table 15 is an extension of Tables IX and X in the O'Neill/Traue paper, though it does not differentiate between men and women at the Diploma level, due to lack of information about the composition of Library School classes since 1967. The

figures cover only the holders of New Zealand qualifications. They show that there is, as might be expected, a higher rate of loss at the Certificate level, and this needs to be taken into account if estimates are being made of the number who should be trained in order to ensure a reasonable supply of new recruits.



"Faxon lets me spend my time as a professional."

All too often, librarians get so bogged down in processing paperwork for serials and continuations that they just do not have enough time for what they need to do.

That's why more and more libraries are turning to Faxon for help. Our comprehensive serials and continuations management services will help you with the work of ordering, invoicing and claiming. We will simplify payment procedures and record-keeping. And what's more, we can supply you with the information you need for quality collection management.

Best of all, Faxon's fast and reliable serials and continuations services are surprisingly affordable. So if you are spending your time wading through endless paperwork, do not waste another minute. Call Faxon for the full story on our services, including details on our remarkable LINX on-line serials management system.

15 Southwest Park
Westwood, MA 02090
Tel: (800) 225-6055

faxon

Over 100 years helping the world communicate.