ANALYSIS OF THE LOCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Thesis for Degree of Master of Urban Planning

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FRED W. HURD, JR.

1970

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE LOCATIONAL ASPECTS
OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

By

Fred William Hurd, Jr.

Criteria and standards for locating public facilities have remained as important inputs in the preparation of community comprehensive plans. Among these are standards for locating public library facilities, which have been developed within the library profession, and used extensively by urban planners. Library standards reflect goals of the institution, including the practical objective of increasing library use. Heavy emphasis has been placed upon location of facilities as an important ingredient toward maximizing use, and consequently location theories derived by librarians focus on location as it relates to increasing library patronage. Unfortunately current standards for library placement do not relate the library, as a service-giving institution, to the public it is intended to serve. Moreover, current location standards are inflexible, and the theories upon which they are based deserve questioning.

Recognizing this problem, the service and locational aspects of public libraries are closely examined in terms of the relationships that exist between the library and its public. The first chapter describes various kinds of libraries, the historical development of public libraries, and how the development of goals within the library profession has influenced the current role and function of the public library

as a community institution. The second chapter describes existing location standards, and examines the rational basis for their development and use.

While the first two chapters discuss service and locational considerations as perceived within the library profession, the third chapter analyzes these from the community perspective. This is accomplished by conducting a comparative analysis on a number of existing studies on public use of the library, and describing these studies in terms of various community-related factors that influence the manner and extent to which a particular public library is used. A result of this analysis is the finding that the public library is sometimes conceived and used in a manner somewhat different than that supposed by practitioners within the library profession. Furthermore, significant evidence is brought forth which raises serious questions regarding the applicability of current library locational criteria.

The last chapter summarizes the facts presented in preceding chapters in order to critically analyze the overall rationality of existing locational policies for public libraries. A concluding section suggests how information gathered throughout the report can serve to provide a framework of criteria from which the best location for a public library can be determined according to local area needs.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE LOCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

By

Fred William Hurd, Jr.

A THESIS

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF URBAN PLANNING

School of Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to Professor Keith Honey for his sympathetic guidance and penetrating critique of this study, and to his wife, Jamie, for her enduring patience and enlightening support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Municipal facilities are physical manifestations and activity centers of government services provided on behalf of the community for public use. Among these the public library has traditionally held an important position along with other public institutions that are considered highly desirable for cultural or educational enrichment.

At one time planning for public facilities was accomplished by planning agencies on a generalized basis, as an element or separate section of the comprehensive plan. In recent years, however, planners and planning agencies have been expected to help determine needs, priorities, and locational standards for each kind of public facility. Efforts along these lines have first been directed toward public facilities considered as most critical for detailed analysis and planning, such as public schools and fire stations. Relatively less attention has yet been directed toward public libraries as an integral part of the total system of public institutions requiring detailed analysis by urban planners.

Recognizing this situation, the overall purpose of this thesis is to specifically examine the public library--its services and locational aspects--in terms of the relationships that exist between the library and the community it is intended to serve. In order to accomplish this objective, the thesis is divided into five chapters, representing the various stages of research and analysis.

The first chapter is devoted to describing the various kinds of libraries currently available for public use. Specific attention is given to the historical development of public library facilities and services, and how the development of goals within the library profession has influenced the current role and function of the public library as a community institution.

In the second chapter existing principles and standards for locating public libraries are examined to determine their source and the rational basis for their development and use. It was found that current policies for locating public libraries have been established within the library profession to meet certain institutional objectives, and have been rationalized as desirable for both the public library and the community on the basis of certain theories regarding the pattern of public use of the library. It was also found that current locational studies prepared by planning agencies have generally accepted and applied locational policies developed within the library profession.

While the first two chapters discuss the service needs, functional requirements, and locational requirements of public libraries as perceived within the library profession, the third chapter analyzes these same considerations from the community perspective. This is accomplished by examining and comparing a number of studies on public use of the library, and describing them in terms of various community-related factors that influence the manner and extent to which a particular public library is used. Through this kind of analysis, it was found that the public library is sometimes conceived and used in a manner somewhat different than that supposed by a number of practitioners within the library profession. An important by-product of this

analysis was the evidence that theories supporting existing locational policies for public libraries may be incorrect, especially if applied indiscriminately to every community situation.

The fourth chapter is then devoted to summarizing the facts brought forth in preceding chapters in order to critically analyze the rational basis underlying existing locational policies for public libraries. In the light of this analysis, a number of recommendations are made regarding additional factors which should be considered when making locational decisions for public library facilities.

The last section of Chapter Four serves as a concluding statement of the major findings brought forth in this thesis, and their significance for further efforts by planning agencies faced with the task of selecting a site for the public library. It is intended that the information gathered in this report will provide the planner with: 1) a comprehensive description of the services, functions, and goals of the modern public library; 2) an objective appraisal of existing standards and principles for locating public libraries; and 3) a framework of criteria from which the best location for a public library can be determined according to local community needs.

CHAPTER ONE

KINDS OF LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY SERVICES

No one plan can describe all libraries, for the form, function, and collection of each library are determined by a multitude of factors, including the objectives of its program, the availability of funds, facilities, and equipment, and the number and quality of personnel. Over the years, however, libraries which have had the same general functions have come to be identified as a group or as a kind of library service, such as national, state, municipal, public, county, school, academic, research, and special.

This report is intended to focus on the locational aspects of public libraries. However, an accurate and precise definition of a public library is difficult because the use of any limiting clauses in the definition immediately excludes many institutions which are generally considered as public libraries. For example, if the limitation of government control is imposed, numerous libraries would be omitted, such as association or privately endowed libraries, which may be free for public use. If limitations of ownership or financial support by local units of government are made, the same problem of definition occurs. Many public libraries are not owned by any one unit of government, and some receive no support from local funds. In general, the only uniform characteristic that should be included in the

definition of any public library is that it is free for use on an equal basis by all residents of the community.[1]

In order to treat the problem of locating public libraries within a reasonable scope, locational questions discussed in this report are limited to those that pertain to public libraries supported primarily by public funds and administered at either the local or regional level of government. These would consist of public libraries most likely to come under the purview of a local or regional planning agency, and would include libraries within: 1) municipal library systems; 2) county library systems; 3) district and multi-county library systems; and 4) regional library systems.

This first chapter discusses the historical development and existing pattern of library facilities, services, and objectives. It is intended to provide a descriptive framework of the overall characteristics of the many various kinds of libraries, which will serve as a basis for the analysis of the locational aspects of public libraries contained in succeeding chapters.

The Municipal Public Library and Its System

As a public agency, the municipal public library is authorized by state law and supported from general public funds or from special taxes voted for the purpose, including bond issues or a special library building tax. Public library service is not mandatory in any state, but all states have general permissive legal authorization for the establishment and support of a library in each township, while the

---

[1] Joeckel, Carleton Bruns, The Government of the American Public Library, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 10.

legal provision for municipal libraries is provided by library laws enacted by the State legislature.[2]

The government of American public libraries varies considerably and cannot be classified logically in detail. However, municipal public libraries can be generally classified, in terms of their control, as follows: 1) those administered by a board which is appointed by the executive or legislative body, or elected by the people; 2) those administered as a department of city government by the city government; and 3) those attached to the school district as the legal entity and administered either by a separate board or by the board of education.[3]

Ninety-five percent of all municipal public libraries are governed by a library board, but their powers vary considerably. An "administrative" board appoints the head librarian and reports directly to the executive or legislative body. An "advisory" board operates mostly as an appeals body and has little or no power in setting policy. Few library boards have the power to raise taxes for support of libraries, and until recent years, few boards have had the right to determine the library's expenditure levels.[4]

Communications between librarians and city hall have traditionally been weak. Often government officials place little preference to libraries as compared to other public services, such as repair of roads or collection of garbage. They have tended to look at the library as an insignificant cultural activity managed by impractical people.

---

[2]Gates, Jean Key, Introduction to Librianship, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968), p. 191.

[3]Ibid., p. 193.

[4]Bowler, Roberta (editor), Local Public Library Administration, (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1964), pp. 55-56.

Librarians, on the other hand, have traditionally overlooked their position in local government, and have not overly concerned themselves with political activities.[5] Consequently, public libraries have not gained the kind of active support enjoyed by other public institutions of local government, such as public schools. Professional organizations of librarians have reacted by maintaining a vigorous campaign to institute programs and policies that will improve the status of the public library as a community service facility. These programs and policies have developed historically, and as will be pointed out in Chapter Two of this report, they have had a direct influence on the establishment of locational standards for public libraries.

A Historical Perspective on the Development of the Municipal Public Library

The tax-supported, free public library came into existence with the establishment of the Boston Public Library in 1852. Although this event marked the official beginning of the American public library movement, it also culminated almost a century and a half of experimentation in the development of three types of semi-public libraries in this country--parish, social and circulating libraries.

The idea of the church affiliated library was promoted by Reverend Thomas Bray, a religious leader appointed by the Anglican Church of England in 1696 to establish the Anglican Church in the Colony of Maryland. Bray organized a society for this purpose, and through this society libraries were established in Anglican churches from Charleston, South Carolina, to Boston. These parish libraries usually consisted of small collections of religious books, placed in care of the parish

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 50-53.

vestry for use by the minister; however, there were also special collections called "layman's" libraries which were set aside for use by the general public.[6]

The first successful attempt at making books available to certain sectors of the general public came through the establishment of the social libraries of the 18th century. Social libraries was a term used to encompass a number of different kinds of libraries that were not free public libraries, but were public in the sense that they were open to any member of the community who cared or was able to meet the requirements for membership. There were basically two types: Those that required actual ownership of property of the library (proprietary libraries) and those that required only payment of an annual subscription fee (subscription libraries).[7]

The first American subscription library was established by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia, in 1731, and to this day it has remained as part of the Philadelphia public library system. Other colonial towns soon followed the example set by Philadelphia, and by 1780 there were about fifty subscription libraries scattered throughout New England.[8]

The period after the Revolution and down to 1850 saw the rapid development of social libraries in many various forms. Some were organized for a particular function, such as the athenaeum, which provided subscription reading rooms where members could have ready access

---

[6]Johnson, Elmer D., Communications: An Introduction to the History of Writing, Printing, Books, and Libraries, (New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966), p. 135.

[7]Eaton, Thelma (editor), Contributions to American Library History (Champaign, Illinois: The Illini Bookstore, 1961), p. iv.

[8]Johnson, op. cit., p. 138.

to periodical publications. Others were designed to meet the specific needs of a particular clientele. These forms included lyceum libraries (for lecturing), mechanics' libraries, mercantile libraries, apprentices' libraries, young men's association libraries, and even factory and mill workers' libraries. Although all of these were subscription libraries, some were unique in the sense that they were organized, partly financed, and used by the young men who had come from the rural areas to the cities to seek employment in the trades. In this respect they represented an initial attempt at formalizing library services for the self-education of working-class citizens.

The rental or circulating library, which was another form of the subscription library, developed in the late colonial period. It was established as a commercially operated library containing a collection of books that could be borrowed for a certain fee. Unlike social libraries formed by voluntary associations, these libraries were strictly business enterprises, which developed in response to the demand for more popular reading materials generally unavailable in the association libraries.

More than one thousand social libraries were established in various forms in the New England states between the Revolution and 1850, and as settlers from the eastern states moved west, schools and libraries were among the first services provided by each new town. Saint Louis had a subscription library as early as 1811, and Chicago established a lyceum library in 1834 and a young mens' association library in 1841.[9]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 155.

But the social library, as a social agency, was to inevitably decline because it served only a limited segment of the community who could afford to pay the membership fee. Since its members were usually few in number and its gifts sparse, many social libraries were short-lived, while others formed the basis for the public libraries that followed. A few are still in existence today.[10]

The first half of the 19th century was a period when the new American nation experienced vast political, social, and economic change, characterized by: 1) a developing spirit of nationalism; 2) the forces of industrialization, urbanization, and westward expansion; 3) a desire by the nation as a whole to develop a distinctive cultural pattern; 4) a growing interest in formal education and self-improvement through self-education; and 5) the accumulation of great individual wealth.[11] Although the origin and development of the free public library cannot be attributed to any single influence, these factors as a whole were to have considerable impact in preparing the way for public supported libraries available for use by all citizens.

Several attempts were made to establish public tax-supported libraries in the early 19th century, but the concept could not receive widespread support until the idea of free public education became familiar to the public. Hence, the educational revolution of the second quarter of the 19th century, which resulted in the beginning of the American system of free public education, provided strong stimulus

---

[10]Garceau, Oliver, The Public Library in the Political Process: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 120.

[11]Gates, op. cit., p. 75.

toward initiation of the American public library movement. Two final conditions were necessary for local development of public libraries--a financial ability at the local level to set up and maintain the public library and the kind of leadership that could convince the local public to impose an additional tax on itself to support a public library.[12]

By the 1850's the need for free public education had gained widespread support. In 1852 the State of Massachusetts took the first step by introducing the first compulsory school attendance law. Four years earlier the Massachusetts legislature had passed an act which enabled the City of Boston to establish a public library and appropriate municipal funds for its support. A report was compiled in 1852 stating that it was the intended function of the Boston Public Library to supplement the City's system of public education. The establishment of a public library by a major metropolitan community and the formulation of a rationale for free public library service, provided the needed incentive to set the concept of the free public library in motion. Nevertheless, it is also significant to note that the Boston Public Library did not come into existence through direct public demand, but rather through the concern of members of the well-educated class, who felt the need to provide adults an opportunity to continue self-education through use of the public library.[13]

In 1855 the State of Massachusetts extended authorization for public libraries to other towns in the State, and by 1875 there was a

---

[12]Lee, Robert Ellis, Continuing Education for Adults Through the American Public Library: 1833-1964, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1966), p. 7.

[13]Ibid., p. 112.

total of 188 public libraries in eleven states, most in New England or the Middle West. Public librarians of this period were primarily scholarly men with an inherent interest in books. Their essential concern was with collecting and preserving books, while efforts toward promoting use were secondary. Because of the compositions of the book collections, libraries were used mostly by adults who could read and had the incentive to do so.[14]

By the turn of the century private donations had become a major source for support of public libraries. Philanthropic efforts included the donation of private libraries to public and college collections, and the endowment of libraries, which were fully supported by private funds, but were open to the public usually under certain conditions set by the donor. One of the first major gifts was the endowment of Enoch Pratt to form the Free Library in Baltimore in 1886. In the 1890's, three endowed libraries from the Astor, Tilden, and Lenox families were consolidated to form the basis of the New York Public Library. But the greatest library benefactor of all was Andrew Carnegie, a self-made millionaire of the steel industry, who from 1881 to 1898 provided funds for fourteen municipal libraries. By 1921 Carnegie funds had been used toward the construction of approximately 2500 library buildings in the United States. Financial aid was given with the understanding that local governments were to provide books, staff, and permanent maintenance, and that each library was to be free for use by the general public.[15]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 113.

[15] Gates, op. cit., pp. 85-87.

During the city beautiful movement of the late 19th century, many libraries were built along with other cultural facilities in a dozen urban centers from Boston to San Francisco. Borrowing facades from French or Italian Renaissance palaces or from Greek or Roman temples, these libraries were symbols of the concept that urban man could be improved both physically and morally, by improving the environment in which he lives.[16]

A librarian's conference in 1876 witnessed the formation of the American Library Association, the national organization of librarians, and marked the beginning attempt among librarians to define the proper role of the public library as a public service agency. Although it was generally agreed among leaders in the Association that the principal role of the public library was to provide for continuing education of adults, numerous practicing librarians did not view the public library as an educational agency.[17] But during the time between the 1876 Conference and the turn of the century, an increasing number of practicing librarians became more concerned with the organization and use of books than just their preservation. In order to remove some past barriers that had made libraries uninviting to the general public, librarians began to develop operational policies to improve the accessibility of books, such as circulation of books for home reading, open access to shelves, longer hours of opening, and personal guidance to readers in locating and selecting books.

---

[16]McKelvey, Blake, The Urbanization of America: 1860-1915 (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1963), p. 123.

[17]This and following comments regarding the historic role of the public library are taken from Lee, op. cit., pp. 14-30.

By the 1880's the question of whether to include popular reading materials had become a continuing issue among librarians. Those who supported the idea held the view that recreational reading services would attract a larger clientele, encourage readers of "low-brow" books to read "high-brow" books, and meet the evident need for an increase in recreation as a part of adult life in an industrializing society. Critics felt that it was not the duty of the municipality to raise taxes to supply popular reading, and that these materials could be obtained from other sources, such as the rental or circulating library. They felt that if librarians responded to the demand for popular reading, this would detract from the library's main educational function.

The controversy over the provision of popular novels and the like marked the beginning of a conflict between the library's principal objectives of education and recreation, a conflict which still exists today. The historic conflict centered on the issue of whether non-fiction works are in fact educational. In later years the issue broadened to include the question of the degree to which a library should allocate its resources between educational and other special services and the demand for recreational reading services.[18]

By the 1890's library collections had increased substantially in size to require the development of practical indexes and guides to facilitate the use of these resources. At this time large municipal libraries began to provide an additional service, called reference service, which consists of aiding the patron in locating facts pertaining to specific inquiries. Urban libraries began to organize special

---

[18]Gans, Herbert J., People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), p. 99.

reference collections to facilitate informational reference services, and by the turn of the century these services had expanded to a level requiring a separate department in some libraries and the full-time efforts of one or more staff members.

During the first two decades of the 20th century, librarians undertook a vast program of extending library services in an attempt to bring the library to a much larger proportion of the population. Service to children became a major activity of libraries of all sizes, and separate rooms for child reading activities were established. Libraries in large cities began to establish subsidiary centers for distribution. These included: 1) deposit stations, locations to which books were sent from the main library and deposited for use by the local community; 2) delivery stations, locations at which requests for books were accepted for later delivery; and 3) branch libraries, which operated either as small versions of the central library or as distribution centers for the circulation of books at the neighborhood level.[19]

Branch libraries actually date from 1871, when the East Boston Branch of the Boston Public Library was established. During the last decade of the 19th century the trend toward branches was well established, aided by philanthropic gifts and the absorption of many social libraries into circulating branches.[20]

During the First World War many public libraries responded to the times by serving as agencies of war publicity for the government, aiding in the Americanization of aliens, and providing library services to

---

[19]Byam, Milton S., "History of Branch Libraries," in Library Trends, Volume 14, No. 4., (April, 1966), p. 371.

[20]Ibid., pp. 369-371.

soldiers' hospitals, the handicapped, and the blind. The re-emphasis on democracy during and immediately after the War gave renewed importance to the educational role of the public library. Efforts to meet new needs of the urban populous included reading guidance and the provision of special materials and services to factory workers and to national and racial groups. These services gradually grew into formalized programs of adult education offered to both individuals and community groups, including reader's advisory services and library-sponsored group programs on books, films, and lectures.[21]

At the same time, however, many librarians had begun attempts to maintain and increase library budgets through efforts to increase book circulation. At the practical level of library administration circulation gradually became the standard measure by which the success of the library was judged. Concerned with increasing library use, many librarians made compromises with popular demand, which resulted in the heavy emphasis on light fiction that characterizes the collections of many small libraries today.[22]

Public library services to public schools, which began before the end of the 19th century, were greatly expanded during the 1930's and 1940's. In addition to inviting use of the library by students and teachers, other services to schools included lending boxes of books, setting up school libraries, giving book talks and holding story hours for children, and assisting teachers in selecting reading materials to supplement the curriculum. The trend toward public library assistance to schools continued, and as late as 1961 more than 5000 schools with

---

[21]Gates, op. cit., pp. 194-195.

[22]Lee, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

over 950,000 pupils were totally dependent upon services provided by the public library.[23]

During World War Two the public library carried on many of the functions it had performed during the First World War. Soon after the War specially designed and commercially produced bookmobiles came into extensive use for the first time. The history of the bookmobile goes back to the horse-drawn book wagons around 1900, which were used to bring books to unserved rural areas. Since the War, bookmobiles have been serving both rural and urban areas, providing service to local neighborhoods and public schools.[24]

Since the 1940's the programs of municipal public libraries have continued to expand and diversify. The 1966 standards for public library systems, published by the American Library Association, express this diversification.[25] The Standards state that it is the function of the municipal public library to provide printed and nonprinted materials to all people in the community for information, education, self-realization, recreation, and cultural growth.[26] The Standards suggest that collections of materials include books, periodicals, pamphlets, newspapers, pictures, slides, films, music scores, maps, disc and tape recordings, and the various microfilms and archival materials that

---

[23]Gates, op. cit., p. 196.

[24]Joseph L. Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, Practical Administration of Public Libraries, (New York: Harper and Row, publishers, 1962), p. 424.

[25]American Library Association, Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems--1966, (Chicago: The Association, 1966).

[26]Ibid., p. 9.

relate to the local community.[27] Services should include organization of materials for convenient use through shelf arrangement, classification, and cataloging; lending of materials to facilitate convenience of use; assistance to civic, cultural, and educational organizations in locating and using materials for various community projects; and stimulation of use and interpretation of materials through publicity, displays, reading lists, story hours, book talks, book and film discussions, and other means either in the library or in community organizations.[28]

All municipal public libraries, regardless of size, will usually have departments of acquisition, technical processing, circulation, reference, administration, and a separate department serving children and young people. The large municipal library will usually be organized into many specialized departments, including subject departments, an extension department, departments serving special groups, departments concerned with a special kind of material (such as audio-visual materials or government documents), and branch libraries.[29]

Table 1-1, on the following page, indicates that according to the 1960 census there was a total of 8190 public libraries in the United States, of which 5768, or approximately 70 percent, were located within communities of less than 10,000 population.

It has been estimated that the American public borrows over 550 million books each year; but according to a national survey conducted in

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[28] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

[29] Gates, op. cit., pp. 203-204.

TABLE 1-1

Number and Percent of Public Library Systems
By Size of Population Served
Aggregate U.S.: Fiscal Year 1960

Population Served	Number of Libraries	Percentage of Total
Total	8190	100.0
Less than 1,000	1574	19.2
1,000 - 2,499	1874	22.9
2,500 - 4,999	1209	14.8
5,000 - 9,999	1111	13.6
10,000 - 14,999	591	7.2
15,000 - 24,999	610	7.5
25,000 - 34,999	311	3.8
35,000 - 49,999	287	3.5
50,000 - 99,999	369	4.5
100,000 - 499,999	217	2.6
500,000 - 999,999	28	.3
1 million and over	9	.1

Source: Table 2 in Frank L. Schick and Doris C. Holladay, Statistics of Public Libraries Serving Populations of 100,000 or More: Fiscal Year 1960 (November, 1961) U.S. Office of Education, OE-15033.

1965, many public libraries do not meet minimum standards for total number of volumes, professional staff, and allocation of funds for operating expenses. The study concludes that more than 100 million volumes are needed to meet minimum American Library Association standards.[30]

County, Multi-County, and Regional Library Systems

It was not until libraries were firmly established in the majority of urban areas of the nation that library service to rural areas had its beginning. The basic problem of providing service to rural

[30] American Library Association, National Inventory of Library Needs, (Chicago: The Association, 1965), p. 5.

communities was one of cost. Many rural communities lacked the financial resources to set up their own library, while on the other hand, municipal libraries in central-city areas faced financial problems in extending permanent service through branches much beyond the outlying district of the urbanized area.

The first attempt to provide rural services was undertaken by state library agencies through a system of traveling libraries. These consisted of a small collection of books packed in boxes and sent to rural areas to be placed in postoffices, stores, and homes. But in many cases this arrangement proved inadequate, and the county was eventually turned to as the logical unit of government for providing service to rural areas on a more permanent basis.

The first county libraries were established in 1898, in Van Wert County, Ohio, and in Washington County, Maryland, Services were provided to the residents of Washington County through traveling libraries, deposit stations, and a book wagon. Branch facilities and bookmobiles have continued to be characteristic features of extension services in county library systems.

During the first decade of the 20th century several other states provided for county support of library service, but development was slow until 1911, when California began a vigorous campaign to organize county libraries on a statewide basis. By 1920, twenty-six additional states had enacted enabling legislation for counties to establish libraries, and in 1930 a multi-county unit was established in Vermont. At present all states have permissive legislation for the establishment

of county or multi-county libraries, either voluntarily or by petition of a required number of citizens.[31]

The diversity of government control of county libraries even exceeds that of municipal public libraries. The simplest form of county library organization is when the library becomes a department of county government. A library so organized may operate with or without a library board, and if there is no board, the county governing body functions as such. County library services may be provided by contract, which involves the extension of complete service by an existing agency to any area that is willing to pay for it. Contractual arrangements vary, and may involve a contract between a county unit and a strong municipal library, a neighboring county or region, the state library extension agency, or an institution of higher learning. A third method of providing county library services is through a joint city-county system, which serves both the city and the county under the county government. The county library may serve all the county or only that part not already served by local libraries, and is usually financed from general tax funds, penal fines, plus state and federal aid.[32]

Multi-county libraries are established by action of each county's governing body or by a vote of the people. The library is usually supported by local taxes voted by each of the counties for that purpose, and is supervised by a library board composed of members from each of the participating counties. County and multi-county library districts have been formed particularly in the fringe areas of cities, where

---

[31]Gates, op. cit., p. 179.

[32]Schenk, Gretchen K., County and Regional Library Development, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1954), pp. 30-40.

several governmental jurisdictions are involved. The district is established by vote of the people, and a district library is formed. The district prepares its own budget and a specific tax is levied in each county for support of the library district.[33]

Other forms of regional library systems include: 1) a geographic region within one highly urbanized county; 2) a variety of governmental units which cooperate in one form or another to maintain library service; 3) an extension of library service from the state through regional branches of the state library; and 4) an interstate compact which provides for an interstate library district governed by its own board with members representing the various participating libraries.

Each kind of county, multi-county, and regional library system maintains a central collection and may extend service through branches, deposit stations, and/or bookmobile service. The central library may serve as a headquarters building for services distributed throughout the service area, and also as a local library for the area in which it is located. Or the central library may give no direct service to the public, but serve more or less as a warehouse for storage, book-ordering, processing and delivery service to smaller libraries in the service area, as well as the central facility for a bookmobile operation.

Services provided by county and regional libraries are similar to those provided by municipal public libraries, but services to children and schools have been the main emphasis, while specialized reference and technical services for adults have been traditionally weak as compared to municipal libraries of similar size.[34]

---

[33] Ibid., pp. 41-45.

[34] Wheeler and Goldhor, op. cit., p. 449.

Central to the concept of library systems are the related concepts of larger units of service and interlibrary cooperation, which have both been emphasized by library leaders since the turn of the century. Taken together, these concepts are viewed as a means for improving the financial base for library operations, as a means for improving economies of operation, and as a means for providing a higher quality of service to a greater proportion of the population. The modern systems concept basically envisions a large central plant for centralizing reference, rarely-used collections, and administrative activities, with a network of branch extension agencies considerably larger and fewer in number than the existing pattern of small branches and independent community libraries.[35]

Cooperative activities include formalized procedures involved in the system arrangement or voluntary arrangements to provide cooperative services informally in certain special areas, such as united (union) catalogs and the sharing of certain materials.

Hence, the systems approach may be instituted in a variety of forms; but in terms of organization, there are three basic types: 1) a consolidated system, usually a municipal public library system, in which a single library board and administrator direct the entire system as a single autonomous unit; 2) a federated system, in which one or more county boards of trustees designate a systems board to direct and control the activities of the systems library, (local libraries retain their autonomy and contract with the system for services and other assistance); and 3) a cooperative system, in which the trustees of a

---

[35]Bowler, op. cit., pp. 29-32.

group of local libraries establish a system by electing a board to represent them in directing the system. The systems board designates a central library to house the interlibrary loan collection, and determines the programs of services within the system. Member libraries remain autonomous, and local library boards continue to operate their own libraries within the system.[36]

Other Kinds of Libraries

The Federal government currently owns and operates many thousands of libraries, including government agency, institutional, military, college, university, school, public (within the District of Columbia), special, and highly specialized technical and scientific research libraries. Local agencies of federally operated libraries are usually parts of systems, such as those in hospitals of the Veterans Administration and in military bases.[37]

Besides providing library services, the Federal government also assists local public libraries through the provision of library materials, technical assistance, and financial aid. Financial assistance for the improvement of library facilities is granted through the 1964 Library Services and Construction Act, which provides states with annual grants for the extension of library services and the construction of individual units. Each state becomes eligible by submitting a state plan for approval by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

---

[36]Gates, op. cit., pp. 183-184.

[37]Johnson, op. cit., p. 250.

Once the grant is authorized, the states allocate the funds to local units on a matching basis.[38]

State responsibility for library service has evolved historically on a cumulative basis. Library services at the state level had its beginning in the late 18th century, and by the end of the 19th century every state and territory had a library located at the seat of government and maintained at public expense primarily for use by government officials and agencies. With the beginning of state support for educational institutions, the states began to accept the responsibility for providing library services within these institutions as a function of the state department of education. Toward the end of the 19th century, state responsibility for library service was broadened to include free public library service for the people of the state as well as its officials. By 1900 many states had established library extension agencies, with specific responsibility to extend library service throughout the state.[39]

The recent trend has been for the development of regional branches of the state library, serving as intermediate units between local libraries and the state agency. A notable example is the State of New Hampshire, where four regional branches of the New Hampshire State Library provide supplementary and extension services, resources, and

---

[38]American Society of Planning Officials, Planning the Public Library, Report No. 241 by the Planning Advisory Service, (Chicago: The Society, 1968), p. 15.

[39]Brahm, Walter T., "State Libraries," in The Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and Implications, edited by Frank L. Schick, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1962), pp. 87-92.

professional assistance to over two hundred independent public libraries, thus placing all libraries under a single statewide system.[40]

Public libraries at the local level have traditionally experienced close ties with school libraries, especially those within elementary and secondary schools. Before the 1920's there was little recognition of the need for school libraries because educational curricula centered on the use of textbooks within the classroom. But in the 1920's the emphasis in education shifted from the subject matter to the learner, resulting in the requirement for a large variety of materials to meet the different needs of each child. Organization of school libraries subsequently increased; but in the late 1930's there were 33,000 schools still totally dependent on classroom collections, usually supplied by the public library.[41]

Since the 1940's school library development has continued to increase, especially in junior and senior high schools. However, libraries within elementary schools have not developed at the same pace, and as late as 1961 only 31.2 percent of all elementary schools had centralized libraries.[42] Where public school libraries have been either inadequate or lacking, public libraries have historically served to fill the gap, either through the provision of services at the library or through the extension of services to the school.

---

[40]McKay, Mildred P., "New Hampshire's Single State Library System," in Library Trends, Volume 13, No. 3, (January, 1965), pp. 279-281.

[41]Gates, op. cit., p. 220.

[42]Mary Helen Mahar and Doris C. Holladay (editors), Statistics of Public School Libraries, 1960-61, Part I: Basic Tables, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 3.

Libraries within higher institutions of learning are as varied as the institutions they serve. There are libraries in junior colleges; in four-year liberal arts colleges; in teachers colleges; in agricultural and mechanical colleges; in technical and professional schools; and there are central libraries in universities and more specialized libraries in the colleges within universities. Before 1900 the average college library was small and consisted primarily of literary classics for use by the faculty and some graduate students. But after the turn of the century the academic library gradually became more an active part of the academic program, and it is now the basic function of the academic library to aid the institution in carrying out its program.

Tremendous increases in the enrollment of students within institutions of higher learning have placed overburdening demands on many existing academic libraries. This is particularly true for the junior or community colleges, which have experienced rapid growth in the past fifteen years, but have continued to operate without sufficient funds for many programs and facilities, including libraries. As with school libraries, where libraries within academic institutions are inadequate, greater demands are placed by students on the public library in meeting student research needs. The inadequacies of library resources in academic libraries are expressed in the 1965 study of national library needs. The report indicates that in the 1962-63 academic year, 73 percent of all four-year institutions fell below American Library Association (ALA) standards in numbers of volumes, and 91 percent of all two-year institutions fell within this same group.[43]

---

[43]National Inventory of Library Needs, op. cit., Table B, p. 47.

"Special" libraries is a term used to describe a wide variety of libraries that fall within four basic groups: 1) those operated by governmental agencies at the local, state and federal levels; 2) those attached to commercial or trade organizations; 3) those attached to profit-making corporations in commerce and industry; and 4) those owned and operated by societies and associations, as well as individually endowed reference and research libraries.[44]

Special libraries are an outgrowth of the technological revolution and the accompanying breakdown of various fields into specialties. A distinguishing characteristic of special libraries is that each is usually a unit of a private or public corporation for the purpose of providing informational resources necessary for the particular organization to fulfill its function. The majority of special libraries tend to be small and maintained as an internal agency of the organization of which they are a part.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this first chapter has been to provide a short overview of the various kinds of libraries and library services available in one form or another for public use. Later chapters of this report will refer to many of the basic characteristics of public libraries discussed in this first chapter as they relate to principles and standards for locating public library facilities.

It is apparent that the current make-up and pattern of public library service is the result of numerous social, economic, and

---

[44]American Corporation, Libraries (A reprint from the Encyclopedia Americana), 1962.

political forces which have historically influenced library development in this country. Public libraries were first established as a service provided and maintained by local governments. However, since its beginning the public library has experienced a disadvantage in vying for revenues in that it has not had the emotional appeal, public contact, and "visibility" enjoyed by other public institutions. Consequently, most public libraries maintained by local governments have been hard put to obtain adequate financial support to provide the quality of service suggested by standards of the library profession.

Problems of financing coupled with expanding public demands for library materials have prompted library leaders to support the concepts of regional systems and larger units of service to replace the existing decentralized pattern of weak and independent local public libraries. Moreover, librarians are faced with the problem of obtaining economies of scale while at the same time maintaining local accessibility to library services at the community and neighborhood level.

Public libraries were first developed in the middle-half of the 19th century by people who could read and had the incentive to do so. They have experienced their most vigorous growth in urban areas, where wealth, a concentrated population, and the habit of a communal cultural activity, have provided the strongest demand for high-quality library service.

From the beginning the public library has remained committed to the principal goal of providing for the continuing education of adults. During the early years of its development, the urban public library was able to fulfill this goal by serving as a means for encouraging the assimilation of working-class immigrants into the middle-class style

of life. Horatio Alger characteristics prevailed among young men and self-improvement was considered a valuable end in itself. But with the tremendous advances in the formal system of free public education, the need and demand for self-educational improvement became less the purpose for patron use of the public library.[45] In the meantime practicing librarians, in attempts to strengthen the public library as a service agency, began to institute a variety of programs which could meet new demands for library materials and increase library use. These included programs for extending library services and the provision of more popular reading materials.

At the institutional level goals were broadened to include support for information gathering, asthetic appreciation, research, and recreation activities, as well as educational activities. Consequently, the aims of public libraries became overlapping and diffused, and hard to define in programmatic terms. Herbert Gans has expressed the problem as follows:

> In defining its goals, the public library has struggled, like all service-giving agencies, between two conceptions of itself. One, which derives from the people who supply library services, and which I will call supplier-oriented, argues that the public library is an institution which ought to achieve the educational and cultural goals of the librarian and his profession; the other, which I call user-oriented, argues that the library ought to cater to the needs and demands of its users. These are polar opposites, and in the library's actual goal choices both positions are included; the usual solution has been to uphold the supplier-oriented conception in its professional conferences and publications, but to adopt more of a user-

---

[45] Banfield, Edward C., "Needed: A Public Purpose," in The Public Library and the City, edited by Ralph W. Conant, (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1965).

> oriented conception in actual practice, if only in order to get the library budget approved by the city fathers.[46]

Gans further explains that the supplier-oriented conception is expressed by the professed objectives of promoting self-education, information gathering, research, aesthetic appreciation, and leisure-time activities, while the user-oriented approach is built into the published standards by which the library plans and evaluates itself. These standards represent a set of practiced objectives, including institutional growth and maximization of library use, in which the adequacy of the library is measured by such criteria as the number of books taken out or the number of reference questions asked annually.[47] It will be shown in Chapter Two of this report that the practical objective of maximizing use has also been incorporated in standards developed within the profession for locating public library facilities.

Banfield argues that the public library no longer serves its original purpose--to assimilate immigrants to the urban, middle-class way of life in America. Immigrants are now assimilated and the present-day poor do not use the library partly because they lack self-motivation and partly because libraries are primarily middle-class institutions that do not appeal to the poor or reject them.[48]

Changing patterns of patron use of libraries, rising demands for a diversity of library services, and changing social characteristics of both urban and rural populations, have presented numerous issues to

---

[46] Gans, op. cit., p. 97.

[47] Ibid., p. 98.

[48] Banfield, op. cit.

library planners concerning the proper role of the public library in present-day society.

CHAPTER TWO

EXISTING STANDARDS AND PRINCIPLES FOR LOCATING PUBLIC LIBRARY FACILITIES

This second chapter is intended to provide an overview of existing standards and principles used in making location decisions for public library facilities. The procedure for analysis was to first examine the historical development of standards which have had nation-wide recognition, and then to examine current studies on library location to determine how nationally recognized standards have been interpreted and used.

Historical Development of National Standards for Public Libraries

Specific national standards for public library services did not come into existence until 1921, when the American Library Association first designated one dollar per capita as the minimum annual revenue for providing adequate service. During the 1930's the Association continued to develop standards and objectives for service, stressing the need for interlibrary cooperation and the development of library systems. Although the one dollar per capita standard was still suggested, it was recognized that modifications were necessary for proper application to local situations.[1]

---

[1]Rose Vainstein and Marion Magg, State Standards for Public Libraries, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE-15010, pp. 7-11.

In 1942, the National Resources Planning Board, an arm of the Executive Office of the President, granted funds to the American Library Association for the formulation of working standards for library service which would serve as a guideline for library development after the War. From this grant the Association published, Post-War Standards for Public Libraries, in 1943, and A National Plan for Public Library Service, in 1948.[2]

The 1943 standards provided both qualitative and quantitative criteria for measuring the adequacy of public library facilities and services. Limited or minimum service could be achieved at the one dollar per capita support (or approximately $25,000 per year to provide service to a population of about 25,000). In cities of 100,000 population or more, the 1943 standards suggested that each branch library should serve, on an average, an area within a radius of 1 - 1 1/2 miles, and a minimum population of 25,000 to 55,000. In all cases where quantitative standards were stated, the 1943 document emphasized the need to adapt these standards according to the local situation, and warned that they should not be used without restraint.

The 1943 standards made the first official statement of criteria for locating public library buildings in terms of the following general principles:

> The public library building should be located on a site which is conveniently situated for service to the greatest number of people in the area for which the building is responsible....The Central building in a municipal library system should be within a block of two of the main business and shopping area and convenient to main traffic

---

[2] Post-War Standards for Public Libraries, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1943), and A National Plan for Public Library Service, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1948).

> arteries. A branch building should be located on or near a main traffic junction within a mile to a mile and a half of the majority of the people in the area to be served.[3]

A National Plan for Public Library Service disclosed that as a whole, library services in the United States fell far below the 1943 standards, principally because: 1) one-fourth of the American people lived in areas where there were no libraries; 2) there were far too many administrative units and the typical library was too small in an area too economically weak to provide proper financial support; and 3) average library support was so low that a large proportion of libraries could provide no more than mediocre service.[4] Similar to earlier statements of standards, the principal recommendation of the plan was to develop larger units of service as parts of integrated systems of library services.

In 1950 a nation-wide survey of public library services, termed the Public Library Inquiry, was completed and published in a summary volume, titled The Public Library in the United States.[5] In its appraisal, the study concluded that: 1) adequacy of public library service could not be described solely in terms of dollar expenditures or per capita support; and 2) $100,000 was the dividing line between an adequate and inadequate annual budget for a single public library system, regardless of size.[6]

---

[3] Ibid., p. 62.

[4] Ibid., p. 18.

[5] Leigh, Robert D., The Public Library in the United States, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950).

[6] Ibid., pp. 65 and 154.

The 1950 study was followed six years later by a revised statement of official American Library Association standards for public libraries, titled Public Library Service.[7] Reflected in the 1956 document are many of the findings, recommendations, and philosophy expressed in earlier statements of standards, including re-emphasis on the development of library systems through various forms of cooperative arrangements. Unlike the 1943 standards, the 1956 document did not prescribe quantitative standards for other than personnel and library materials. Population bases for various library sytems were not defined because it was felt that many demographic variations in the United States made it undesirable to prescribe a fixed pattern of sizes for public library systems. By this time per capita standards for minimum financial support had reached the three dollar per capita level. But per capita expenditures were not considered in the 1956 document because it was felt that they were too misleading, especially when used in areas of low-density population.[8]

In the 1956 standards, the section dealing with the location of central library facilities is stated somewhat differently as compared to the 1943 document. Whereas the 1943 standards suggest that the central facility should be located near the downtown shopping area, the 1956 standards suggest that the best location, from the standpoint of the immediate area served, is within or immediately adjacent to a shopping district.[9]

---

[7] Public Library Service, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1956).

[8] Vainstein and Magg, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[9] Public Library Service, op. cit., p. 60.

Following publication of the 1956 standards there was considerable controversy among librarians regarding the question of whether the new standards were set too high for the more than two-thirds of all libraries in the United States serving populations of under 10,000 (Reference Table 1-1). The American Library Association responded by publishing, in 1962, Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines Toward Achieving the Goals of Public Library Service.[10] The introductory statement to the interim standards explains that the new standards should be regarded as an interim goal, to serve until small libraries can meet the standards of Public Library Service. Although a definition of a small library is not given, it is suggested that the standards could be used for libraries serving population groups of various sizes up to 50,000 persons. Both qualitative and quantitative statements are provided regarding adequate levels of library service and materials, stressing in this case the role of the library in the local community. Only one statement is made regarding the proper location for the library facility:

> The library building should be located in or near the community shopping center and at street level if possible. Adequate parking should be available nearby.[11]

The most current statement of American Library Association standards for public libraries was published in 1966, and is titled, Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966.[12] The 1966 document

---

[10] Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines Toward Achieving the Goals of Public Library Service, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1962).

[11] Ibid., p. 13.

[12] Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, op. cit.

provides the most comprehensive statement of what is intended by the concept of library systems. It is stated that the principal objective of the systems approach is to make all resources and services available to local readers, but not necessarily available within the local community library. To meet the needs of users, wherever they may be, the system operates on three principal levels: 1) the community library, working jointly with the school library, the college library, and the special resource libraries in its area; 2) the system headquarters, supplying resources in depth and specialized personnel; and 3) the state library agency, using its own resources and those of universities, bibliographic centers, and federal libraries.[13]

The 1966 standards suggest that the minimum population for a library system should be 150,000 people, and the quantitative standards for library materials are provided on that basis. Standards for locating physical facilities reflect further interpretation of the criteria for central and local libraries first suggested in the 1956 and 1962 documents:

> The site for a (headquarters) public library building should be where the largest percentage of all people to be served will have access to the library frequently in the normal pursuit of their activities. The site should have heavy pedestrian traffic; be convenient to public transportation; and have conveniently available automobile parking, in commercial or library parking lots....The community library should be located in a place to which residents come often, such as a shopping center or the community's business center.[14]

---

[13] Ibid., p. 12.

[14] Ibid., pp. 60 and 65.

Other Sources for Nationally Recognized Standards

Besides standards published by the American Library Association, it is apparent that there has been essentially two other sources for public library service standards: 1) standards set forth by individual states at the state level; and 2) standards suggested by various reports and textbooks published within the field of library science.

State standards actually predate national standards published by the American Library Association, and were first instituted by the State of New York in 1910. From their beginning, national standards were intended to serve as broad guidelines for more specific interpretation at the state and local levels. This is one of the reasons why quantitative standards for measuring the quality of service were eventually de-emphasized at the national level. However, the usual practice in state library plans has been to make passing reference to national standards, without developing more specific standards for the several types and levels of libraries within the state.[15]

A national survey of state standards for public libraries was conducted in 1960, and it was found that of the minority of states that had developed their own standards for library services, considerable variation existed between the states.[16] In terms of accessibility of service, for example, the State of Maryland divided service at the local level into two types: 1) a branch library which was economically sound

---

[15]Martin, Lowell A., "Principles of Statewide Library Planning," in Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries--A Report of a Conference, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE-15060, pp. 7-8.

[16]Vainstein and Magg, op. cit., p. 33.

when there were 3000 or more people within a mile and a half radius; and 2) a branch where there was a population of 3000 within a radius of ten miles or, if there was not this minimum within ten miles, there would be a branch in the shopping center of the county. The State of Virginia, on the other hand, required that all public libraries would provide an extension service outlet within a five mile radius of every resident, while city and county libraries serving more than 90,000 population would provide a branch for each 30,000-40,000 population or within a radius of one mile.[17]

Library literature is replete with various reports, articles, and chapters of textbooks, dealing with the questions of service area standards, circulation standards, and site standards for public library facilities. Whereas circulation standards and detailed site criteria have never been specified at the national level, it is apparent that these standards have been derived principally within the literature of the profession. After reviewing a significant number of these sources, it is evident that a majority of them adhere to a set of standards set forth by Joseph L. Wheeler, a long-experienced librarian who has dedicated his career to the practical aspects of library administration. The basic text to which later textbooks and reports refer was published by Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor in 1962, titled, Practical Administration of Public Libraries.[18] For an independent central library or a branch of a local or regional library, the following table, Table 2-1, has frequently been used as a guideline for determining library size, cost, and circulation:

---

[17] Ibid., p. 24.

[18] Wheeler and Goldhor, op. cit.

TABLE 2-1

Experience Formulas for Library Size and Costs

Population	Book Stock Volumes Per Capita	Number of Seats Per 1,000 Population	Circulation Volumes Per Capita	Total Square Feet Per Capita	Desirable 1st Floor Square Feet Per Capita	1961 Fair Estimated Cost Per Capita*
Under 10,000	3 1/2-5	10	10	.7-.8	.5-.7	$ 15.
10,000-35,000	2 3/4-3	5	9.5	.6-.65	.4-.45	$ 12.
35,000-100,000	2 1/2-2 3/4	3	9	.5-.6	.25-.3	$ 10.
100,000-200,000	1 3/4-2	2	8	.4-.5	.15-.2	$ 9.
200,000-500,000	1 1/2	1 1/4	7	.35-.4	.1- .125	$ 7.
500,000 and up	1-1 1/4	1	6.5	.3	.06-.08	$ 6.

Source: Joseph L. Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, Practical Administration of Public Libraries, (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 554.

* Without furnishings (add 15%) or air conditioning (add 10%)

In addition to the above guideline, the 1962 text indicates that a branch is justified only when it is assured a minimum annual circulation of 75,000, and desirably 100,000 books, of which 45 percent to 50 percent will be adult circulation, and at least 10,000 adult information questions answered each year.[19] According to the text, branches should be expected to serve at least 30,000 people, and, in general, should be located no more than three or four miles from any other service agency.

[19] Ibid., p. 412.

It is also suggested that for libraries serving less than 50,000 population, a permanent branch facility is not justified.

Standards and criteria for locating public library facilities have been discussed in a large quantity of library literature since the turn of the century. Although there have been numerous differences of opinion, through the years the vast majority of librarians, who have written about the subject, have supported the concept of locating the public library so that its potential use is maximized. With this basic objective in mind, there have been several specific site selection criteria developed, all of which relate to the overall objective of maximizing potential use.

The basic rationale for this objective, as well as the problems faced by librarians in attempting to implement this objective, are most comprehensively discussed in, The Effective Location of Public Library Buildings, a report written by Joseph Wheeler in 1958.[20] Since this report has been referred to most frequently by recent literature dealing with the subject of library location, it is apparently considered as the current "bible" among librarians for locating public library buildings. For this reason a concentrated effort has been made in this report to analyze the proposals set forth by this document.

The basic thesis presented by Wheeler is that every new public library, central or branch, should be located in the center of the major pedestrian shopping and office area, where busy stores would flourish. Central facilities should be located in the heart of the

---

[20]Wheeler, Joseph L., The Effective Location of Public Library Buildings, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Library School, 1958) University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers, No. 52.

downtown shopping district, on or near the "100% corner" of heaviest retail trade. Local outlets should be situated in the center of neighborhood or community shopping centers.

These general conclusions rest on a number of surveys conducted by Wheeler over a ten year period preceding the 1958 publication date, including the responses to a questionaire sent to all public libraries in cities of over 100,000 population, and a number of smaller ones (The exact number is not specified). Throughout the entire report, Wheeler presents his thesis in terms of dozens of case examples where opinions of librarians across the country have suggested the need for locating the library within the downtown shopping district.

The concept of locating public libraries within pedestrian-oriented business districts carries with it the inherent assumption that the degree to which public libraries are used depends largely upon the opportunity for potential and actual users to combine trips to the library with other shopping and business errands. Wheeler attempts to prove this, as well as the validity of the general concept, by three statistical approaches: 1) by citing several surveys conducted by librarians between 1930 and 1958 which indicated that a high percentage of users combined their trip to the library with their downtown day's work, their daytime shopping, or their evening entertainment trips; 2) by comparing circulation figures for two libraries of similar size within a system--one located "poorly" (i.e., not within a pedestrian center), and the other located in a prominent shopping area; and 3) by comparing circulation figures for a library before and after it was relocated within or away from a pedestrian shopping and business area.

An example of the first approach is the report of a 1930 survey of the Cincinnati main library, which showed that 95 percent of all users made the library trip incidental to either shopping, business, or entertainment. The second statistical approach is exemplified by the report of the Williams branch of the Atlanta Public Library, located in a central trade area, which loaned 100,000 books in 1955, while Kirkwood branch, located in the same system and opposite a park, loaned 30,000 in the same year. An example of the third statistical approach is the report of a branch of the Cleveland Public Library, which moved in 1950 from a pedestrian center and experienced a 35 percent drop in circulation, despite better and larger quarters.[21] In judging the adequacy of a library, Wheeler refers to his standard of 75,000, as the minimum annual book circulation figure that must be assured if a branch is to be justified.

To the casual reader of Wheeler's report, the sheer number of case examples and the manner in which they are presented would lead him to believe that the very economic success or failure of any library would depend on its being located in the heart of a central trade district. In Chapter Four of this report several questions are raised regarding the validity of this concept based on data supplied in Chapter Three. But in any case there are still some questions which can be raised regarding Wheeler's statistical approaches for proving his theory on library location.

First among these is the question of whether circulation is an adequate measure of library use. Leon Carnovsky, a librarian and

---

[21]These examples are abstracted from pages 11-13 of Wheeler's report.

student of library use studies, has pointed out that the amount of circulation is not an adequate measure of library use simply because there are many other factors, both inside and outside the library, which may affect circulation counts. Among these are changes in the magnitude and character of the population, changes within local institutions, such as larger school enrollments, changes in the accessibility of the library itself, changes in the accessibility of other competing library outlets, and changes in book selection policy, such as emphasizing or de-emphasizing more popular books or books needed for school assignments. Unless these and other factors are taken into consideration, circulation figures can be very misleading as a sole criterion for measuring library use.[22]

Second is the question of whether circulation figures serve as an adequate measure of quality of service received by the public. From the community's side, circulation figures measure only the magnitude of books or other materials placed on loan, and not the number or type of people who borrow them, or whether the books are in fact read. For example, 10,000 books on loan could be read by 2 percent or 92 percent of the population within the service area. Inside the library, circulation figures measure only one of a number of services provided by many libraries, including reference and information services, telephone requests, story hours for children, art exhibits, and other services discussed in Chapter One.

---

[22]Carnovsky, Leon, "Surveys of the Use of Library Resources and Facilities," in Library Surveys, edited by Maurice F. Tauber and Irlene R. Stephens, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 73.

There is also the question of whether a comparison of circulation figures between two libraries or one library at different locations is an adequate approach for correlating library use with location. As pointed out above, in all cases the surveyor must recognize that library use depends upon a multitude of factors. In cases where a library is relocated into a shopping center, the fact that the new library is a modern and expanded facility may contribute more to an increase in use than the location itself.

These criticisms of Wheeler's statistical approaches for correlating library use with location are not intended to suggest that circulation figures should not be utilized as a tool for measuring library use. In fact, circulation figures are often the only record available of public use of the library. (There is an increasing tendency among librarians not to keep records of registration because of the administrative costs involved.) However, these criticisms do suggest that circulation, as a measure of library adequacy, should not be accepted at face value, but should lead to further analysis of causal factors.

Principles for Where a Library Should Not Be Located

The strong thesis for locating all public libraries within the heart of pedestrian-oriented shopping and business districts has been translated into what librarians have termed as current misconceptions regarding the function of a library and where it should be located. These misconceptions are summarized by Wheeler as follows[23]:

1. That the library building is primarily a monument, and therefore should be associated with a setting of

---

[23]Wheeler, op. cit., pp. 3-5.

monumental buildings, large landscaped grounds, and quiet, aloof surroundings.

2. That the public library is primarily a genteel cultural and recreational agency, and consequently belongs with other cultural buildings.

3. That the library should stand in the geographic or population center of a community, or else that it should be located close to schools and parks.

4. That the availability of parking should be a major factor in the determination of the location of the library building.

5. That the central library should be divided and part of it put somewhere else where ground is cheaper and parking is easier.

The basis for these statements actually relates to the historical development of public libraries, as discussed in Chapter One of this report. These "misconceptions" represent some of the traditional views of the public library, which predate the modern extension movement, at a time when the library was considered by both practicing librarians and the general public as more an educational and cultural institution than as an agency for the distribution of library materials. This particularly applies to the traditional concept of locating public libraries within a cultural setting, or close to schools and other public buildings. But as a result of the current emphasis on maximizing the use of services, attempts have been made to de-emphasize these traditional views of the public library. In this respect, any location which might separate the library from the central activity area of the community is considered less than ideal.

The strong argument expressed by librarians for locating the public library within the central business district also reflects differences of opinion concerning site selection which have occurred

between librarians and public officials, including planners. The problem is expressed by Wheeler as follows:

> Librarians are logically in a position to have sounder opinions than anyone else in a community, as to where libraries should be placed. But when the time approaches to decide a library's location, public officials, citizen's groups, real estate men, planners, newspaper editors, and many others, often ignore experienced opinion and advice, only to offer unsound, illogical proposals and bring heavy pressure to do the very things which would be and have proved to be most disastrous for the library's services to its community.[24]

In defining the "illogical proposals" made specifically by planners, Wheeler states that:

> All too often, planners think about the library only in terms of finding an economical site, failing to realize that a bad location will measurably reduce the return on the considerable investment in the library building and from the annual operating budgets. A second common mistake which planners may make, in thinking about libraries, is to stress secondary considerations, e.g., parking for library patrons, combining or grouping a public auditorium or museum with a library, or creating a monumental traditional structure on spacious grounds.[25]

Another area of disagreement between librarians and planners has been the proposal made by some planners, particularly in large cities, for physically separating the circulation department of the central library from its administrative, reference-research, and non-book functions. The circulation and basic reference department would be located in the central-city area, while the more specialized and administrative functions would be located on less costly sites further

---

[24] Ibid., p. 8.

[25] Ibid., p. 38.

out.[26] Although comparative feasibility studies are lacking, it appears to be the general consensus among librarians that the circulating, reference, and other special collections of the central library cannot be split without heavy penalties in duplicated collections and staff, and increased operating costs.

In accordance with statements regarding current "misconceptions" of the public library, specific principles have been established for where the library should not be located. These may be summarized as follows:

1. A public library should not be located in a civic center, a government center, a cultural center, or a park.
2. A public library should not be located on a quiet side street, away from the heavy pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
3. A public library should not be located temporarily within rented quarters.
4. A public library should not be located within or adjacent to public schools.

Of course, all of these principles relate to the basic idea that any remote location (either literally or psychologically) should specifically be avoided. Consequently, it is assumed that cultural centers and parks fit this definition because they tend to be "aloof and inaccessible, and somewhat separated from the daily life of the community."[27]

---

[26]For example, see Huff, Robert L., "Library Planning," in Planning 1961: Selected Papers from the ASPO National Planning Conference, Denver, Colorado, (Chicago: The American Society of Planning Officials, 1961), pp. 162-167.

[27]Bowler, op. cit., p. 299.

The principle for not locating the public library on a quiet side street refers essentially to the local community library, which has often been placed in such a manner. It is also in response to some current proposals for compromising the pedestrian shopping center location by placing the library in a nearby area where land costs are not so high. Wheeler responds by suggesting (without evidence) that for every block the library is located away from the central trade area, the library will suffer decreasing patronage.[28]

The third principle refers to past practices in some cities where branches were temporarily established in buildings designed for subsequent use as stores, and erected by concerns which rented them to the library for ten or more years. However, the general experience has been that in the meantime land rent continued to rise, and try out savings were eventually lost in later costs for a permanent site.

The fourth principle arises from past practices of locating the local community library, particularly branches, within local public schools. This has traditional ties with the one-time popular practice in the mid and late 1800's of establishing school-district public libraries, which were administered by the common school system, and open for use by both students and adults. Although this practice lost popularity by 1900, there are still a number of public libraries administered and financed by school districts. In recent years the location of public libraries in school buildings has frequently been proposed by those who wish to apply library resources in direct aid to schools, or by those who wish to provide a general service at an

---

[28]Wheeler, op. cit., p. 31.

economic level through the use of an existing public building containing a related activity.

However, there is evidence that school and public library combinations have not worked well in the past. From an administrative standpoint, it has been difficult to provide for both the specialized needs of students and the more general reading needs of adults. If the book collection is shaped mostly for the needs of students, often adult patrons have felt themselves intruders and have ceased to use the library. Other difficulties include the problem of arranging hours of opening, the problem of providing sufficient parking during the day or when school activities occur at night, and the fact that some schools are located on large tracts of land that are poorly lighted and sometimes dangerous in the evening hours.[29]

If the criterion of maximizing use is applied, then there are inherent problems of locational considerations between the two facilities. In order to provide the proper environment for learning, it is often suggested that elementary schools should be placed away from distracting influences, ideally in a quiet residential area. To minimize noise and provide maximum safety for children, it is also suggested that elementary schools are not located adjacent to a major thoroughfare. Because of their larger service areas, it is usually necessary to locate junior and senior high schools along a major or minor traffic arterial; however, a quiet site away from business districts is still preferable. Obviously, these locational considerations

---

[29]Bowler, op. cit., pp. 275-276.

are directly opposite to the concept of locating the public library in the center of heaviest shopping and business activity.[30]

Location Standards Used in Various Library Plans

Increasing demands for library services coupled with increases in federal and state aid for the development and expansion of library systems have led to the preparation of numerous library plans at the state, regional, and local levels. Among the wide variety of plans are those prepared by state library agencies, individual libraries, library consultants, and in recent years, by city and regional planning agencies.

State-wide and regional library plans have characteristically focused on system-wide needs for coordinated and expanded library services. Since they are dealing primarily with the long-range aspects of library planning, specific locational requirements for individual facilities are usually not included. Only several local library plans prepared by librarians or library consultants were available for review. Among these it was found that the majority place major emphasis on the need for improved services and additional financial support, while little if any attention is given to locational analysis or community relationships with the library.

In 1966 a study was made of comprehensive or master plans prepared by city planning agencies for thirty-three major urban centers.[31]

---

[30] West End Branch Study, (Tacoma, Washington: City Planning Commission, 1958), p. 13.

[31] See Bewley, Lois M., "The Public Library and the Planning Agency," in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, No. 7, (July-August, 1967), pp. 968-974.

The master plans were published or revised since 1960, and were selected at random from the University of Illinois City Planning library. The purpose of the study was to determine how much attention was given to public libraries as an element of the master plan. It was found that the degree to which these master plans give consideration to public libraries varies considerably, from those that make no mention of public libraries whatsoever, to those that include entire chapters or separate documents devoted to libraries and library planning.[32]

Of all plans available for review, it was decided to focus on those prepared by planning agencies either as separate elements of the master plan or as special reports intended to supplement the master plan. The review was limited to these particular plans for three reasons: 1) because time limitations would not allow for a more comprehensive review of all plans; 2) because it was evident that these special reports prepared by planning agencies give more attention to locational criteria than any other type of library plan; and 3) because it was expected that in analyzing locational requirements for public libraries, planning agencies would take a more community-related and objective viewpoint than that expressed by librarians.

A search through bibliographic sources revealed that approximately twenty-five separate library plans have been published by planning agencies over the past two decades. Several of these were locally available for review, while others were sent for by mail. Since several mailed requests were not fulfilled, a total of sixteen

---

[32] Ibid., p. 971.

plans were secured for review (These are listed in the bibliography of this report).

Table 2-2 provides a capsule summary of the population base, service area, and principal location standard suggested by each of the plans for each type of library discussed. With some notable exceptions, it was found that the majority of plans have accepted the concept of locating all public libraries within or adjacent to a shopping or business district, and have applied this concept directly to the local situation.

Besides the one criterion of a shopping center location, other locational criteria are provided in all the plans, which further support the notion of situating the library so that its use is maximized. Although these supporting criteria vary between reports, and are sometimes stated without a distinction between branch or central libraries, they usually consist of the following:

For the central library--

1. The site should be located at the corner of a busy street intersection, where the library can be easily seen and where pedestrian traffic is heavy.

2. The building should be placed near the edge of the sidewalk, with the front facing the main artery of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Maximum use should be made of display windows and views of the interior.

3. The site should be located on level terrain, permitting street-level entrance.

4. The site should be located within one block of a mass-transit terminal, and seen from the terminal.

For the branch library--

1. A branch should be located as if it were a local retail store.

TABLE 2-2

Recommended Standards for Population Base, Service Area, and Location of Various Kinds of Public Libraries

Plan Report	Type of Library	Population Base	Service Area	Location Standard
1. Public Libraries Element Revision Study Los Angeles, California 1968	Central	Entire city	Entire city	N/S*
	Area	1-1.5 million	Valley region	N/S
	Regional	300,000-350,000	N/S	N/S
	Community	25,000-50,000	2 mile radius	N/S
2. Changing Patterns: A Branch Library Plan for the Cleveland Metropolitan Area, 1966	Branch	Varies	Varies	Proximity to home.
3. Branch Library System Expansion Study Houston, Texas, 1965	Branch	N/S	Median of 5' driving time	Within or adjacent to a suburban commercial or business center.
4. Report Upon a Branch System for Hamilton County, Ohio, 1964	Branch	minimum 25,000-50,000	1- 1 1/2 mile radius	Within or adjacent to a suburban commercial or business center.
5. Tucson Public Library 1970 Library Plan Tucson, Arizona, 1964	Regional	50,000-75,000	20-25 sq. miles or 5-10' driving time	Adjacent or across from major commercial or financial
	Local	25,000-50,000	8-12 sq. miles or 5-10' driving time	Same as above.

* N/S -- Not Specified.

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)

Plan Report	Type of Library	Population Base	Service Area	Location Standard
6. Library Study Dayton Area (Ohio), 1964	Branch	minimum 25,000	1-1 1/2 mile radius	Existing or potential drawing influence (plus other criteria).
7. Community Facilities Study Lansing, Michigan, 1964	Central	50,000 and over	System-wide	Fringe of central business district.
	Branch	25,000-49,999	2-3 mile radius	At regional or community shopping centers.
	Community	Up to 49,999	Varies with population size	In the center of the major shopping and pedestrian area.
8. Libraries of Knoxville and Knox County Knoxville, Tennessee, 1963	Main Central	N/S	System-wide	In the center of the major shopping and pedestrian area.
	Branch	minimum 25,000-50,000	1-1 1/2 mile radius	Same as above.
9. Milwaukee's Ten Year Library Report Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1962	N/S	minimum 60,000	5' driving time	Where people are naturally attracted, such as a shopping center.
10. A Plan of Branch Libraries for Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee, 1961	Branch	N/S	N/S	In the heart of the shopping and business district.
	Local Branch	25,000-50,000	5-10 sq. miles	In subregional shopping centers.
11. Library Plan for the City of Phoenix Phoenix, Arizona, 1961	Major Branch	75,000-150,000	20-40 sq. miles	In regional shopping center.

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)

Plan Report	Type of Library	Population Base	Service Area	Location Standard
12. Preliminary Plan for Libraries Warren, Michigan, 1960	Branch	minimum 15,000-20,000	N/S	Near the focal point of residential neighborhoods, preferably near a shopping center.
13. West End Branch Library Tacoma, Washington, 1958	Branch	minimum 10,000	range of 1 1/2 miles	Located where a variety of community facilities attracts the residents of the area.
14. Libraries of Central Lucas County, Toledo, Ohio, 1958	Branch	N/S	2 mile radius	Locate in a major shopping concentration, preferably a shopping center.
15. Boston's Branch Library System, Boston, Mass., 1955	Branch	minimum 25,000-50,000	1 1/2 mile radius	Locate in or adjacent to major shopping and community centers.
16. Location of Public Libraries in San Francisco (Calif.), 1953	Branch	minimum 10,000	minimum 1 mile radius	Locate where a variety of community facilities attracts residents of the area.

2. The site should be located directly on or easily accessible to a major thoroughfare, or other heavily traveled transit route.

3. The site should be conveniently located in relation to schools within the planned service area; however, this should be considered as a secondary factor.

4. A branch should be located where people go, not necessarily where people live.

5. The branch should be at street-level entrance, with as little setback as possible. There should be enough windows on its street frontage so that activities inside serve as a constant invitation to use.

As indicated in the above list of standards, a number of planning reports make a strong analogy between branch libraries and chain store outlets, where the problem of locating or relocating them is treated in terms of their potential "volume of business." The viewpoint is expressed adamantly in the 1961 Nashville plan by the following statement:

> It has been pointed out that what is needed and would be good for both a library and its community, is that the library be included in the community plan as the informational, merchandise, sales and service plant that it is and not as a civic and cultural building.[33]

Thus, several of the plans use the standard minimum of 75,000 to 100,000 annual circulation as the principal basis for deciding whether a branch should be relocated or closed down.[34]

As indicated in Table 2-2, there is a general tendency among the majority of plans to rely heavily on quantitative standards established

---

[33] Books for Metropolitan Nashville: A Plan for Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee, (Nashville: Nashville City and Davidson County Planning Commissions, 1961), p. 34.

[34] For example, see Report Upon a Branch Library System for Hamilton County, Ohio, (Cincinnati: Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, 1964), p. 6.

within the library profession. In fact, the majority of reports reflect much more the quantitative Postwar Standards for Library Service of 1943 than the more qualitative Public Library Service standards of 1956, even though most reports were published after 1956. For example, the standard of 25,000 to 50,000 population base is used several times as the only criterion for deciding that sufficient demand exists for the construction of a branch library. This is done even though the originators of the standard specified that its proper use would require adjustment according to local conditions.

It was found in both the survey of master plans and in this survey of special planning reports for libraries that few planning agencies have included a study of library services and programs as they relate to the local community and its needs for these services. As a result there is a lack of understanding of how the library could best be located to meet the various needs of the people living within the library's service area. An understanding of how the public library relates to the community it serves can be gained through local analysis of user patterns and the reasons why certain population groups use or do not use the public library. However, planning limited to the physical aspects of public library service will probably continue until librarians and planners are in a better position to define more specifically the role and function of the public library in the community.

Summary and Conclusions

Standards for measuring the quality of library services have existed since the first decade of the 20th century. Early standards established at the national level incorporated per-capita expenditure

levels as a means for measuring the adequacy of financial support. Later national standards de-emphasized the use of quantitative measures of service quality, recognizing that the quality of service provided by an individual library could not be measured solely by numerical criteria established at the national level. Nevertheless, states and local levels have continued to rely heavily on quantitative measures of library services, such as minimum circulation figures, as well as rule-of-thumb standards for minimum population base and minimum service area requirements. When used in their proper context, general standards for measuring the adequacy of an existing library facility or the need for a new library should provide the basis for further examination of local conditioning factors. Unfortunately the tendency has been to rely almost entirely on the standard itself as the principal basis for deciding whether an existing library facility is adequate, or whether a new facility is needed.

The policy of maximizing library use has been translated into locational policies as to where the library should or should not be located. Inherent to these policies is the assumption that the degree to which a library is used depends heavily on its locational aspects. Statistical methods for proving this have been based on the technique of comparing circulation figures between libraries "strategically" located within pedestrian-oriented shopping and business districts and "poorly" located away from such areas, even though such techniques do not account for many other factors that influence library use besides location.

Much of the problem of measuring the effectiveness of library services lies in the fact that: 1) measuring criteria are not

community-related, and are therefore incapable of measuring the value of library service to the community itself; and 2) specific objectives for public libraries have not been defined in sufficient detail to facilitate specific planning and testing of services.

Rather than applying general standards for library location to every community situation, it is evident that local community characteristics should first be examined in terms of the type of library that is to be established and the manner in which it is likely to be used. The following chapter examines these community-library relationships, and attempts to provide a general framework for analysis from which policy decisions on library location can be made.

CHAPTER THREE

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

In the preceding chapter it was pointed out that the question of library location needs to be treated with an adequate understanding of how each public library will relate to the community it is intended to serve. Predicting future needs and demands for library services is admittedly a difficult task, and it is complicated by the fact that libraries, unlike public schools, have no compulsory attendance. Thus, use of the library is dependent on the individual desires and preferences of all persons living within the service area.

Although specific patterns of library use will vary with each community, there are certain basic relationships between the library and its public which have continued to exist in most typical communities. This chapter is intended to verify these relationships, which can then be used as a basis for further clarification through local analysis.

To date the most extensive survey of public use of the library is a nation-wide study compiled by Bernard Berelson and published in 1949.[1] The Berelson study was followed, in 1952, by the publication of

---

[1]Berelson, Bernard, The Library's Public, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949).

another national survey of public library use.[2] However, the conclusions of the 1952 study were based on data compiled and used in the 1949 Berelson study. Hence, the basic conclusions of both studies are identical.

Since the time of these studies there have been no other national surveys of public library use. In fact, there have been very few studies of public use of the library even at the regional and local levels, and the evident need for current studies of this nature has been expressed within numerous articles in current library literature.

In the meantime considerable controversy has developed regarding the question of whether the findings of the Berelson study are still valid today. Although the 1949 study predates the era of television and paperback books, some spokesmen have expressed the opinion that many of the basic conclusions of the 1949 study are, nevertheless, still applicable in today's society. Others have suggested that the study is completely outdated, and can no longer provide a factual picture of public use of the library.

In order to clarify the facts behind this issue, it was decided to compare various findings within the Berelson study with two current surveys of library use, each conducted for a major metropolitan area within the United States. In addition to these studies, several other surveys are incorporated within various sections of this chapter to provide further evidence of a particular relationship. Choice of these current studies was governed solely by the fact that they were the only

---

[2]Angus Campbell and Charles A. Metzner, Public Use of the Library and Other Sources of Information, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1952).

fairly extensive surveys of library use available for review. However, within the time limitations of this report, it was felt that a general review of these studies would provide an adequate picture of basic relationships that currently exist between the library and its public.

Description of the Studies

The Berelson report is the product of two separate surveys. One was a national sample survey of library use made for the Public Library Inquiry by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, and conducted during October and November of 1947. Personal interviews were held with 1151 adults, selected at random in different counties scattered over the United States. The second survey involved an analysis of all studies of library book use and users published since 1930. By combining both surveys, the 1949 report was designed to give an accurate picture of patterns of library use which existed from 1930 to 1947.

A branch library plan for the Cleveland Metropolitan Area was the first current study selected for review.[3] The plan was prepared by the Cuyahoga County Regional Planning Commission and published in 1966 as a report to the Cleveland Public Library and the Cuyahoga County District Library. Primary data on library use was obtained from two special surveys: 1) An at-library survey was designed to obtain information from library patrons about their backgrounds and actual patterns of use. It was administered to 4063 people using twenty-one selected city and county district branch libraries on a Monday in

---

[3] Changing Patterns: A Branch Library Plan for the Cleveland Metropolitan Area, (Cleveland, Ohio: Cuyahoga County Regional Planning Commission, 1966).

October of 1965. 2) A home-library survey was designed to identify non-library users and to ascertain their reasons for non-use. It was administered to 2000 households randomly selected throughout Cuyahoga County in December, 1965. At the time of the study Cuyahoga County contained nine library systems, including the Cleveland Public Library System, the Cuyahoga County System, and a number of independent school-district libraries.

The second current study selected for review is the report of an extensive survey of library use within the entire Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan Region of Maryland. The survey was conducted on succeeding days of the week over a six-week period between March and May of 1966. Every fifth adult (defined as twelve years of age or older) entering one of the public libraries within the Region was asked to fill out a questionaire. The sample was designed to include a cross-section of the various kinds and sizes of public libraries. It was administered to 21,385 patrons, and the rate of return was 79.1 percent. The survey is reported in two articles written by Mary Lee Bundy, a professor within the School of Library and Information Sciences at the University of Maryland (and for convenience, both articles are referred to in this chapter as the Bundy report).[4] At the time of the survey the region contained ninety-nine public library units (including sixteen bookmobiles), distributed among nine library systems. The Enoch Pratt Free Library, located in the central core

---

[4]Bundy, Mary Lee, "Metropolitan Library Use," in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 42, No. 2., (May, 1967), pp. 950-962, and "Factors Influencing Public Library Use," in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 43, No. 4, (December, 1967), pp. 371-382.

area of Baltimore, serves as the central coordination unit for inter-library cooperation activities between all nine systems. Except for the Baltimore city system, all other systems are administered at the county level of government.

Who Uses the Public Library

Use of the public library may be described in terms of the social characteristics of its clientele, including age, sex, occupation, economic status, and education.

1. Age--The Berelson report revealed that children and young people (defined as fifteen years of age and below) used the library much more than older people. In a 1945 survey of all cities over 25,000 population, it was found that the percentage of the total population under fifteen and over five years of age averaged sixteen percent in each city, while the percentage of total public library registration and circulation for this same age group averaged thirty-three and forty-three percent respectively.[5]

Although the more recent studies do not relate age groups of library users to the total population of the survey area, each survey indicates that young people have remained as the predominant users of public libraries. In the Bundy report, patrons twenty-one years old and younger represented 47.3 percent of the total sample, while the Cuyahoga County report indicates that young people (through nineteen years of age) made up 76.3 percent of all public branch library users in the metropolitan area (See Table 3-1).

---

[5]Berelson, op. cit., Table 5, p. 20.

TABLE 3-1

Percentage of Users By Various Age Groups

Bundy Report		Cuyahoga County Report	
Age Range	Percentage of Users	Percentage of Users	Age Range
12 - 16 years	22.4	51.8	0 - 14 years
17 - 21 years	24.9	24.5	15 - 19 years
22 - 34 years	18.1	3.1	20 - 24 years
35 - 50 years	25.0	19.9	25 - 64 years
Over 50 years	8.3	0.7	65 plus years
No response	1.3		
(total)	100.0	(total) 100.0	

Source: Bundy Report, p. 953, and Cuyahoga County Report, p. 89.

In all three surveys, the high percentage of library use by young people is attributed to use of public libraries by students for school-related activities. This is supported by the evidence that use of the library by young people tends to fall off sharply at the school-leaving age.

In a separate study of student use of public libraries in the Baltimore area, it was found that almost two-thirds of library services to students, both in the number of books supplied and the number of hours of use, comes from the public library.[6] Further analysis of student library use disclosed that present-day teaching at the

[6]Martin, Lowell A., Students and the Pratt Library: No. 1 in the Deiches Fund Studies of Public Library Service, (Baltimore, Maryland: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1963), p. 2.

secondary level assumes the availability of a substantial subject collection, containing extensive holdings of both books and periodicals, even though school libraries do not serve this function, except to a limited extent. As a result, many student readers prefer to use the public library rather than the school library. In order of importance, the reasons for this preference are: 1) more adequate collections in public libraries; 2) more suitable hours of service; and 3) fewer restrictions and controls.[7]

The Berelson report concludes that the public library attracts a progressively smaller proportion of the population in each successive higher age level. But the more recent studies suggest that decreasing use of the library does not necessarily follow increasing age in a constant progression. Nevertheless, there is evidence in all studies that older people, particularly those over fifty years of age, do not use the public library as much as younger people (See Table 3-1).

2. Sex--In all three studies (the Berelson report, the Bundy report, and the Cuyahoga County report) it was found that more women than men use the public library, although the difference is not great. Both of the current studies indicate that approximately sixty percent of all users were female. Further analysis in the Bundy and Berelson reports suggests that women tend to use circulation services more than men, while men tend to use the reference services more than women.

3. Occupation--The Berelson and Bundy reports both indicate that students constitute the major occupational group in the library's clientele. Of the student users in the Baltimore-Washington region,

---

[7] Ibid., p. 2.

high-school students predominated (64.5%), while 10.3 percent were in elementary school and 25.2 percent were in college.

In the 1949 survey, it was found that student use of the library was followed in lesser proportions by housewives and white collar workers, then professional and managerial people, and finally wage earners (skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled). The 1967 Bundy report has similar conclusions, indicating that housewives and professional groups predominate as the major occupational groups using the library other than students:

TABLE 3-2

Percentage of Users of the Library
By Various Occupational Groups

Occupational Group		Percentage of Users
Students		47.3
high school	64.5	
elementary school	10.3	
college	25.2	
Housewives		16.4
Professional, technical, and kindred workers		13.6
All other employed adults		12.3
Retired persons		2.3
No response		8.1
	(total)	100.0

Source: Abstracted from Bundy Report, pp. 953-954.

In the Bundy report a comparison was made between the occupations of employed users and the occupational characteristics of the population of the metropolitan area. The results showed that the professional and managerial groups were overrepresented by library users, while all other employed occupational groups (excluding students and housewives) were underrepresented. The major difference was with the professional group--while only 15 percent of the adult employed population consisted of professional people, 52.3 percent of employed library users were in one or another of the professions.

4. Economic status--As of the 1949 survey, little study had been made of the use of the public library by different economic groups. Based on the available data, Berelson summarized that, in general, the public library was not used much by either the very wealthy or the very poor, primarily because the former had private sources of books while the latter, because of their low level of education, were less likely to read. Consequently, Berelson concluded that the majority of public library users represented members of the middle-income groups. But the home-library survey of households throughout Cuyahoga County revealed that as family income rose, the probability that any member of the family used a library also rose, even in the higher income groups (See Table 3-3).

According to Table 3-3, approximately one-third of the people in families with incomes between 0-$3,000 used libraries, while approximately three-fourths of the people in families with incomes of greater than $15,000 used libraries.

TABLE 3-3

Household Income and the Percent of Household Members Who Used or Did Not Use a Library

Household Income	Percent of Users*	Percent of Nonusers*	Total Percent
$0- 2,999.00	31.7	68.3	100.0
$3- 4,999.00	41.7	58.3	100.0
$5- 6,999.00	48.6	51.4	100.0
$7- 9,999.00	60.9	39.1	100.0
$10-14,999.00	72.2	27.8	100.0
$15,000 plus	77.6	22.4	100.0

* Non-users are defined as persons who did not use any library during a six-week period preceding their interview.

Source: Cuyahoga County Report, p. 39.

5. Education--In every study of the relationships between the library and its public, level of formal education has repeatedly proven to be a major correlate of public library use. Education, sex, age, and occupation, which are discussed separately in this chapter, are in reality not only coexistent but also themselves correlated. Thus, some relationships between personal characteristics and the public library which are descriptively true, such as that younger people use the library more than older people do, are attributable at least in part to another factor--the fact that younger people have received more formal education than older people. In this regard Berelson found that:

> In every case differences in library use are much greater with regard to educational levels than any other factor. Characteristics such as age and economic status are of less determinative importance, and the educational

> level emerges as the most important single factor affecting adult use of the American public library.[8]

The proof that this statement still holds true is perhaps most clearly shown in the 1966 Cuyahoga County study. In order to predict future demands for library circulation services, a number of variables were reviewed for their possible relationship with changes in circulation. Among these variables were average median income, number of children between 0-19 years, percent of juveniles in the population, population density, social rank (based on education and occupation types of population in census tracts), and average median education. Step-wise multiple regression was the primary statistical technique used to analyze the wide variety of independent variables potentially related to library use. The program involved a process which reviewed each potential variable thought to influence circulation, and then select only those variables which correlated best. It was found through this technique that social rank (which included education), average median education, and population density, were the three factors that, taken together, best simulated library circulation. These variables were then used in a model to predict future demands for library circulation services.

In every case, including the 1949 Berelson study and the recent Bundy and Cuyahoga County reports, the proportion of people actively using the public library rose sharply with formal level of schooling. In the Bundy study it was found that the majority of the out-of-school adult library users had a college education. Of those adults queried,

---

[8]Berelson, op. cit., p. 28.

8.3 percent indicated that the last school they attended was elementary school, while 28.1 percent indicated high school, and 60.5 percent indicated college (3.1 percent did not respond).

The home-interview survey utilized in the Cuyahoga County study disclosed a different pattern of library use for people out of school as compared to people still in school. For people out of school, additional completed education up through the 11th grade did not significantly add to the likelihood that a person would use a library; but education after the 11th grade did associate with a higher percentage of library users (See Table 3-4).

TABLE 3-4

Education Level of People Out of School (Education Completed) and the Percent Who Used or Did Not Use a Library Within Six Weeks

Education Completed	Percent of Users	Percent of Nonusers	Total Percent
0 - 8 grades	12.1	87.9	100.0
9 - 11 grades	13.1	86.9	100.0
12 grades	26.7	73.3	100.0
1 - 3 years of college	46.1	53.9	100.0
4 plus years of college	63.6	36.4	100.0

Source: Cuyahoga County Report, p. 125.

For people still in school, the only significant difference in the percent of people using a library was between those in grades 1-6 and those in higher grades. There was no significant difference in the percent of library use by persons in junior high school, high school, or college. Because of the consistently high percentage of people in school that were library users, the study concludes that almost all children in school can be expected to use public libraries (See Table 3-5).

Up to this point it has been determined that the majority of a library's clientele is likely at any time to consist of people who are young, well-educated, female, or either students, housewives, or in the professional or managerial occupations. The studies reviewed for this report provide further evidence that library users with these personal characteristics are also likely to use the library more frequently than library users without these personal characteristics.

TABLE 3-5

Education Level of People in School (Education in Progress) and the Percent Who Used or Did Not Use a Library Within Six Weeks

Education in Progress	Percent of Users	Percent of Nonusers	Total Percent
1- 6th grade	88.7	11.3	100.0
7- 9th grade	96.2	3.8	100.0
10-12th grade	97.0	3.0	100.0
In College	95.1	4.9	100.0

Source: Cuyahoga County Report, p. 125.

Tables 3-3 through 3-5 indicate a higher concentration of use among people with higher incomes, in school, or out of school and well-educated. These are the people more likely to use the library at least once every six weeks. Of the 21,385 patrons surveyed in the Bundy study, 79.9 percent had used the nearest library to their home at least once a month:

TABLE 3-6

Frequency at Which Surveyed Patrons Used the Library Nearest Their Home

Frequency of Use	Percentage of Total Users
Once a month or more	36.0
Once or twice a month	43.9
Less than once a month	13.1
First time	4.1
No response	2.9
(total)	100.0

Source: Abstracted from Bundy Report, p. 955.

When estimating future demand for library services, it is therefore necessary to consider not only the magnitude of the population, but also the fact that certain groups are likely to use the library more frequently than others.

Getting to the Library

Perhaps the least understood relationship between the library and its public is that of accessibility as it relates to public library use. It is difficult to generalize about the accessibility of a library because of the wide diversity of each library's clientele (thus raising the question of to which group the library is to be most accessible), and because of the fact that library accessibility is a function of a number of factors, including distance to the library and the level of service provided by the library itself. Consequently, the following discussion attempts only to identify certain basic relationships which would always need clarification by local survey.

1. Distance As It Affects Library Use--Many of the existing standards for determining the service radius of a library are based on the findings of the 1949 Berelson study regarding the relationship between the use of the library and the distance separating the user from it. As pointed out previously, the distance patrons are willing to travel to the library depends on factors other than just distance itself; however, assuming that the composition of the population does not vary with distance from the library, Berelson found that proximity to home remained as a major factor in determining library use. His conclusions are drawn from Table 3-7, extracted from his report, which summarizes all studies that had been conducted on the subject as of 1949.

It is significant to note that Table 3-7 summarizes surveys of urban situations only, and is not, as Berelson points out, representative of suburban and rural localities. From Table 3-7 Berelson

TABLE 3-7

Public Library Registrants and Users (Adults) At Different Residential Distances from the Library, Adapted From Various Studies

Distance From the Public Library in Blocks	Percentages						
	Ulveling 1939: Registrants	Kreig 1929: Registrants	Quinly 1948	Cole 1948: Library Branch	Field and Peacock 1948	Wylie 1948	SRC 1948
1 - 5	61	23	14	48	26	51	19
6 - 7	20		17	10	28		
		33				19	35
8 - 11	13		26	13			
					23		
12 - 15	2	13	16	14			
						17	37
16 - 19	1	14	13		7		
				15			
20 and over	3	17	14		16	13	9

Source: Berelson Report, Table 23, p. 45.

concludes that in cities the major part of library registrants and users live within a relatively few blocks of the library building.

In the 1967 Bundy study, it was found that the distance traveled by patrons ranged considerably, but that over 80 percent traveled less than five miles and three-fourths of users traveled fifteen minutes or less (See Table 3-8).

2. Origin-Destination of Library Visits--Of particular interest to this report is the pattern of origin and destination for trips made to the public library. This is because a basic part of the rationale for locating public libraries within or adjacent to shopping centers is based on the theory that most patrons combine library and shopping

TABLE 3-8

Distances At Which Patrons Traveled To Use a Public Library
(Based on Their Own Estimates)

Distance in Miles	Percentage of Total Users	Percentage of Total Users	Distance in Travel Time
Less than 1 mile	39.7	34.2	1- 5 minutes
1 - 5 miles	44.4	28.4	6-10 minutes
5 - 10 miles	9.1	14.6	11-15 minutes
10 - 15 miles	3.5	7.2	16-20 minutes
Over 15 miles	1.8	1.9	21-25 minutes
No response to question	1.5	3.5	26-30 minutes
		3.4	Over 30 minutes
		6.8	No response to question
(total)	100.0	(total) 100.0	

Source: Abstracted from Bundy Report, p. 955.

trips. It will be recalled that the Wheeler study, reviewed in the last chapter, provides evidence through case examples that the above theory is generally true. However, in the more recent studies conducted for the Cleveland and Baltimore metropolitan areas, the findings are somewhat different, raising the question of whether the case examples presented by Wheeler are an adequate basis for making across-the-board assumptions regarding the travel behavior of library patrons.

The origin and destination of library visits were investigated in the Cuyahoga County study by means of the at-library survey. A

special trip was categorized as one which originated from and terminated at home with a visit to a library in-between. A dual-purpose trip was categorized as one where the origin and destination of the library visit were different, implying that the library user combined other tasks with his library visit. The findings are summarized in Table 3-9, extracted from the report.

Table 3-9 indicates that approximately one-half of all trips to a branch library were "special" trips for both children and adults, and that there was a relatively low percentage of any one type of "dual-purpose" trip. Among all trips for both children and adults, only 16.3 percent involved a trip to the local shopping district. These findings were especially surprising since a corresponding field check of the location of libraries determined that over 60 percent of all branches were located in or near retail shopping centers.

Table 3-9 also indicates the important difference between the trip behaviors of grade-school students and adults. While the major trip pattern for all patrons was the home-to-home trip, the second most important trip for young people was the school-to-home trip and the second most important trip for adults was the shopping-to-home trip.

Although the Bundy report does not include an O-D study of trip patterns, it was found through the survey of patrons that a total of 16,019 library patrons, or 74.9 percent, set out for the library from home, but 11.9 percent did come from school and 7.5 percent from work. Of the group, 57.2 percent made the trip solely to go to the library; 16 percent went to the library while they were out shopping, while 24.9 percent made their trip in connection with some other activity.

TABLE 3-9

Estimated Percents of Adults and Child Trip Patterns
To Branch Libraries

Origin or Destination	-Library-	Destination or Origin	Percent of Children (0-19 years)	Percent of Adults (20 plus years)
Home	-Library-	Home	53.1	48.3
School	-Library-	Home	17.4	2.8
Shopping	-Library-	Home	9.7	27.3
Other	-Library-	Home	5.3	5.9
Friend's home	-Library-	Home	5.7	3.4
Work	-Library-	Home	1.0	7.4
School	-Library-	Home	2.9	0.1
Friend's home	-Library-	Friend's home	2.6	0.8
Work	-Library-	Work	0.1	3.3
Shopping	-Library-	School	0.8	0.7
Shopping	-Library-	Friend's home	0.9	0.0
School	-Library-	Friend's home	0.0	0.0
Shopping	-Library-	Shopping	0.5	0.0
		(total)	100.0	100.0

All Library Trips Involving:	Percent for Children	Percent for Adults	Total Percent for children and adults
Home	92.2	95.1	89.1
School	21.1	3.6	17.9
Shopping	11.9	29.1	16.3
Work	1.1	10.7	4.0
Friend's home	9.2	4.2	9.2
Other	N/S*	N/S	7.2

* Not Specified

Source: Abstracted from Cuyahoga County Report, Tables 4 and 5, pp. 90 and 91.

3. Mode of Transportation to Libraries--Of the twenty-one libraries surveyed in the Cuyahoga County study, the average mode of transportation was split between pedestrian-oriented travel (57.9%), which included walking and bicycling, and auto-dependent travel (42.1%). The Bundy report indicates that two-thirds traveled by car (67.9%), while 24.6 percent walked.

In both studies there appeared to be little reliance on mass-transit as a means for reaching or leaving a public library. Through regression analysis, the Cuyahoga County study found that the split between pedestrian and auto travel to a library varied in accordance to the service radius of the library. Thus, a local library with a relatively small service area located within a densely populated neighborhood is likely to experience more patrons walking or bicycling to the library than some other library located in a more rural situation or with a larger service area.

Why People Use the Library

In Chapter One it was shown that the public library offers many services other than just the circulation of books for home use. Even small community libraries frequently maintain the capability for providing a wide diversity of additional services, such as: 1) answering reference questions in person, by phone and by mail; 2) providing reading and study facilities; 3) maintaining files of newspapers, magazines, and other materials; 4) facilitating research work; 5) developing reading lists of various kinds and providing personal reading guidance; 6) administering discussion groups; 7) participating in group work in the reading problems of clubs and organizations;

8) stocking and lending films and recordings; 9) offering instruction in the use of the library; and 10) telling stories to children. Thus, the community library is not only a book distribution agency, but is also intended to serve as a center for group meetings and study efforts. By comparing the various surveys under review in this report, some insight can be gained regarding what use the library's public makes of these various services.

1. Library Services Used--A comparison of all three surveys reveals that the circulation of books for home use has continued to represent the major public service provided by the American public library. Table 3-10, extracted from the 1949 Berelson report, indicates that circulation scored over reference in a ratio of at least two or three to one, both in public use and in the amount of time spent by library personnel.

Although reference questions ranked second only to circulation of books as the single most-used service of the public library, Berelson notes that reference services were usually overrated by statistical accounts. Most of the reference service to adults was of a "fact-finding" nature--up to 90 percent of all questions called for a brief and simple answer, while less than 10 percent called for extensive research of any kind.

Berelson found that besides circulation and reference services, all other services ranked as minor in comparison. According to the national sample, only about two to three percent of all newspapers and magazines read were provided by the public library, and only six percent of the national cross-section indicated libraries as having any influence on popular reading by direct advice on the selection of

TABLE 3-10

Comparison of Circulation and Reference Services of the Public Library, Adapted From Three Studies

Services	Percentages					
	Phelps 1947*			Field & Peacock 1948**	Baldwin & Marcus 1941***	
	Boston	Los Angeles	St. Louis	Los Angeles	Staff Time	Salary Expenditures
Circulation	66	71	75	64	30	27
Reference and Information	34	29	25	20	8	8

* Total represents number of books withdrawn and reference questions asked during a "typical week."

** Use of the library on latest visit; other uses omitted.

*** Average distribution of library time and expenditures in a sample of public libraries; other jobs and expenditures omitted.

Source: Berelson Report, Table 26, p. 52.

books. It was found that use of the card catalog, as with most services, varied with the size of the library and the extent of its collection; but in the national sample it was found that only about four percent of library patrons used the card catalog on a continual basis. In all cases Berelson found that the use of these additional services (other than circulation) was restricted to a group of specialized persons, usually students or well-educated adults.

Since publication of the Berelson report, library literature has repeatedly emphasized current concentrated efforts for increasing and expanding special educational services to groups, to be provided by public libraries by all sizes. However, an analysis of the two current studies of library use reveals that patron-use patterns of library services within the two metropolitan areas under study were very similar to those patterns disclosed in the 1949 Berelson report. In the Bundy study it was found that only a small proportion of users availed themselves of library guides and tools and staff help. Twice as many patrons reported that they selected a book by browsing through books on the shelves as compared with the number who used library catalogs (Table 3-11).

As Table 3-11 indicates, activities involved in book circulation accounted for nearly 50 percent of all services, while reference services ranked significantly in second place. All other services ranked minor in comparison to circulation and reference services. Considering that many users did not actually talk to a librarian but to a clerical staff member, and that such assistance in any case was probably directional in nature, the Bundy report concludes that probably less than 10 percent of patrons actually received truly professional assistance.

TABLE 3-11

Percentage of Various Services Used By Patrons

Library Use	Percentage of Total Users*
Looked through books on shelves	43.1
Reference books	22.1
Library catalogs	19.1
Help from a librarian	16.0
Consulted books or magazines in the library	12.4
Read new magazines or newspapers	8.7
Periodical indexes	5.7
Recordings	2.7
Films	0.7
Other use	2.0
No response	11.1

* Percents add up to more than 100 since multiple answers were possible.

Source: Abstracted from Bundy Report, p. 956.

The at-library survey used in the Cuyahoga County study provided similar statistics. Of all patrons surveyed, 70.2 percent used book circulation services, 20.9 percent used reference materials, and only 17.5 percent used any other available services (Percents add up to more than 100 because multiple answers were possible).

2. Reasons For Using the Library--Patron use of library services directly reflects the reasons why people come to the library. As might be expected, both of the recent studies found that personal

reading (for pleasure or study) and school-related use were the two major reasons for making a trip to the library:

TABLE 3-12

Reasons For Respondents' Use of the Public Library
(In Percentages)

Bundy Report, 1967*		Cuyahoga County Report, 1966*	
Reasons for Use	Percentage of Total	Percentage of Total	Reasons for Use**
Personal reading	49.3	50.8	School
School	41.7	49.6	Pleasure
For another person	9.1	20.8	Personal reading
Job	6.5	5.8	Study
Club activity	2.0	4.2	Job
For some other reason	2.6	9.0	Other
No answer	5.8		

* Percents add to more than 100 since multiple answers were possible.

** It is admitted in the Cuyahoga County report that the distinction between pleasure and personal reasons, and the distinction between school and study reasons was not clear. By regrouping the reasons for use so that the range of percents was expressed in more detailed groups, it was found that personal satisfaction assumed more importance than the school-related motivation.

Source: Bundy Report, p. 956, and Cuyahoga County Report, p. 94.

A cross-sort analysis used in the Cuyahoga County study disclosed that the average motivation for children was distinct from that of adults. Whereas children (0-19 years) used libraries almost equally for both school-study and personal-pleasure reasons, practically all

adults (98.3%) used libraries for personal-pleasure reading and only a fifth for study.

As Table 3-12 indicates, both surveys found that public library services to support occupational or group activities is minimal when compared to personal reading and school-related use.

Public Opinion of Library Services

Since the 1949 Berelson study, it is evident that the public library has continued to serve a rather self-selected minority with special characteristics, comprising a disproportionate share of the younger, better-educated, culturally alert members of the community. In an attempt to discover why many people do not use their public library, several opinion surveys have been conducted either as integral parts of library use studies or as separate studies in themselves. An opinion survey was incorporated in the Cuyahoga County study by means of a home-library survey administered to a sample of 2000 households in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area. Because the Bundy study did not include an opinion survey, it was felt that the findings of the Cuyahoga County study should be compared with those findings of other recent opinion surveys. Among those available were two of fairly recent origin, which were consequently selected for review in this section.

The first report is the product of a study made of the demand for public library services in Oakland County, Michigan, published in 1960 by the Michigan State Board for Librarians.[9] The report is based on

---

[9] McKinley, Elizabeth, Demand for Public Library Service in Oakland County, Michigan, (Lansing, Michigan: State Board for Libraries, 1960).

the results of an attitude survey conducted during 1957, in which 501 persons were selected at random to be interviewed in their home. The sample was designed to include a representative cross-section of persons thirteen years of age or older living in various cities, towns, or rural areas within the County. Oakland County was selected by the State for this study because it represents a heavily populated urban county within the Detroit Metropolitan Area. At the beginning of the survey there were twenty-three libraries in Oakland County, ranging from medium-sized systems serving approximately 95,000 persons to four small volunteer efforts at providing some reading material in a community.

The second report is described in a recent article within the American Library Association Bulletin.[10] It is the result of a study conducted by the Pennsylvania State Library in January, 1965, to examine the impact of library services in five medium-sized Pennsylvania cities. Relevant information was obtained from various reports, interviews conducted with library staffs, board members and community leaders, and home interviews with a selected sample of county householders. The five cities ranged in population from slightly over 21,000 to nearly 140,000, and were geographically distributed throughout the State.[11] The study focused on the headquarters unit of each system, of which all five were district library centers within the Pennsylvania plan for state-wide integrated library services.

---

[10]Monat, William R., "The Community Library--Its Search for a Vital Purpose," in ALA Bulletin, Volume 61, (December, 1967), pp. 1301-1310.

[11]The five cities in order of population were Erie, Altoona, Lancaster, Williamsport, and Pottsville.

1. The Public's View of the Public Library--The 1949 Berelson study includes a report on a survey conducted in 1946 in several large cities, in which respondents were asked how much difference it would make to them personally and to the city if there were no public libraries in the community. The replies indicated a wide discrepancy between the two sets of evaluations:

> A sizeable group felt that the absence of a public library would strongly affect the community generally, but not themselves. Only a relatively small group felt that they themselves would be affected a great deal. In other words, the prevailing sentiment seemed to be that a public library is symbolically a good thing for a city to have, as a civic institution or as a monument or as something for other people to use.[12]

It is significant that in all of the more current attitude surveys reviewed for this report the findings were similar, especially with reference to non-user groups. In the Oakland County study, it was found through the home interview survey that even though a person had not used a library for years, or never had used one, he usually displayed a certain pride in the fact that his community has a good public library. Through interviews with households and community leaders, the 1965 Pennsylvania survey revealed that no one openly opposed library services. Everyone spoke well of the community library; but in many ways these sentiments and attitudes referred to the public library as an institution, and not as a service agency.

As indicated in the last chapter, librarians have been inclined to interpret the general public's long-standing habit of placing considerable symbolic value on the public library as something detrimental

---

[12]Berelson, op. cit., p. 85.

to the fulfillment of the library's function as a public service agency. This has been translated into the current principles for not locating public libraries within cultural settings. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the general public, both among users and nonusers of the public library, remains to place considerable importance on the cultural atmosphere the library provides as an integral part of the community's institutional framework.

2. Satisfaction With Specific Services--Consistent with the above observations has been the repeated finding that patrons usually are quite satisfied with public library service. Of the various studies summarized in the 1949 Berelson report, it was found that about 75 percent of the library's clientele reported they were able to get what they wanted from the public library, while only about 20 percent reported partial satisfaction:

TABLE 3-13

Satisfaction With Public Library Service, Adapted from Several Studies
Percentage of Library Users

Degree of Satisfaction	Haygood 1938	James 1941	NORC 1946	Field & Peacock 1948	SRC 1948
Completely satisfied	"a little over 1/2"	75	75	80	70
Partially or occasionally satisfied	"over 1/3rd"	8	25	16	14
Not satisfied	14	17	-	-	5
No answer	-	-	-	4	11

Source: Berelson Report, Table 35, p. 83.

The 1960 Oakland County attitude survey revealed that only 7.5 percent of all persons interviewed were dissatisfied in one way or another with existing library services and facilities. Similarly, the 1965 Pennsylvania survey found that very high levels of overall satisfaction were expressed by clients of all five libraries--75 percent of all respondents. Of all patrons questioned in the 1966 survey reported by Bundy, only 7 percent of library patrons reported that they were completely unsatisfied, while 47 percent of all users indicated that they were completely satisfied, and 28.5 percent that they were partially satisfied (The remaining 17 percent did not respond to the question).

Among the relatively small percentage of users who have expressed some dissatisfaction with library services, there is considerable differences in the findings of the various studies, due undoubtably to variations in the conditions in which the surveys were conducted. In all the studies reviewed by Berelson, the overwhelming majority of unsatisfied demand was due to inadequacy of the book collection (an average of 85 percent of all dissatisfaction expressed). Likewise, the Bundy study found that of those unsatisfied users who gave their reasons, 47 percent wanted materials which were already loaned and 36 percent wanted a book not in the library. In both the Oakland County study and the Pennsylvania survey, the majority of complaints from users dealt with practical matters of convenience, such as longer hours of opening and improved parking accommodations, with only minor expressed dissatisfaction with internal service aspects. However, characteristic of all surveys was the general lack of any expressed opinions regarding the more specialized services offered by public libraries,

including reference, informational, special services to groups, and personal-assistance services offered by librarians. The lack of expressed demand for these services would appear to bear out a major finding of the 1949 Berelson report--that the general public is not particularly knowledgeable of the educational functions of the public library and its full program of services, other than circulation services.

3. Reasons for Not Using the Public Library--Only two of the recent studies provide a detailed account of why non-library users do not use the public library--the 1960 Oakland County report and the 1966 Cuyahoga County report. The findings for both surveys are summarized for comparative purposes in Table 3-14.

TABLE 3-14

Non-Library Users and Their Reasons for Not Using Libraries (in Percents)

Cuyahoga County Report, 1966*		Oakland County Report, 1960*	
Reasons for Non-Use	Percentage of Total**	Percentage of Total	Reasons for Non-Use
No need	50.8	50.0	No need
Too busy	41.3	21.0	Too busy
Have own library	10.8	6.0	Had other reading sources
Inconveniently located	5.4	5.0	Inconvenient hours, location, etc.
Hard to park	23.4	0.0	Parking
Do not have books	21.7	2.0	Lack of desired materials
Other reasons	10.1	16.0	Other reasons
		100.0	(total)

* A non-user was defined in the Cuyahoga County study as a person who did not use a library in 6 weeks prior to the survey, while a non-user was defined in the Oakland County study as a person who did not use a library in 12 months prior to the survey.

** Percents add to more than 100 since multiple answers were possible.

Source: Cuyahoga County Report, adapted from Table 11, p. 172, and Oakland County Report, Table 12, p. 13.

As Table 3-14 indicates, the primary reason for not using libraries was found in both studies not to be due to poor library service, but rather because people felt no need or were too busy to use the public library. In both cases a very low percentage of non-users indicated that libraries were inconveniently located.

4. Opinions on Library Location--Another aspect of the home-interview surveys conducted in both the Oakland and Cuyahoga County studies dealt with the question of opinions regarding proper library location among user and non-user groups. Two specific questions were asked of Oakland County residents regarding their feelings about whether location of the public library nearer their home or in a shopping area would increase their use. Table 3-15 shows the responses:

TABLE 3-15

Responses to Questions Regarding Library Accessibility
Oakland County Survey, 1960

Questions	Respondents	Responses (in percentages)			
		Yes	No	Library Near Enough	No Answer
1. Would location nearer home increase your use?	Total	39	47	13	1.0
	Users	49	33	17.5	.5
	Non-users*	35	52	12	1.0
2. Would location near shopping areas increase your use?	Total	34.5	63	-	2.5
	Users	33	67	-	-
	Non-users*	35	62	-	3.0

* Non-users defined as persons who did not use a library in twelve months prior to the survey.

Source: Oakland County Report, adapted from Figures II and III, p. 16.

Table 3-15 indicates that, in general, the majority of persons felt that libraries located nearer their home or a shopping area would not increase their own use of the public library. However, among both users and non-users, nearness to home was more important than nearness to shopping facilities.

In the Cuyahoga County study opinions on library location were obtained through questions asking patrons why they chose the public library they used. By dividing users and their reasons cited for choosing a public library according to their household classification, it was found that convenience preferences varied between household members.

Table 3-16 indicates that for both children and adults the two major reasons for approving a library was nearness to home and its possession of necessary books. The most significant difference between children and adults was that children preferred a library near school and did not really care about anything else. All other reasons for choosing a library, including nearness to shopping, were relatively minor in comparison.

By comparing these findings of the home-library survey with those of the at-library survey, the Cuyahoga County study was able to verify the following general observations[13]:

1. All library users consider the proximity of the nearest library to home as the most important factor in their choice of a library. Spouses and younger children are most concerned with distance.

2. Spouses are the users most concerned with a library's nearness to shopping.

---

[13]Adapted from p. 118 of the Cuyahoga County Report.

TABLE 3-16

Reasons Cited for Choosing a Public Library
(in percentages)

Type of Individual	Near Home	Near Shopping	Near Work	Near School	Near Civic Center	Near Transit Stop	Easy Parking	Old Attach-ments	Had Book
Household head	57.8	2.1	11.7	1.4	3.4	0.7	8.3	2.3	36.9
Spouse	77.6	7.1	2.2	1.4	0.8	0.4	10.3	2.2	37.2
Oldest child*	65.8	1.5	1.5	13.1	0.6	0.8	3.7	0.9	39.8
2nd oldest child	74.8	0.9	0.4	14.0	0.9	0.4	3.5	0.9	39.2
3rd oldest child	74.7	0.3	0.3	15.0	1.7	0.3	2.8	0.6	36.8

* Children defined as a group of whom 85.2 percent were 5 to 19 years of age.

Source: Cuyahoga County Report, Table 7, p. 117.

3. Household heads are the users most concerned with a library's nearness to work.

4. Children, especially in the younger age groups, are the users most concerned with a library's nearness to school.

5. Household heads are the users most concerned with a library's proximity to a civic center.

6. Spouses and household heads (adults) are the users most concerned with easy parking.

7. All users are equally influenced by the availability of desired books.

The Relationship of Library Size and Library Use

An inherent weakness of all the studies on library use reviewed for this report is the lack of comparative analysis between user trends experienced by various kinds and sizes of public libraries. In Chapter One it was pointed out that there are many variations of public libraries, both in terms of size and programs of service. For descriptive purposes it is possible to classify public libraries into main or central, local or community, or branch libraries. But in reality these categories overlap and do not represent any one particular pattern of library size or service level. For example, a main or central library may represent the central headquarters of a large regional system within a highly urbanized metropolitan area or it may represent the central library of a small rural town with bookmobiles providing service to outlying school districts. Likewise, branch facilities range from small community branches serving populations of less than 5,000 to large regional branches of the state, serving populations exceeding 250,000.

The basic service programs of "large" libraries are somewhat similar regardless of their type (branch or central) because they usually serve as a central unit for lower-order libraries in the hierarchal system, and consequently house a central collection and administrative functions for the system. But the relationship of size to service program breaks down considerably as library size decreases, especially among community libraries, which may serve as small versions of main libraries or merely as book distribution agencies (depending on local factors and whether the library is a member of the system).

Of all the studies available for review, only one--the Bundy study--attempts to compare user trends experienced by different kinds and sizes of public libraries. Library size in terms of the size of the book collection is used as the index of level of service. Although it is evident from previous discussion that such an index is not truly an accurate representation of a library's service program, it is felt that such an index is adequate for making at least some gross comparisons.

It will be remembered that the Bundy report describes a six-day at-library survey conducted in the metropolitan area of Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C., in which over 20,000 patrons were asked to fill out questionaires at a total of ninety-nine library units. Because of the large size of the sample taken at each library, it was possible to conduct several subanalyses of the data, including a comparison of library size and library use. The purpose of this further analysis was to provide evidence as to whether increasing size of the library (i.e., increasing level of service) influences user composition, the purpose for using the library, user travel patterns, and

the use of various services. The findings are summarized in Table 3-17, on the following page.

The Enoch Pratt Free Library, the largest library in the metropolitan area, serves the central city of Baltimore as well as all other libraries in the region through centralized administrative services. Each user has the opportunity to use any library in the entire Maryland Metropolitan Region, and may borrow materials from any library in the Region free of charge. Except for the Enoch Pratt system, all other systems are administered at the county level of government.

As Table 3-17 discloses, patterns of library use did in fact vary with different library sizes. Size of the unit was first compared with the personal characteristics of users. It was found that the percentage of male users generally increased with library size. Further breakdown of young people into different age groups revealed that use of the library by the twelve to sixteen year olds decreased as the size of the library increased, while use by the seventeen to twenty-one age group tended to increase slightly as size increased. This reflects the tendency among grade students below driving age to use their local public or school library for school-related purposes. On the other hand, increased mobility and the greater need for research materials prompted more in the older age group to travel further to the larger library outlets.

It was found that the percentage of housewives in each user group tended to decrease as library size increased, reflecting the tendency among housewives to meet their own personal reading needs and the needs of their young children through use of the local public library. The fact that housewives seldom experienced the need to

TABLE 3-17

Trends in Use Experienced By Public Libraries of Various Sizes
(Measured in Terms of the Size of Book Collections)
(In Percentages)

Library Size:	Bookmobiles	10,000-25,000 Volumes	25,001-50,000 Volumes	50,001-100,000 Volumes	Over 100,000 Volumes	Pratt Central 824,882 Volumes
1. Number of Units	16	41	20	12	2	1
2. Total Number of Users	898	4421	5958	6859	1419	1646
3. Percent of Male Users	27.3	38.7	41.6	46.4	45.2	54.7
4. Percent of Users Who Are Housewives	26.7	19.7	16.8	15.8	15.8	2.4
5. Percent of Students in College	6.0	17.5	20.0	27.2	31.5	56.5
6. Percent of Professionals Among Employed Adults	55.9	49.1	50.4	53.2	54.1	58.3
7. Percent of Users Coming by Car	32.0	66.9	68.9	74.5	90.8	40.1
8. Percent of Users Traveling More Than 15 Minutes	3.4	9.7	13.0	14.1	21.2	55.1
9. Percent of Users Using the Library for General Reading	58.7	37.9	32.9	31.3	31.4	19.4

TABLE 3-17 (continued)

Library Size:	Bookmobiles	10,000-25,000 Volumes	25,001-50,000 Volumes	50,001-100,000 Volumes	Over 100,000 Volumes	Pratt Central 824,882 Volumes
10. Percent of Users on a Subject Coming by Car	17.1	28.4	32.7	34.5	38.9	51.2
11. Percent Using the Library for Personal Reading	75.5	55.9	48.2	46.2	45.7	35.8
12. Percent Using the Library for Job Purposes	3.5	5.2	6.1	6.7	7.5	11.7
13. Percent Using the Library for School Purposes	27.7	35.8	42.7	43.5	43.5	54.4
14. Percent Using Library Catalogs	1.0	14.5	17.3	21.0	25.2	34.4
15. Percent Using Reference Books	10.1	18.7	21.1	23.5	26.8	31.8

Source: Bundy Report, adapted from various tables, pp. 375-378.

travel to the central-city library is expressed by the low percent (2.4%) of housewives that used the Enoch Pratt Central (See Table 3-17).

When student groups were further analyzed it was found that the bookmobile was used by a much higher percentage (33.8%) who were elementary school students than the other size categories, in which youngsters represented 13 percent or less of total users. Pratt Central had the highest percentage of college students, and, as Table 3-17 indicates, it was found that the percentage of each group attending college generally increased as library size increased. A similar relationship was found with the percentage of professionals, which (with the exception of bookmobile patrons) also increased with library size. These findings appear to bear out some of the user trends disclosed as far back as the 1949 Berelson study, which indicated that professional and managerial groups (mostly men) were likely to use the more extensive reference collections available at the larger library outlets, while women (mostly housewives) were likely to make most use of local community book circulation services.

Another aspect of the comparative analysis was to relate size of the library with user travel habits. With the exception of Pratt Central (used to a high degree by college students residing in the downtown area), it was found that use of the car to reach libraries increased with the size of the unit. Likewise, the percentage of patrons traveling more than five miles or spending more than fifteen minutes coming to the library also increased as library size increased. Of course, these relationships reflect the fact that library services

generally increase with library size, particularly if the library functions as a central headquarters for a regional system.

A third aspect of the comparative analysis was to relate size of the library with the reasons why patrons came to the library. As Table 3-17 discloses, the major differences in the use of the library for general reading purposes was at the extremes, with Pratt Central and the bookmobile users (19.4% and 58.7% respectively). The low percentage of Pratt users who came for general reading purposes is due not only to the extensive reference services offered by the large central-city unit, but is also due to the high percentage of users who were students (57%). The use of the public library to obtain materials or information on a subject also increased as size increased, as did use of the library for job purposes and for school purposes. On the other hand, use of the library for personal reading purposes decreased with increasing size, particularly at the extremes (See Table 3-17).

A final aspect for study was to compare library size with the use made of various library services. As Table 3-17 indicates, it was found that the percentage who used library catalogs and the percentage who used reference books both increased steadily with library size. A further analysis of the use of library services revealed that the percentage using periodical indexes and the percentage that consulted books and magazines for research purposes also increased with library size.

From the data supplied in Table 3-17 it is evident that the increased capability of larger units to provide extensive collections for research activities has a direct influence on the personal

characteristics, travel characteristics, and use characteristics of the library's clientele. How far a person is willing to travel to meet some particular need for a certain library service is a factor difficult to predict; however, the evidence strongly suggests that a higher proportion of users of larger library units have come with a special purpose in mind--usually to make use of the more extensive resources not available at the nearest local library outlet.

Physiographical Factors Affecting Library Use

Although most locational studies for public libraries have made passing reference to the affects of land-use arrangements and terrestrial differences on library use, these micro-locational aspects have rarely been studied empirically in actual case situations. During the research phase of this report, it was found that the only available study of this kind was an analysis made of the micro-locational aspects of four Detroit branch libraries.[14] The study made an analysis of the service areas of each branch to determine the affects upon circulation of physical barriers, land-use arrangements, and competition with similar facilities. Service areas were delimited by plotting on a land-use map the addresses on library slips for the first and last week of a month. The service area was then defined as that area containing 98 percent of the patrons of a particular branch. Boundaries between branches were drawn on the map where the majority of patrons in the block on one side of the street used one branch and on the other side used a different branch. Differences in residential

---

[14] Rawley, Ethel, "Analysis of the Location of Four District Branch Libraries," (Unpublished master's thesis), Wayne State University, 1961.

densities were accounted for by delimiting on the map these differences and restricting comparisons of patron use to those areas where population densities were similar.

In terms of land-use barriers, it was found that major industrial complexes, major transportation arterials, and large open-land uses, such as cemetaries, acted as the principal barriers to patron walking trips to the library. It was suggested that rivers, vacant land, and hills, were the principal physical barriers to use. Unfortunately the analysis did not further clarify these effects by accounting for the differences in personal characteristics of patrons living in each neighborhood. For example, the low distribution of patrons living in areas adjacent to and blocked off by industrial complexes might have been due more to the possibility that the people living in these areas were of a social group less inclined to use the library regardless of the presence or absence of physical barriers.

Perhaps the most interesting finding of this study was the combined effect of physiographical factors and the nearness of another branch or the overlapping of service areas. In this case there was evidence that people were generally willing to overcome physical barriers when making a pedestrian trip to the library, unless there was another library which was actually more convenient (although further in distance) due to less physical barriers.

This kind of analysis points out the importance of considering physiographical characteristics and distance of duplicate service units when evaluating the circulation figures of a library or when accounting for physical convenience factors in locational decisions. Such detailed considerations are particularly necessary in urban situations

where trips to the library are more pedestrian-oriented and where the high intensity of land uses tends to create numerous physical barriers to pedestrian travel.

Long Term Factors Influencing Library Use

Variations in the use of the public library reflect not only the local characteristics discussed throughout this chapter, but also the temporal patterns that influence both the public and the library as an institution in itself. The following discussion attempts to suggest how population trends, educational trends, and technological trends may affect the long-range patterns of library use.

1. Population Trends--Recent library literature has given considerable attention to the general growth and changing characteristics of the nation's population and how this will affect future demand for library services. Particular attention has been directed toward the trend in recent years of an increasing proportion of younger people in the overall population, a group which has traditionally placed heavy demands on library services. Most calculations that have placed the nation's 1985 population in the range of 270 million have been based on the assumption of continued high birth rates of twenty-two to twenty-five births per thousand population. However, in 1967 the U.S. recorded the lowest birth rate in its history, 17.9 per thousand, and the outlook is for a continuing decline.[15]

Actually population statistics for the nation as a whole are of limited value to librarians whose institutions are located primarily in

---

[15] ASPO Newsletter, American Society of Planning Officials, Volume 34, No. 10, (November, 1968), p. 119.

metropolitan areas where population trends are not consistent with national averages. For example, it is well known that birth rates among negroes in central city ghettos are far higher than among whites in other areas. Furthermore, migration patterns within and among cities which are locally unique probably have a greater effect on individual library markets than single population growth.[16]

2. Educational Trends--Public libraries have continued to experience close ties with the entire field of education, particularly in terms of the library's traditional commitment to adult education. In recent years there has been an increase in the proportion of the children born each year who finish high school, who enter college, and who graduate from college. Since 1950, the number of school and college students (ages 5 to 34) has increased 70 percent, and according to a 1962 national survey made by the National Opinion Research Center, one in five adults is taking part in some form of organized educational activity.[17]

3. The Impact of Technology--Perhaps one of the most difficult problems faced by librarians is the question of how the library should adapt its communication functions to the rapid pace of technological developments. Increasing technologies affect the library's public and its pattern of library use as well as the role and function of the library itself as an agency for the communication of knowledge.

---

[16]See Conant, Ralph W., "Sociological and Institutional Changes in American Life: Their Implications for the Library," in ALA Bulletin, Volume 61, No. 5, (May, 1967), p. 530.

[17]Havighurst, Robert J., "Educational Changes: Their Implications for the Library," in ALA Bulletin, Volume 61, No. 5, (May, 1967), p. 537.

From the community perspective, increasing technology has meant longer life span and increasing leisure time for potential patrons. New demands for improvements in key areas of transportation and housing will eventually affect all urban institutions. Improved urban transportation coupled with techniques for information storage and retrieval may, for example, further the possibilities of scattering library resources which at the present time must remain centralized. Improved multiple housing design in central cities may eventually lure a sizeable middle-class population back to downtown areas. At the heart of increasing demands for library services is the knowledge explosion, which has witnessed the accumulation of information at such a rapid pace that it is physically impossible for even major libraries to keep up with the rate of expansion.[18] A corollary to this is the increasing need for more specialized information and the fact that past knowledge often becomes obsolete, if not actually false. Consequently, all educational institutions are faced with the continuing task of collecting, selecting, and discarding knowledge at a pace which is kept in time with technological advancements.

For all libraries the technological revolution has meant the awesome task of finding ways to store and retrieve the increasing flood of new information. In recent years a torrent of books and journals have poured off the presses around the world. There are 400,000 books published annually worldwide and in the sciences alone, there are 35,000 separate journals published annually with over 1.5 million articles in them. Journals are estimated to be growing in number at

---

[18] Ibid., p. 539.

the rate of five to ten percent per year, while the literature in them doubles every ten to fifteen years.[19]

For a number of years technological innovators have supported the establishment of public agencies for information retrieval and dissemination which would make utilitarian information and factual knowledge available at established rates to subscribers throughout the world. The establishment of special information centers is currently spreading in this country, and as of 1966, there were more than ten thousand information centers, special libraries, and documentation centers in the United States and Canada.

The formation of major information retrieval centers is also well under way. For example, the Committee on Scientific and Technological Information of the Federal Council for Science and Technology (COSATI) is currently working on the establishment of a network of computerized information centers and special libraries to provide retrieval service in the major scientific disciplines. In 1966 the Committee on Scientific and Technical Communication (SATCOM) was formed with the objective of planning national networks of information systems.

Amidst all these developments many librarians have begun to question whether the traditional public library will be a thing of the past. Computer technology, microfilm technology, and developments in mass communications, have raised the question of whether the book will become obsolete. In order to probe for answers to these questions, Educational Facilities Laboratories, a New York corporation, arranged

---

[19] The Impact of Technology on the Library Building (pamphlet), (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, no date).

a symposium of experts to explore the impact of computer, microfilm, and communications technologies on the library building. It was the consensus of those who participated in the conference that:

> ...for at least the next 20 years the book will remain as an irreplaceable medium of information. The bulk of library negotiations will continue to be with the book--although the service and technology sections will gradually shrink. Remote retrieval of full texts in large amounts over long distance will not be generally feasible, and the continued use of a central library building will still be necessary... To be sure, technology will modify library buildings. But changes will involve trade-offs in space and demands for additional space, rather than less.[20]

Richard Meir has speculated that the library, data bank, and documentation center, will share in the task of sorting out and retaining valuable information. Regional data banks will collect retrievable information about the workings of urban services. Most data banks will be urban facilities established to assemble trend data for local and regional public decision-making. Documentation centers will also house public information to aid in decision-making, but other similar centers will assemble the new materials in sciences, technology and literature, from the world at large. But there is much information that is valuable, yet inconvenient to store and retrieve by mechanical means, and this is where the public library comes in:

> In the future we may expect that the routine and high-volume demands now made upon a library would be divested from it, while the unique services to adult education and scholarship would be expanded. Despite the proposals now being put forth for automating certain library procedures, it appears that the labor of acquisitions, cataloging, and bibliographic compilation would render the library an unsuitable locale for their application. Labor-saving devices will continue to be added, but automation rarely.[21]

---

[20] The Impact of Technology on the Library Building, Ibid., p. 19.

[21] Meir, Richard L., "The Library: An Instrument for Metropolitan Communications," in The Public Library and the City, op. cit., p. 57.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has analyzed some of the basic factors that influence public use of the library. Such an analysis is important because the planner needs to gain an understanding of how the library relates to the community it serves, particularly in terms of the various patterns of use and the reasons why certain groups within the community are likely or not to use the public library. Once the various needs and demands for library services are understood, the planner is then in a good position for making rational decisions regarding the best location for the public library building.

Despite great changes in the environment for libraries and the advancements in the library sciences, all of which have occurred since 1949, it was found that most of the basic findings made by Berelson still apply today, at least in the areas for which surveys were reviewed for this report. In this respect it can be postulated that public libraries, despite their community-wide rhetoric, have continued to serve a considerably more restricted clientele, comprising a disproportionate representation of the younger, better educated, culturally alert members of the community. Among the various personal characteristics of the library's clientele, education has proven to remain as the major correlate of library use. Within a given population group, those adults with at least a high school education are more likely to use the public library than those who did not complete high school, and use it more often.

Housewives and people with professional or managerial occupations make considerable use of the public library; but the principal user, among occupational groups, is the student. In analyzing the reasons

why students prefer to use the public library rather than their own school library, it is evident that more adequate collections provided by the public library, coupled with longer hours of service and fewer restrictions, rank as the major causes.

Evidence has been provided in this chapter showing that it cannot always be assumed that a high proportion of trips to the library are combined with other tasks, even when the library is located in a shopping center. Rather, it was found that trip behaviors vary with household members, although all household members consider proximity to home as the most important factor in choosing a library.

Despite the large variety of services offered by many public libraries, it was found that people continue to make most use of circulation services. Reference services are most used by students and professional people, while all other services are used to a much lesser extent. It was also found, however, that patterns of library use depend upon the size of the library and its level of services. Larger units, usually containing centralized collections and extensive reference resources, tend to attract more high school and college students, as well as adults, who make a special trip to the library for study and research purposes. Local library outlets, on the other hand, cater more to younger elementary students and housewives, as well as other adults concerned with obtaining a book for pleasure-reading or informational purposes.

Whether a person uses a public library or not, it was found that he usually places considerable value on the library's cultural image. But the symbolic nature of the library conflicts with its modern

perspective as a place for busy activity located in the middle of the thick of things.

CHAPTER FOUR

CRITIQUE AND CONCLUSION: PRINCIPLES AND PLANNING PERSPECTIVES FOR LOCATING PUBLIC LIBRARY FACILITIES

In Chapter Two of this report it was shown that a basic locational principle supported by the library profession is for the placement of all public libraries within the heart of downtown or neighborhood pedestrian-oriented shopping and business districts. Further analysis of existing library plans has indicated that the above principle has been accepted literally and used in most plans, including those prepared by local and regional planning agencies.

Undoubtedly there are numerous local situations where a shopping center location for the public library is both feasible and desirable. However, when investigating a possible site for the public library, the urban planner must first gain an understanding of the librarian's rationale for adamantly supporting the shopping center location. The planner must then analyze the community to determine whether this one principle is actually suitable in terms of local community characteristics and needs.

In the first three chapters of this report, facts were presented which, taken together, raise some questions regarding the rationality and need for strict adherence to the one locational principle supported by librarians. These issues are brought together in the following discussion, and are intended to serve as the basis for an objective

appraisal of a locational principle that has long been accepted, but seldom questioned.

The Historic Basis for Current Locational Principles

In Chapter One it was pointed out that the public library, operating traditionally as a function of local government, has struggled for many years in attempting to obtain sufficient financial support to improve the quality of services. In an effort to elevate the status of the public library, librarians began in the late 19th century to emphasize the need for increasing library use. This was also seen as a means for reducing per capita costs for providing library services.

First attempts at increasing public use of the library were made in terms of book selection policies. While the official book selection standards reflected the cultural objectives of the profession, the actual practice became one of acquiring best sellers and other books for which there was a strong local demand.

The practical objective for increasing public use of the library eventually found strong expression in terms of the locational and physical aspects of the public library building. Here it was reasoned that potential use of the library could be maximized by: 1) locating the building in the heart of the business area of town at the crossroads of the heaviest pedestrian traffic; and 2) designing the building so that it would be eye-appealing. A part of the pedestrian crowd who would otherwise not think to enter the library would then be attracted to do so.

At the practical level, maximization of use was viewed among librarians as a means for increasing economies of operation as well as the library's community status. But it was also a professed objective that increasing library use would enable the library to reach a wider segment of the local public, including a greater representation of people who, because of their personal characteristics, are not inclined to use the public library. Thus, maximization of use was viewed among librarians as a means toward achievement of the library's professional objective of "service to everyone at the lowest possible unit cost."

Location As It Relates to Library Use

In Chapter Two it was indicated that the concept of locating public libraries within shopping centers involves an assumption that the degree to which a public library is used depends largely upon the opportunity for patrons to combine their trip to the library with other shopping and business trips. Wheeler provides data to support this from a number of surveys of individual libraries conducted mostly in the 1940's and 1950's for central libraries located downtown in major urban centers. However, the two more recent surveys described in Chapter Three of this report provide evidence which contradicts the findings reported by Wheeler. Both surveys were conducted for a large number of libraries located throughout the two metropolitan regions, and in both studies it was found that the majority of library patrons made a special trip to the library or a dual-purpose trip that did not include shopping. The low percentage of library-shopping trips was particularly prevalent in the Cuyahoga County study of branch libraries, where it was found that less than 17 percent of all patrons

surveyed included a shopping trip with their trip to the library, despite the fact that over 60 percent of all branches surveyed were located in or adjacent to shopping centers (Refer to Table 3-9).

An overview of all the findings brought forth in the entire Third Chapter provides the analyst a logical basis for reasoning why the majority of patrons made a purposeful and not an incidental trip to the library. The overall conclusions of these findings lies in the fact that formal education has remained since the 1949 Berelson study as the single most important factor influencing the use of all public libraries, central or branch. Adults with at least a high school education and young people in the process of being educated compose the majority of the library's clientele, and for these people a trip to the library is something desired or necessary. It is seldom an activity resulting from whim or impulse.

Data compiled throughout Chapter Three supports the above general conclusion. For example, in the Cuyahoga County study it was found that 76.3 percent of all users were young people, nineteen years of age or younger, and that a high percentage of adult users had received at least a high school education (Refer to Tables 3-1 and 3-4). Consequently, it is not surprising to find that the majority of surveyed users indicated nearness to home as the main factor in their choice of a branch library (Refer to Table 3-16).

Similar evidence appears in the comparative study of user trends between public libraries of different size, conducted as a part of the survey of libraries within the metropolitan area of Baltimore and Washington, D.C. In this study it was generally found that as library size increases, the percentage of users who made a special trip to the

library in order to obtain information on a particular subject also increased (Refer to Table 3-17). The difference was especially prevalent at the Enoch Pratt Library, which serves as the central headquarters unit for the entire region. The statistics suggest that central-city libraries are used heavily for research-related purposes by well-educated adults and students who are willing to make a special trip to the library in order to use the extensive resources not immediately available at local library outlets. These findings place additional emphasis on the question of whether location of the central library at the "100% corner" of the downtown area actually results in a high degree of increased use.

The question then arises as to why the findings of the surveys described in Wheeler's report are consistently different than the evidence provided by the more recent surveys. A number of factors could have been involved, and it would be impossible to analyze these because the Wheeler report does not include a description of the conditions under which the surveys were conducted. However, there is clearly one basic weakness in the conclusions made by Wheeler regarding library trip patterns. From the evidence that a high degree of patrons had made a dual-purpose trip to the library, Wheeler concludes that these same patrons would not have otherwise made a special trip to the library. But a description of trip pattern does not in itself describe trip behavior or the motivation for a trip. In this respect, the high percentage of patrons reporting a dual-purpose trip was possibly due essentially to the fact that the libraries surveyed were located in shopping centers. There is really no evidence that these same patrons

would not have made a special trip to the library if it were not located in a shopping center.

Shopping Center Location and Its Influence on the Library's Clientele

At the beginning of this chapter, it was noted that librarians have rationalized the concept of locating public libraries within shopping districts by suggesting that such a location affords the library an opportunity to reach a wider representation of the people living within the community. Although none of the studies described in Chapter Three provide data on individual libraries, there was really no evidence that placement of the library within a shopping district results in drawing more patrons who do not normally use the library (i.e., low income and poorly educated groups). Rather, the data strongly suggests that the library's clientele is still composed primarily of a special group of people who have the incentive to use the library regardless of whether it is located within a shopping center or not. If the use of a particular library is increased due to its location within a shopping district, the evidence suggests that it is probably due to greater use among segments of the community who already make regular use of the library, or who are at least inclined to do so.

Further evidence along these lines is provided by the opinion surveys described in Chapter Three, which were conducted in order to discover why non-users do not use the public library. It was found that convenience of the library in terms of its location among various land uses was not a principal reason for non-use. Instead, among those non-users surveyed it was found that their principal reason for non-use

was personal rather than due to the library or its location (Refer to Table 3-14).

Throughout this report the findings have suggested that location of the library in order to maximize its use is not a panacea for the problem of reaching those people in the community who have not been motivated to use the public library. Attitude surveys have repeatedly shown that the general public is really not aware of the many special programs and services offered by the public library. Surveys of patron use have indicated that the library is used principally for personal reading or study purposes, and that services to special groups are minimal (Reference Tables 3-10 through 3-13). All of these findings suggest that if the library is to truly reach a wider clientele, then it must do so in terms of its full program of services as well as its locational aspects. In other words, the library must reach out to various segments of the community and draw them to the library through special programs or services that cater directly to the needs and desires of the people involved.

The Question of Reducing Unit Costs

Among the various reasons for promoting the location of all public libraries within shopping districts is the concept of reducing unit costs. Costs per unit of service are usually measured by dividing the total number of library materials circulated annually by the total population within the library's service area. Increasing circulation or use of the library serves to lower the cost per transaction, and this, in turn, helps to justify a larger book collection, additional staff, or other improvements in services.

The librarian's concern for minimizing operational costs is readily understandable, especially since the public library has traditionally suffered from a lack of sufficient financial support. However, in the heat of public debate it is apparent that some economically-minded librarians have come to confuse means with ends. Reduction in unit costs through increased circulation has become an end in itself, rather than a means for providing a proper balance between cost of services and level of services. The objective of minimizing costs has been clearly expressed by the opinion that principles governing the location of public libraries are identical to those for the location of retail stores. Thus, each library is viewed as a separate and individual economic unit, which must "pay for itself" if its existence is to be justified. The facts brought forth by this report, however, reveal that the library is neither used or conceived by the public as a department or neighborhood store. Moreover, the library as a public agency is not intended to function entirely as an economic enterprise. This is particularly true for branch libraries operating as components of a library system in which funding for all units is achieved through cooperative arrangements between various levels of government, including local, state, and federal sources.

This problem provides a good example of the need for an objective analysis of the operations of a public agency that seeks to strike a reasonable balance between the practical needs of the institution and the service needs of the community. While the library's objective for minimizing operational costs is certainly desirable from a practical viewpoint, it should not be used as the basis for an arbitrary locational standard that bears little if any relationship with the

community and its needs for library services and the locational aspects of these services.

The Locational Needs of Central Public Libraries

When speaking for the locational requirements of central library facilities, librarians have argued that the main library cannot function at its best unless it is located in the heart of the downtown business district at a "100% corner" on the intersection of two main streets heavily traveled by shopping pedestrians. To add emphasis to the importance of this location, Wheeler has suggested that the central library will suffer decreasing patronage for each block the library is located away from the 100 percent spot, even though there is no statistical evidence supporting this statement (refer to Chapter Two).

A characteristic weakness of this one general standard is its inability to account for the fact that the functions of central business districts are not everywhere the same. For example, it is inherently assumed that all central business districts serve as regional centers for convenience goods shopping to which people travel daily to accomplish their everyday shopping needs and other business errands. But the recent trend, especially in metropolitan areas, has witnessed the decentralization of convenience stores from the downtown area to regional shopping centers located in the urban fringe and suburban areas. In the meantime, downtown areas are becoming centers for comparative goods shopping, offices, and entertainment activities. In these situations it is highly unlikely that the public library will experience much use from shoppers accomplishing their daily errands. Moreover, a comparative goods shopping area functions best when the

individual stores are conveniently located in relation to one another so that shoppers can move along pathways that maximize the visibility of each store and the goods it has for sale. A large municipal library located in the heart of such a shopping area will tend to break up this pattern, not only because of the large size of the building but also because the functions of the two activities are not the same. Data compiled in this report has indicated that central libraries in large urban centers are used mostly by people who make a special trip to the library to accomplish a specific task. People who are shopping for a certain item, and comparing the cost for this item at a number of stores, are also accomplishing a specific task. Both activities usually require a considerable amount of time, and the likelihood that many people will combine both activities in one trip is certainly open to question.

Another characteristic weakness on the one general standard lies in its inability to recognize the functional differences between some central library facilities. For example, there are many communities with populations of less than 75,000 which serve as county seats. The central library located in these communities is often the county headquarters building of a county-wide system, which functions primarily as a means for extending library services to rural areas of the county through the use of bookmobiles. As indicated in Chapter One, in some cases the central library of a county system functions entirely as a storehouse for books and an administrative headquarters, giving no direct service to the public. In any case, the dependency of a county headquarters unit for patron use from the immediate urban area is sometimes considerably less than what might be expected for a municipal

library located in the downtown area of a large city. If the primary function of the county library is to serve the rural areas in the surrounding region, then a location on the periphery of the city may prove best for regional accessibility. This kind of consideration points out the need for analyzing the relative degree to which any central library functions as a local service outlet as well as a regional service agency. Both factors must be weighed when deciding upon the proper location for the central facility.

The Locational Needs of Local Community Libraries

In Chapter Two it was pointed out that Wheeler and other librarians have questioned some of the traditional criteria for locating public libraries. Among these is the concept that the library should stand near the population center of the community or in the center of a residential service area, so that convenience to residential units is maximized. This criterion is subordinated in the belief that the trade center location must always receive first priority, regardless of whether or not it is located near the center of the residential areas.

There is evidence provided in Chapter Three, however, which suggests that residential distance to the public library is probably a more important convenience factor than location within a shopping center. Berelson found distance from home to be an important factor influencing library use in urban areas, and the more recent surveys record similar evidence (Refer to Tables 3-7 and 3-8). More specific evidence on convenience factors is obtained from Tables 3-9 and 3-16, which were both abstracted from the Cuyahoga County study. Table 3-9

shows that for both children and adults the majority of trips were made from home and directly to the library. The Bundy study also found that the majority of patrons made their trip solely to go from home to the library. Table 3-16 cites reasons why different household members chose a particular library. For each household member, nearness to home was the major reason of choice, while other locational factors ranked minor in comparison. The evidence compiled in this report suggests that the local community library is used primarily as a home-centered neighborhood facility which belongs in an area convenient to surrounding residential districts. Location within the neighborhood shopping center may be perfectly adequate, but it is apparent that first priority should be given to a location that is convenient in distance to residents living within the service area.

The Question of Land Costs

The amount of investment for acquisition of a library site has been a source of bitter arguments between librarians and city officials, especially in large municipalities. Librarians have argued that the location of the library facility is so important to its use that it may be the best investment to pay half as much for a pedestrian-center site as for the building itself.[1] On the other hand, city officials, including planners, have questioned whether placement of the public library in the heart of the downtown area represents a highest and best use of the land. This question is especially relevant in municipalities that are experiencing grave

---

[1]See Wheeler, J. L., The Small Library Building: Number 13 in a Series of Pamphlets by the Library Administration Division of ALA, (Chicago: The American Library Association, 1963), p. 4.

difficulties in securing sufficient revenues to finance government operations. Purchase of land within the heart of the downtown area not only involves an extensive investment from limited public funds, but also results in a considerable loss of tax dollars to the municipality's revenue system. Issues raised throughout this report regarding the validity of the 100% spot location adds emphasis to the need for questioning whether acquisition of such a site for the library building represents the best investment for cities with limited financial resources.

Related to the problem of acquiring land in the downtown center for the library building is the additional problem of obtaining sufficient space for parking. In the Cuyahoga County study it was found that the percentage of patrons who drove by automobile to the library generally increased with the library's size and service radius. Table 3-17 also shows this relationship, where it is indicated that the percent of users coming to the library by car increases steadily with library size. Taken together the evidence suggests that a high percentage of patrons of central libraries will be making a special trip by car, and these people will naturally be concerned about finding a convenient parking space on or adjacent to the library site. But a downtown location in the heart of the shopping district presents the most difficult problems of providing convenient and spacious parking. It is rarely possible that parking can be provided on the site. In most situations patrons will be required to search for a metered parking place along city streets or within municipal parking lots. Few studies have recorded the affect of inconvenient parking on patron use of individual libraries. It may be possible that convenience of

parking is a factor that influences the use of the public library more than the location of the building itself. Some evidence of this possibility is provided by Table 3-14, which indicates that difficulties in parking ranked considerably higher than convenience of location as a reason for non-use of public libraries in the Cleveland metropolitan area.

Principles for Where the Library Should Not Be Located

In Chapter Two it was pointed out that the current emphasis on increasing library use has led to a rejection of some sites traditionally selected for the library's location. Any location which is either literally or psychologically removed from the "thick of things" has been considered less than ideal. In this respect, civic centers, governmental centers, cultural centers, parks, side streets, and public school sites, have all been classified as poor locations for the public library.

Throughout this chapter a number of conflicts have been discussed that result when library location is treated principally as a means for maximizing library use. Among these is the problem of finding a proper balance between the practical objective of achieving increasing use and the library's professed objective of meeting the cultural needs of the community. When properly balanced these two objectives need not conflict. In fact, increased circulation among educationally deprived groups and increasing use of special educationally and culturally-oriented programs and services could serve as the means for the achievement of institutional goals. But when increased use becomes the end in itself, then conflicts arise between

institutional goals and the means for achieving them. The problem is exemplified by existing policies for where the library should and should not be located. Many urban libraries are offering special, culturally and educationally-oriented programs, such as art exhibits, the loan of art objects, film forums, and discussion-group meetings. Unquestionably these activities are functionally related to the cultural aspects of museums, community centers, and educational institutions. If the library is to fulfill its institutional objectives through further use of these programs, then there is a logical basis for locating the library among other facilities with related functions, regardless of whether book circulation services are maximized or not.

Existing policies for library design and location also disregard the symbolic value of the library building. The importance of this latent function has been discussed in Chapter Three. Traditionally the American public library has had a certain awe-inspiring character reflected by the library's architecture. There is something in the old-style library which has continued to arouse more than just nostalgia, and it could continue to do a great deal for the contemporary American urban texture, with its busy pace. For one thing, the library can emphatically not be a part of a shopping center, hardly differing in its bright, glassy architecture from the other stores and supermarkets. Rather, the urban public library can predominate as a place where quiet spaces are preserved for urban dwellers who wish to escape the busy activities of the city. This traditional function may be of even greater importance in the current urban environment, where noise, congestion, and the general intensity of

of activities, have made it more difficult than ever to find a quiet place "away from it all."

One final criticism must be levied against existing policies for where the public library should not be located. Restrictive policies such as these give no regard to modern concepts of integrating community activities within centralized community centers. In recent years, for example, considerable attention from city school systems and educators has been given to the concepts of the educational park and the community school, both of which are innovations in the development of school design.

The educational park concept has meant different things to different cities, but it basically involves the clustering of schools of all levels from elementary up through high school and possibly through a community college, on a single, campus-like setting. One variation of the concept has suggested the centralization of other community facilities with the schools so that all persons in the community use the one central complex. In this manner the park would also serve as the community's cultural and recreational center.[2]

One major advantage suggested by the educational park concept is the opportunity to achieve economies of scale, both in terms of centralizing community facilities and in terms of centralizing special services to students and adults in the community. For library services the park would provide the opportunity to replace a number of weak, local branches with one central facility, offering a strong program of general as well as special services to groups. Adequate arrangements

---

[2]See Wolf, Max, "The Educational Park Concept," in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 42, No. 7, (October, 1967), pp. 173-175.

can possibly be made for combining school and public library facilities, assuming that the traditional problems discussed in Chapter Two can be resolved. Otherwise the public library could be used as a facility entirely separated from the school system. In this case the attachments between library services to students and the general community would be limited to internal administrative and personnel aspects.

The education park concept also offers the opportunity to bring together students from a wide variety of socio-economic backgrounds. In this respect educational parks embody the concept that expanded attendance areas could be combined with centralized facilities to achieve racial desegregation in schools and improve the overall quality of education for all students.[3] Social integration of students within one school complex could provide the public library an excellent opportunity to fulfill its objective of reaching a wider representation of various community groups, including lower-income and minority groups.

A recent national survey sponsored by the Center for Urban Education in New York City has found that there has been a very rapid dissemination of the educational park concept throughout this country in the past five years, with parks being developed in more than sixty-five cities. The survey concluded that the country is on the threshold of extensive development of educational parks.[4]

---

[3]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in Public Schools, Volume 1 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), "Educational Parks," in Chapter 2, pp. 167-183.

[4]Wolf, op. cit., p. 232.

Related to the educational park concept is the concept of the "community school" which calls for school planning so that such facilities as the library, the auditorium, gymnasiums, and cafeterias, are accessible for both community and school use. In New Haven, Connecticut, for example, it was decided that schools should become the focal point of the revitalized neighborhoods emerging from an extensive urban renewal program. New schools would be scattered throughout the city to serve neighborhood areas and would include community facilities. As a prototype to the concept, one middle school (grades 5 through 8) was designed to include separate structures housing a senior citizens center, a combined school and public library, and a small theater-auditorium. A wide range of other community services, including employment, medical, social and psychiatric help, and legal aid, are offered but housed separately from the school. Responsibility for the various services remains with the appropriate muncipal and community agencies, but a central physical location, and the opportunity for coordinating all services, are provided by the school.[5]

The concepts of the educational park and the community school provide excellent examples of how the services and the locational aspects of the public library can be integrated with other community services and planned to meet specific community needs. These examples also point out the negative value of adhering to restrictive policies for locating public library facilities--policies that do not account

---

[5] The Schoolhouse and the City, (pamphlet), published by Educational Facilities Laboratories, (New York: 1966), pp. 16-18.

for the fact that public libraries can be located in a variety of situations that benefit both the library and the community as a whole.

A Planning Perspective on the Locational Aspects of Public Libraries

Planning attempts to coordinate decision-making to distribute the community's resources in a manner that will best achieve the community's goals. Consequently, when planning for a specific institution, the planner needs to relate the services offered by that institution to the goals of the community plan, and on that basis recommend the amount of resources that should be allocated to that institution for its particular services and facilities.

Throughout this report it has been shown that existing standards for locating public libraries are supplier-oriented in that they are designed to fulfill practical objectives of the library as an institution seeking its own ends. But if the planner is to relate the public library to the goals of the community plan, he must temper institutional goals with the needs and demands for library services expressed by the community itself. Once these needs and demands are understood, then the planner can strive to achieve an optimum balance between the objectives of the library, the demands of the library's clientele, and the library needs of the community as a whole.

It has been indicated in several sections of this report that communication between librarians and planners has been less than ideal. The problem arises from the notion that libraries and librarians compose a separate institution which can best handle its own affairs. The separation between the public library and the rest of local government has been formalized through the library board, which,

except for questions on financing, is usually allowed to maintain library services on its own policies and terms. It is evident, however, that planning for the location of public library facilities cannot be separated from the planning of library services. Likewise, there is tremendous need for policy agreement between librarians and city officials, including planners. On the one hand, the planner can supply the librarian with valuable information regarding such factors as existing and future pattern of growth, population distribution, land-use regulation, and traffic flows, as well as many facets of community needs for library services. The librarian, on the other hand, can supply the planner with a knowledge of how library services can best be programmed to meet both institutional and community needs. It is only through such mutual cooperative efforts that the total service program of the public library, including the location of facilities, can be planned to meet the needs and objectives of the community as a whole.

Much of the problem of planning for library services lies in the fact that existing criteria for evaluating library services are not community-related, making it difficult to judge the true value of the public library to the community, and hence to the goals of the community plan. Along these lines further research is needed on the social effects of the public library. For example, it has long been asserted that the public library improves the reading taste of its community, yet no one really knows whether or actually how it does so. Historically the public library has proclaimed its value as a contributor to occupational mobility, although there is still some question regarding whether or how it performs this function. Questions

of this kind, that relate the public library to the social currents of today's society, are important and necessary if the public library, as a social institution, is to receive proper consideration in the community plan.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion of this thesis is the clear need for an objective analysis of the locational aspects of each public library that seeks to find a reasonable balance between the goals of the institution and the goals of the community it is intended to serve. This can only be accomplished through a careful evaluation of local characteristics to minimize reliance on general standards and to develop, instead, a set of criteria for library services and location tailored to meet local needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. American Library Association, Library Statistics: Handbook of Concepts, Definitions, and Terminology, Chicago: The Association, 1966.

2. Berelson, Bernard, The Library's Public, New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

3. Bowler, Roberta, editor, Local Public Library Administration, Chicago: International City Manager's Association, 1964.

4. Campbell, Angus, and Metzner, Charles A., Public Use of the Library and Other Sources of Information, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1952.

5. Carnovsky, Leon, and Winger, Howard W., The Medium-Sized Public Library: Its Status and Future, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

6. Conant, Ralph W., editor, The Public Library and the City, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965.

7. Eaton, Thelma, editor, Contributions to American Library History, Champaign, Illinois: The Illini Bookstore, 1961.

8. Galvin, Hoyt R., and Martin, Van Buren, The Small Public Library Building, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

9. Gans, Herbert J., People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

10. Garceau, Oliver, The Public Library in the Political Process: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry, New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

11. Gates, Jean Key, Introduction to Librianship, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

12. Goodman, William L., and Freund, Eric C., editors, Principles and Practices of Urban Planning, Chicago: International City Manager's Association, 1968.

13. Joeckel, Carleton Bruns, The Government of the American Public Library, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

14. Johnson, Elmer D., Communications: An Introduction to the History of Writing, Printing, Books, and Libraries, New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1966.

15. Lee, Robert Ellis, Continuing Education for Adults Through The American Public Library: 1834-1964, Chicago: The American Library Association, 1966.

16. Leigh, Robert D., The Public Library in the United States, New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

17. Licklider, J. C. R., Libraries of the Future, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965.

18. Line, Maurice Bernard, Library Surveys: An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure, and Presentation, Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1967.

19. McKelvey, Blake, The Urbanization of America: 1860-1915, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1963.

20. Schenk, Gretchen K., County and Regional Library Development, Chicago: American Library Association, 1954.

21. Shera, Jesse H., Foundations of the Public Library, Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1965.

22. Schick, Frank L., editor, The Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and Implications, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1962.

23. Sinclair, Dorthy, Administration of Small Public Libraries, Chicago: American Library Association, 1965.

24. Tauber, Maurice F., and Stephens, Irlene R., editors, Library Surveys, New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

25. Wheeler, Joseph L., and Goldhor, Herbert, Practical Administration of Public Libraries, New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Reports and Plans

26. A National Plan for Public Library Service, Chicago: American Library Association, 1948.

27. Books for Metropolitan Nashville: A Plan of Branch Libraries for Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee, Nashville: Nashville City and Davidson County Planning Commissions, 1961.

28. Boston's Branch Library System, Boston, Massachusetts: Boston City Planning Board, 1955.

29. Branch Library System Expansion Study for the Houston Library Board, Houston, Texas: Houston City Planning Commission, 1965.

30. Changing Patterns: A Branch Library Plan for the Cleveland Metropolitan Area, Cleveland, Ohio: Cuyahoga County Regional Planning Commission, 1966.

31. Cultural Facilities: An Inventory, Part II, Community Facilities Study, Lansing, Michigan: Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, 1964.

32. Demand for Public Library Service in Oakland County, Michigan, McKinley, Elizabeth, Lansing, Michigan: State Board for Libraries, 1960.

33. Guidelines for Library Planners, Doms, Keith, and Rovelstad, Howard, editors, Chicago: American Library Association, 1960.

34. Libraries of Central Lucas County, Toledo, Ohio: Toledo-Lucas County Plan Commissions, 1958.

35. Libraries of Knoxville and Knox County, Knoxville, Tennessee: Knoxville and Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission, 1963.

36. Library Building for the Future, Library Building Institute, Chicago: American Library Association, 1967.

37. Library Plan for the City of Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona: City Planning Commission, 1961.

38. Library Study: Dayton Area, Dayton, Ohio: Dayton City Planning Board, 1964.

39. Location of Public Libraries in San Francisco, San Francisco, California: San Francisco City Planning Commission, 1953.

40. Milwaukee's Ten Year Library Report, 1962-1971: Site, Survey, and Program, Community Facilities Report Number 2, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Milwaukee Department of City Development, 1962.

41. National Inventory of Library Needs, Chicago: American Library Association, 1965.

42. Planning Library Buildings for Service, Roth, Harold L., editor, Chicago: American Library Association, 1964.

43. Planning the Public Library, Report No. 241 by the Planning Advisory Service, Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1968.

44. Preliminary Plan for Libraries, Warren, Michigan: Warren Planning Department, 1960.

45. Problems in Planning Library Facilities: Consultants, Architects, Plans, and Critiques, Chicago: American Library Association, 1964.

46. Public Libraries Element Revision Study, Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles Planning Department, 1968.

47. Racial Isolation in Public Schools, Volume I, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, "Educational Parks," in Chapter 2, pp. 167-183.

48. Report Upon a Branch Library System for Hamilton County, Ohio, Cincinatti, Ohio: Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, 1964.

49. Seminar to Study the Problems Affecting Library Service in Metropolitan Areas, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Graduate School of Library Science, Rutgers University, 1967.

50. Site Study West End Branch Library, Tacoma, Washington: Tacoma City Planning Commission, 1958.

51. State Standards for Public Libraries, Vainstein, Rose, and Magg, Marion, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE-15010, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

52. Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries: A Report of a Conference, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE-15060, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

53. Statistics of Public Libraries Serving Populations of 100,000 or More: Fiscal Year 1960, Schick, Frank L., and Holladay, Doris C., editors, U.S. Office of Education, OE-15033, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

54. Statistics of Public School Libraries, 1960-61, Part I: Basic Tables, Mahar, Mary Helen, and Holladay, Doris C., editors, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

55. Students and the Pratt Library: Number 1 in the Deiches Fund Studies of Public Library Service, Martin, Lowell A., Baltimore, Maryland: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1963.

56. The Changing Environment for Library Services in the Metropolitan Area, Allerton Park Institute Paper Number 12, Goldstein, Harold, editor, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1966.

57. The Effective Location of Public Library Buildings, Wheeler, Joseph L., Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Library School, 1958, University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers, No. 52.

58. The Library Functions of the States: Commentary on the Survey of Library Functions of the States, Chicago: American Library Association, 1966.

59. Tucson Public Library 1970 Library Plan, Tucson, Arizona: Tucson City-County Planning Department, 1964.

60. West End Branch Study, Tacoma, Washington: Tacoma City Planning Commission, 1958.

Articles, Pamphlets, and Unpublished Materials

61. "Access to Education," in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 38, (December, 1963), pp. 335-351.

62. Analysis of the Location of Four District Branch Libraries, Rawley, Ethel, Unpublished Masters Thesis, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, Department of Geography, 1961.

63. ASPO Newsletter, American Society of Planning Officials, Volume 34, Number 10, (November, 1968).

64. "Building Blocks for Library Planners," Doms, Keith, and Fagione, Joseph L., in Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin, Volume 31, Number 1, (August, 1967), pp. 5-10.

65. "Educational Changes: Their Implications for the Library," Havighurst, Robert J., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, Number 5, (May, 1967).

66. "Factors Influencing Public Library Use," Bundy, Mary Lee, in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 43, Number 4, (December, 1967), pp. 371-382.

67. "Guideposts in Planning Public Library Buildings: An Outline of Some Criteria and Factors Useful in Preliminary Building Planning and Site Selection," Klausner, Margaret, and Bryan, J. E., in News Notes of California Libraries, Volume 52, Number 3, (July, 1957), pp. 504-513.

68. "History of Branch Libraries," Byam, Milton S., in Library Trends, Volume 14, Number 4, (April, 1966),

69. Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines Toward Achieving the Goals of Public Library Service, Chicago: American Library Association, 1962.

70. Libraries, American Corporation, A Reprint from the Encyclopedia Americana, 1962.

71. "Libraries: Future Unlimited," Keppel, Francis, in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 41, (May, 1967), pp. 896-949.

72. "Library Planning," Huff, Robert L., in Planning 1961: Selected Papers from the ASPO National Planning Conference, Denver, Colorado, Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1961, pp. 162-167.

73. "Library Site Selection," McCarthy, F. J., in News Notes of California Libraries, Volume 52, Number 3, (July, 1957), pp. 514-522.

74. "Metropolitan Library Use," Bundy, Mary Lee, in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 42, Number 2, (May, 1967), pp. 950-962.

75. Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems--1966, Chicago: American Library Association, 1966.

76. "New Hampshire's Single State Library System," McKay, Mildred P., in Library Trends, Volume 13, Number 3, (January, 1965), pp. 279-281.

77. Post-War Standards for Public Libraries, Chicago: American Library Association, 1943.

78. "Problems of Library Services in Metropolitan Areas," Report of a Seminar Directed by Dorthy Bendix and Co-sponsored by the American Association of State Libraries and the Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia: Drexel Press, 1966.

79. Public Library Service, Chicago: American Library Association, 1956.

80. "Research, Planning and Coordination," Drennan, Henry T., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, Number 9, (October, 1967), pp. 1062-1065.

81. "Sociological and Institutional Changes in American Life: Their Implications for the Library," Conant, Ralph W., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, Number 5, (May, 1967).

82. "Standards--Criteria for Service or Goals for the Future?", Monroe, Margaret E., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 56, (October, 1962), pp. 818-820.

83. "Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems," Tauber, M.F., in Library Trends, Volume 13, (July, 1964), pp. 15-30.

84. "The Community Library--Its Search for a Vital Purpose," Monat, William R., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, (December, 1967), pp. 1301-1310.

85. "The Educational Park Concept," Wolf, Max, in Wilson Library Bulletin, Volume 42, Number 7, (October, 1967), pp. 173-175.

86. The Impact of Technology on the Library Building, New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Undated.

87. "The National Dimension," in Library Journal, Volume 92, Number 1, (January, 1967), pp. 64-71.

88. "The Public Library and the Planning Agency," Bewley, Lois M., in American Library Association Bulletin, Volume 61, Number 7, (July-August, 1967), pp. 968-974.

89. The Schoolhouse and the City, New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1966.

90. The Small Library Building: Number 13 in a Series of Pamphlets by the Library Administration Division of the American Library Association, Wheeler, Joseph L., Chicago: American Library Association, 1963.