This review is presented as a response to major questions related to school and public library cooperation. Its specific objectives are to: (1) indicate the present status of cooperation between school and public libraries; (2) present a historical perspective within which to evaluate the progress of current efforts; (3) identify future trends and directions; (4) point out barriers to cooperation and factors leading to its success; (5) suggest outstanding sources which contain relevant insights about school/public library cooperation; and (6) identify some representative cooperative activities. As a structural framework, several functional categories are identified for the literature: in addition, a distinction is made between research-based and non-research-based documents. Major areas treated in the non-research-based literature include history, legal bases for school/public library cooperation, cooperative techniques, factors leading to success, barriers, and trends in school/public library cooperation. Research-oriented studies of cooperation between school and public libraries, conducted on a more limited basis, are discussed in the categories of combined school/public libraries and less formal cooperative activities between school and public libraries. An extensive bibliography concludes the review. (SW)
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INTRODUCTION

School/public library cooperation has engendered much discussion in the library field since the late 1800's. One has only to look at Resources in Education, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Library Literature to see that hundreds of articles have been written on this topic and that librarians have generally hailed the idea of interlibrary cooperation as a major vehicle for providing more effective library services for all types of users.

At this time it would be difficult to find a school or public librarian who does not speak favorably of the advantages of cooperation to the youth he or she serves. However, a number of thoughtful writers examining cooperative ventures question the actual amount of progress being made in specific situations and the degree of commitment that school and public librarians really feel toward the concept.

Dorothy Broderick stated in 1965 and reemphasized in 1977 that "sometimes it seems as if there have been hundreds of words, thousands of words, millions and billions and trillions of words written about the relationship of the school and the public library in America. It also seems that most of the words were designed to further misunderstanding and create confusion in the mind of the reader."¹

This Information Analysis Product has been developed in an effort to dispel these feelings and to answer major questions related to school and public library cooperation. Its specific objectives are:

1. To indicate the present status of cooperation between school and public libraries;
2. To present a historical perspective within which to evaluate the progress of current efforts;
3. To identify future trends and directions in the area;
4. To point out barriers to cooperation and factors leading to its success;
5. To suggest outstanding sources which contain relevant insights about school/public library cooperation; and
6. To identify some representative cooperative activities.
This document will focus chiefly on cooperative activities between school and public libraries other than those activities involving participation in multitype library networks for two reasons. First, by far the most common types of cooperative activities between school and public libraries are informal in nature and, second, another ERIC Information Analysis Product is to be devoted solely to the school library's role in formal multitype library networks.

Markuson's definitions of "library cooperation" and "library networks" form the basis for differentiating between informal and formal interlibrary cooperation. She defines library cooperation as "any activity between two or more libraries to facilitate, promote, and enhance library operations, services to users, or use of resources." Library networks, she states, are a subset of library cooperation of the most formalized type. The formalization includes a legal basis for organization, a central staff, and contracts for services. When these two definitions are applied to the cooperative activities between school and public libraries, a definite distinction emerges and cooperative activities from simple information exchange to those resulting in shared facilities and programs fall within the purview of this investigation. No discussion of cooperation between types of libraries would be complete, though, without some references to networking, so this area will be treated briefly when trends in school/public library cooperation are explored.

Citations with ED numbers included in the bibliography are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service in both microfiche and paper copy. Full information for ordering can be found at the end of this publication.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Interest in school/public library cooperation has been expressed frequently in the literature of librarianship. The final report of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services contains at least four resolutions directly addressing the need for interlibrary cooperation.³

Bibliographies on interlibrary cooperation further corroborate the great amount of attention generated by the topic. Stenstrom identified 383 journal articles dealing with proposed and on-going programs of interlibrary cooperation in his bibliography covering the years from 1940 to 1968.⁴ Of the articles cited, almost twice as many were devoted to school/public library cooperation as to any other areas of cooperation. In 1978 Winters' bibliography on cooperation between school and public libraries reflected a similar level of concern among authors in the field.⁵

Reasons for Current Interest in School/Public Library Cooperation

A variety of factors have contributed to the current interest in school/public library cooperation. Increased demands for materials and services generated from the information explosion, as well as from the use of more discovery-oriented, individualized teaching methods in the schools, have placed an intolerable burden on individual school and public libraries. At the same time, added fiscal constraints have been imposed on libraries faced with mounting costs of resources and services and with increased pressures to make better use of tax monies. Taxpayers are unwilling to put greater amounts of money into programs which cannot maintain cost effective operations.

Other trends such as community education have also had an impact on school/public library cooperation. As schools have opened their doors to all community members who desire a variety of educational, recreational, social, and cultural experiences, school library media programs are often being asked to serve as community libraries during and after school hours. In order to meet the needs of all community members in these situations, Aaron and Fleming recommended that school and public librarians cooperatively plan and implement community education library programs.⁶

Legislation, especially at the federal level, is another factor which has had
a decided effect on cooperative programs in school and public libraries. Frary notes that most of the changes that have come about in recent years in these libraries have been the result of federal legislation and programs.

Title III funds of the Library Services and Construction Act are devoted only to those programs which promote interlibrary cooperation. State agencies administer and distribute these funds on the basis of long range plans of service aimed at developing interlibrary cooperation at the state level. As of April 30, 1980, the Washington Newsletter indicated that President Carter’s budget recommendation for this activity in FY81 was twelve million dollars, an increase of seven million over the FY80 figure.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the National Defense Education Act are other major pieces of federal legislation which have played an important part in promoting interlibrary cooperation. The funds made available through these sources have helped school library media programs establish, expand, and improve library collections and services. Consequently, many school libraries are now better able to offer needed resources and services to other types of libraries that are attempting to upgrade their services through cooperation. This is especially true in the audiovisual area where school media specialists have developed expertise and accumulated resources that are generally far beyond those of other types of libraries.

Technological developments have further stimulated interlibrary cooperation. The introduction of computer and communications technology into the field has provided a means of rapid access to information that was not possible in the past. The vehicle for schools to take advantage of this innovation already exists in many school districts. At the building level in some instances, as well as in centralized offices, computer terminals and/or teletype machines that could be used for communication within an interlibrary cooperation network are available.

Some of the factors identified in preceding paragraphs have also given rise to the renewed attention to combined school and public library services in the same facility. In addition to declining fiscal resources, increased public pressure for more cost-effective library operations, and a broader acceptance of the community school concept, current interest in this type of interlibrary cooperation has resulted from the public library’s assumption of a larger responsibility for the education of community members. This expanded function has led to a narrowing of the differences between the roles of the public and school libraries.
in the eyes of many community members. The 1979 Bowker Annual indicates that combined school/public library facilities are being established in places as diverse as Jal, New Mexico, and Montgomery County, Maryland, and are being eliminated in Newfoundland, Canada.  

Classification of the Literature

The literature of school/public library cooperation can be divided into six categories. The first one includes local, state, and national plans dealing at least in part with interlibrary cooperation. Library Services and Construction Act state plans, which are written statements of how Title III funds will be expended to achieve specified library cooperation objectives in a state, fall into this category, as does Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action, a national plan utilizing interlibrary cooperation to make materials accessible to all people in the United States.  

The second category includes policy statements which are generally issued by state agencies. These have, for the most part, attempted to define the distinct roles, functions, and organizational relationships of the public and school libraries. They also frequently contain a discussion of differences between school/public library cooperation and combined programs. The statement from the Wisconsin Division for Library Services is typical of items included in this category.  

The next category covers information pertaining to a specific site or sites in a particular geographical region. In some instances these are federally funded pilot or model projects such as the one in Olney, Texas, or the Philadelphia Action Library Project. In other cases, they are strictly local endeavors. Frequently articles which identify these cooperative efforts present an account of the author's role in the program as well as a description of factors which have influenced the success of the project.  

The fourth category contains information which deals more generally with the concept of school/public library cooperation. Bell's article entitled "School Library-Public Library Cooperation Reviewed" is an example of this generalized approach. Documents in this category explore areas such as organizational relationships, funding, trends, legislation, and historical events, or they may dwell in greater depth on one of these aspects of school/public library cooperation.
The next category deals with research studies which have investigated an issue within the cooperative area. Esther Dyer's Delphi study of selected future events in the field of public and school library services to children (K-6)\textsuperscript{17} falls within this category as does Ruth White's study on school-housed public libraries.\textsuperscript{18}

The remaining category of literature includes materials which report proceedings from conferences, institutes, and other meetings relating to school/public library cooperation. In these reports, generally a problem is defined and discussed, then recommendations are made to provide direction in solving the problem. \textit{Total Library Service}, edited by Guy Garrison,\textsuperscript{19} fits into this category since it reports a conference in which conferees examined the feasibility of combined school/public libraries as they considered how to develop community based library service.

\textbf{Content of Non-Research Based Documents}

The non-research based literature on school/public library cooperation is primarily composed of uncritical descriptions of cooperative projects and of articles focusing on the pro and con views of the desirability of school/public library cooperation. There is little attempt to include evaluative data based on in-depth objective analysis of central factors contributing to the success or failure of a cooperative effort. In addition, reports of different and innovative approaches to cooperation are limited and projects which have failed rarely receive attention in the literature. According to Kraus, accurate information about costs is also particularly hard to ascertain, in part because participating libraries often absorb many of the costs attached to a project, and partly because standard reporting procedures have not been developed.\textsuperscript{20}

Even with these limitations, a brief review of the major areas treated in the non-research based literature reveals some distinct patterns that it is important to be aware of when conceptualizing the role of school/public library cooperation and determining whether it will result in more effective, cost-efficient service to patrons. These areas include the following: history, legal bases for school/public library cooperation, cooperative techniques, factors leading to success, barriers, and trends in school/public library cooperation.
In the late 1800's, people began questioning whether the material resources available in the school could furnish students with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they needed to become educated individuals. Francis Adams, Jr., a trustee of the Quincy, Massachusetts, Public Libraries, in a paper read before a National Education Association meeting in 1880, spoke of the importance of the public library to the education of students in Quincy schools. He said, "We try now to treat the child throughout as a moral, reasoning being, and not as an automaton, and so we begin with Froebel's method and end with the public library. They are both in our Quincy common schools now, only the library is by far the more important factor of the two." Adams' efforts had a major influence on shaping the educational role of the public library in the schools.

Another event which had a great impact on future directions for librarians was the publication of "Public Libraries in the United States of America." This report was an effort to determine the status of public libraries, to indicate basic questions and practices, and to help librarians and others to see their educational role in the proper perspective. The most important message from this report for librarians was that public libraries were auxiliaries to education.

As this view became more widely accepted, educators and librarians jointly began to explore how the public library could serve the schools in better ways. In 1897, John Cotton Dana, president of the American Library Association, urged the National Education Association to appoint a committee to study the interrelationship of the two organizations. The report issued by this committee was one of the major documents in the area. It examined every aspect of cooperation between the school and the public library and it gave practical advice to the teacher and the librarian about how to achieve the best cooperative learning environment for students.

During the late 1800's and the early 1900's school libraries were almost nonexistent and public libraries were offering their services to the schools on a continuing basis. However, as educators became aware of the dependence of the school on adequate materials to carry on its educational program, schools began to assume the responsibility for their own library services. By the 1920's many high school libraries had been established in urban areas of the country, but rural sections still had few of these programs. School libraries continued to grow in the 30's and 40's, though their progress was slowed considerably by the depression.
and the war. Throughout this period public libraries generally continued to serve schools with bookmobiles and other means of services, and even established public library branches in schools in many instances. This was especially true in elementary schools where public libraries supplied a major part of the library materials long after high schools had set up their own libraries. Although school libraries existed in many schools, their collections were inferior and very little reciprocity existed in the school/public library relationship at that time.24,25,26

In 1941 another major event occurred which spurred the growth of school libraries. A joint committee of the National Education Association and the American Library Association developed a document entitled *School and Public Libraries Working Together in School Library Service.*27 This document stated that school library service was a responsibility of the board of education, and also that school and public libraries should "work together to provide a coordinated and complete library service to school children without unnecessary duplication of activities."28 So, local boards of education were asked to establish a school library in each school in order to help students to meet essential educational objectives. In 1951 the *Elementary School Libraries Today Yearbook* reported that the accepted practice in schools was to have school libraries supported by boards of education with public library services complementary to, rather than as substitutes for, school library services.29 The first set of national standards for school libraries, *School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow,* published in 1945, strongly supported cooperation between school and public libraries in order to meet students' educational and cultural needs.

In the 1950's as school libraries grew stronger, more cooperative activities, such as joint book fairs and cooperative book reviewing, were reported in the literature. At the same time public libraries were slowly ceasing to operate school libraries and there was a growing trend toward greater separation of the two institutions.

In 1961 a set of guiding principles was adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers to delineate this separation of roles of the school and public libraries and to indicate how the two institutions interrelated to serve youth. The essence of this document has appeared frequently since 1961 and has served to clarify opportunities for sharing responsibilities in many instances. It states that:

(a) The school library serves the school, and the public library serves the community. Teachers and pupils are members of both the school and the community.
(b) Public library service—including service from state, regional, county, and community libraries—may supplement but never supplant the school library. Service which replaces the school library impedes the development of school libraries to the detriment of service to teachers and pupils and tends to separate library materials from instructional programs.

(c) The school has the primary responsibility for instruction and guidance of children and youth in the community in the use of libraries. The program of library instruction directed by the school librarians has the broad purposes of teaching library skills adaptable to all types of libraries for continuing self-education. School librarians, teachers, and public librarians should cooperate in planning instructional programs in the use of libraries for educational and recreational purposes.

(d) Cooperative planning in the selection and utilization of materials for children and young people is the responsibility of school administrators, teachers, school librarians, public librarians, and other community leaders concerned with youth.

In the 1960's, passage of the Library Services and Construction Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act did much to influence cooperative endeavors. LSCA Title III funds were used solely to promote interlibrary cooperation and have had a major influence on developments in this area. ESEA Title II funds were responsible for vastly increasing and, in some instances, initiating improved school library collections. Because of these ESEA funds, school libraries were in a much better position to act as equal partners in cooperative endeavors.

National standards in the school and public library areas have also had a decided effect on cooperative activities in the 60's and 70's because they have been so instrumental in strengthening resources and services and because they have provided a strong impetus for planning future directions related to interlibrary cooperation. Public library standards have always strongly addressed the need for school/public library cooperation. In the latest public library standards, entitled The Public Library Mission Statement, this cooperative thrust was placed within the context of multitype library networking. The 1975 school library standards, Media Programs District and School, also approached cooperation from a networking point of view and advocated formal cooperation with all types of libraries and other community agencies. The emphasis on informal cooperation between the school and public library contained in the 1960 school library standards is given minimal attention in the 1975 document. Instead, much greater attention is focused on instructional services to school media...
programs from district, regional, and state level educational agencies in order to help the school library media specialist more effectively fulfill his or her instructional role within the school.

This brief historical overview has presented major events which have played a large part in shaping present day attitudes and practices toward school/public library cooperation. Reciprocal cooperative activities have increased as school libraries have reached a level of adequacy which has allowed them to possess resources and services needed by the public library. The most common form of cooperation between the two institutions is still composed of informal activities but there is an indication that some school librarians, as well as librarians in other types of libraries, are beginning to realize that school libraries have a unique contribution to make and much to gain in more formal multitype library networks.

Legal Bases for School/Public Library Cooperation

The legal basis for school/public library cooperation varies from state to state. The ASLA Report of Interlibrary Cooperation 1978 identifies specific authorization in some states that allows all types of libraries to merge and provide more effective library service. In other states the authorization extends only to designating a state agency that will coordinate and promote cooperative activities. A third means of authorization used in some states is a blanket law allowing two or more public agencies to enter into agreements with any other agency for joint or cooperative action. Even where specific authorization does not exist, few states have reported legal barriers to statewide participation in multitype library cooperatives.

Martin points out that on an interstate level there has also been a minimum number of legal restrictions on cooperation. This has enabled voluntary programs to operate with some success. Nevertheless, he feels that the lack of legislation which permits or encourages interstate library programs had handicapped efforts to realize the potential of multitype library cooperation at the multistate, regional, and national levels.
Cooperative Techniques

A large majority of the articles pertaining to school/public library cooperation are devoted at least in part to a description of a technique or techniques employed in a specific locality to enhance services to users. Because these cooperative activities can assume many different forms it is necessary to categorize them. Esterquest has suggested the following as categories of specific cooperative arrangements: (1) those devices that serve to locate and mobilize for use existing library resources, and (2) those devices that serve to develop or add to existing resources.

Devices which aid in the location and mobilization of existing resources are the most commonplace types of cooperative activities between school and public libraries. They range from union catalogs to interlibrary loan. Other examples of actual practices are:

1. Developing a catalog of periodicals indicating all titles held by each school and public library in the service area.

2. Exchanging bibliographies.

3. Bringing together classroom collections and special materials in public libraries which can aid students in doing research units.

4. Enabling young adult librarians from the public library to discuss their programs and reference services in the public schools.

5. Setting up a system which enables members of the school's audiovisual club to operate equipment for the public library.

6. Providing the school library media specialist with a borrowing card in the school's name so the public library can loan materials to teachers without their being individually responsible.

The task of cooperatively developing or adding to existing resources has not been pursued as vigorously as that of cooperatively developing devices to locate and mobilize existing resources for use. One of the major reasons for this probably can be attributed to institutional constraints. With different funding bases, governing bodies, etc., it becomes more difficult to participate in developmental activities such as cooperative acquisitions. However, these activities do occur in some localities. A group of school and public librarians in Pennsylvania wrote a joint LSCA Title III proposal and were awarded a grant which allowed them to create a summer bookmobile program which served
10,000 people in ten rural communities.\textsuperscript{35} Other examples of activities in this category are:

1. Children's services/school services liaison who helps school and public librarians to enhance cooperative library programs, and to expand services to non-users.\textsuperscript{36}

2. Development of a joint community resource file that is available in both school and public libraries.

3. Combining of equipment orders, particularly those having to do with expensive audiovisual materials, so both libraries can realize larger discounts.\textsuperscript{37}

The examples given in this section include only a small sampling of the techniques which have been identified in the literature. Unfortunately, in many cases not enough evaluative information or detail about operating procedures is given to allow a sound judgement to be made about the feasibility of a particular technique for a specific situation.

With these limitations in mind, a joint task force on school/public library cooperation of the Ohio Association of School Librarians/Ohio Library Association created "The Cooperation Game."\textsuperscript{38} This game format is aimed at helping school and public librarians proceed through the steps necessary to build their own programs of cooperation. It gives them ideas of cooperative activities and a means for evaluating the chances of success of various cooperative techniques. This effort to present a systematic approach to the development of cooperative activities in an entertaining way represents a real departure from most of the other literature in this area.

Factors Leading to the Success of School/Public Library Cooperation

Although it is difficult to find evaluative data related to school/public library cooperation in the non-research based literature, a number of writers have offered their assessment of elements which must be present for a cooperative activity to succeed. Those mentioned most frequently are: planning; evaluation; differentiation of roles; technological, monetary, communications, leadership, and other similar requirements; attitudes and perceptions; and organizational concerns.

Writers focusing on the planning and evaluation areas stress the importance of incorporating these activities throughout the cooperative process. Anders has
strongly suggested that statistical data be used extensively since it can contribute significantly to cooperative planning during the preliminary explorations, in the actual planning process, and after the plan becomes operational. Drescher emphasizes the necessity of monitoring and evaluating a project to obtain results based on the project's value to the people served rather than on the personality of an individual.

The need for careful role definition to prevent either school or public librarians from being apprehensive about entering into cooperative agreements is underscored by Darling. Much mistrust, misunderstanding, and jealousy have arisen in cooperative situations where these definitions were not developed initially or were unclear. Darling also emphasizes that both school and public libraries must enter into cooperative agreements as equals able to offer approximately the same level and quality of services. Otherwise, the library providing the majority of the services loses its incentive to participate.

The level and type of cooperative activities being pursued will determine the money, technology, and personnel required. However, several authors point out that a realistic estimate of these factors must precede the beginning of a project if it is to be successful.

Qualities desired in the professional personnel chosen to take part in a project have also generated discussion. Regardless of the size and structure of a cooperative activity, certain traits, such as good personal relations, leadership ability, ability to communicate, flexibility, and initiative, must be present, according to Olson. Additional characteristics identified by Olson and others needed by the directors of the respective libraries are a philosophical commitment to the concept of cooperation and a willingness to take the first step toward realizing its benefits, the vision to objectively evaluate the advantages available to users through cooperative ventures, and the ability to recommend a sound course of action.

The attitudes and perceptions of users and providers of resources and services have been cited as two of the most important elements influencing success. Users must feel that access to a larger number of materials and services is worth the delay which may result in filling requests through cooperative measures. Professionals must also possess a number of perceptions and feelings essential to the success of school/public library cooperation. First, they must feel that the gains accomplished through cooperative activities outweigh the loss of some of the library's autonomy and the risk of losing some
Individual achievement. It must also be apparent to personnel that these gains are worth the effort in terms of improved services to young people.\footnote{47} Second, school and public librarians who engage in cooperative activities must be aware of and concerned about the unique hierarchy and management procedures of each sponsoring agency.\footnote{48} Finally, librarians must be willing to think more in terms of collection utility than collection size.\footnote{49} This may be difficult, especially for school librarians, as long as accreditation standards require a certain number of materials in the school library.

Various organizational concerns have also received the attention of a number of authors discussing factors influencing the success of cooperative activities. Broderick notes that the higher in the organizational structure the decision to cooperate is made, the more likely the chances of achieving success.\footnote{50} Others, like Kraus, deal with the need to establish formal agreements, a stronger organizational structure, and machinery to insure the permanence of cooperative activities.\footnote{51} Pettem cautions, though, that it is generally necessary to begin with small informal arrangements before a formalized network can be successful.\footnote{52} Franckowiak has expressed a concern about the level at which cooperative activity should occur. He urges that a substantial effort must be made to coordinate and articulate the relationship between emerging public library systems and regional media programs specifically designed to meet the needs of schools. Cooperative efforts must be developed at the regional level to build new programs to provide for services which cannot be provided through existing agencies.\footnote{53}

Charles Nelson’s propositions related to cooperation identify other elements which must be considered if a cooperative venture is to be successful. These propositions are:

1. Cooperation is desirable when it benefits the institutions individually or makes them more effective collectively.

2. Cooperation is a voluntary act.

3. Benefits cannot always be assured in advance.

4. Successful cooperation must take into account legitimate ambitions as well as the present status of cooperating institutions.

5. A degree of rivalry and competition is inevitable among similar institutions in the same locale.

6. Cooperation must not impose uniformities that tend to destroy the special character of the individual cooperating institutions.
7. Conversely, where economies or other benefits can be achieved through uniform practices which do not strike at the special character of the institution, they are not to be feared.

8. No institution is so rich in resources that it can be assumed a priori to have nothing to gain by cooperation.

9. Cash transactions can be an appropriate element in cooperative efforts.

10. The cooperative effort must be professionally staffed if permanent and significant results are to be achieved.

Because of the lack of reported systematic data in most cases in the non-research based literature, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine what combination of factors in what amount or quality must be present to guarantee a successful school/public library cooperative activity. Instead, elements identified serve as indicators of areas to be considered and should be subjected to careful scientific investigation if realistic guidelines for making informed decisions are to be defined.

Barriers to Successful School/Public Library Cooperation

Barriers which impede progress toward more effective school/public library cooperative activities have been identified frequently in the literature. Some, such as lack of money, resources, staff, time, expertise, equipment, and facilities appear numerous times while others are mentioned infrequently. The most pressing problems generally fall within the institutional, leadership, communications, psychological, accessibility, and fiscal areas.

A major psychological constraint has been the difficulty of changing traditional attitudes of librarians, educators, and administrators and replacing them with innovative, forward looking, positive ideas about cooperation. This problem has been compounded because of librarians' fears of loss of autonomy, personal status, and institutional pride, and because of the competition, jealousy, and mistrust which is often prevalent among school and public librarians who have failed to adequately define and communicate their complementary roles.

In discussing the reality of the differing roles of school and public librarians, Bell points out that public librarians take a broader community oriented view of services while most school librarians concentrate on the needs
of the school and the students attending that institution. This results in a narrower, curricular focus on the part of the school librarian, and therefore further limits the common ground on which to base cooperative services.\textsuperscript{56}

Another barrier created by the subordinate role of the library in the school is that school librarians cannot consider cooperation solely in library terms as public librarians can. Instead they must work within the guidelines and rules of the parent institution, thus creating more complex problems.\textsuperscript{57}

Obstacles to access have also slowed school/public library cooperation. Students and teachers often have an "immediacy of need" that cannot be satisfied through cooperative activities. A delay in the provision of materials usually renders them useless,\textsuperscript{58} and patrons sometimes feel that the library is inadequate because it has to secure materials and services from another source. A different aspect of the access problem is the fear on the part of many library professionals that cooperation will result in exploitation and more limited access to materials and services for their primary constituency. According to Franckowiak, sufficient incentives have yet to be developed to overcome this fear of being misused, overused, and undercompensated.\textsuperscript{59}

The leadership capabilities of those directing cooperative activities have created another set of problems. Many authors have commented on the lack of creative leadership. Met\textsuperscript{60}Calf has suggested another possible weakness in the leadership area which influences cooperation, i.e., the very traits which generally help people reach top administrative positions, those of self reliance and independence, are not conducive to promoting cooperative activities. Sullivan focuses on the types of decisions made by those in leadership positions. She indicates that the planning for cooperative activities is often performed at the supervisory level by people who may not have real knowledge of the needs and interests of librarians in branches, small communities, high schools, etc.\textsuperscript{61}

Lack of coordination at the community and state levels, failure to establish formal communication channels, the difficulties caused by interjurisdictional loan of materials, the type of library emphasis in library education, and the lack of formal cooperative agreements are other barriers which are regarded as obstacles to more effective school/public library cooperation. As was noted in the discussion of factors contributing to the success of school/public library cooperation, there is a minimum amount of systematically gathered data to indicate at what point the individual and combined effects of these barriers would significantly weaken cooperative efforts between school and public libraries in a specific situation.
Trends in School/Public Library Cooperation

The major trend in interlibrary cooperation is the move toward multitype library networks including the four types of libraries. The role of school libraries in the formalized organizational structure has been defined in the Report of Task Force on the Role of the School Library Media Program in Networking adopted by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. However, there are few networking plans which grant school libraries equal representation. Public libraries, on the other hand, have moved ahead jointly with other types of libraries into what has come to be known as "The Age of Library Systems." This Age is characterized by partnerships among local, state, and federal library systems with states assuming a key role in network development, increased infusion of technology, and a trend toward more formal, even governmental, connections among different types of libraries over a large geographical area. It remains to be seen if school and public libraries can move from informal, uncoordinated cooperative activities to coordinated formal agreements which would bring about more effective library services to youth all over the United States.

Content of Research Based Documents

Research related to interlibrary cooperation, especially between school and public libraries, has been conducted on a very limited and sporadic basis. Minder noted that the field of librarianship has no design data, no standards, no models, and no operational personnel competence in this area. Instead, librarians have generally proceeded from the conceptual stage directly to the operational stage without allocating the time or money necessary to obtain systematically gathered, evaluative information. This non-research based approach has resulted in little real evidence to support the contention that resource sharing results in certain benefits, even though librarians have almost universally accepted interlibrary cooperation as the only realistic way of meeting future demands.

The research evidence which does exist about school/public library cooperation has been generated largely by local, state, or federal agencies, and by individuals attempting to complete degree requirements. Researchers directing
the studies have investigated at least some of the following areas: the status of presently existing cooperative or combined programs; information about past attempts; opinions relating to various facets of the program; advantages and disadvantages; reasons for success or failure; and techniques for planning, implementing, and evaluating the program.

The major focus of these studies is generally either on combined school/public libraries or on less formal cooperative activities between school and public libraries. Consequently, these two areas will be discussed separately.

Cooperative Activities

In the 1960's a number of studies were initiated which examined the relationship between the public library and the school. These were chiefly surveys which attempted to determine the status and direction of cooperative activities in school and public libraries, or state wide planning investigations which resulted from the impetus of the Library Services and Construction Act. State wide planning studies completed during this period generally fell into one of two categories. Some, such as the New York study exploring the feasibility of public libraries providing processing for school and college libraries, 67 evaluated the benefit on one cooperative activity. Others examined cooperation within the larger framework of library development in a state to determine how these activities could contribute to more effective library service.

Studies devoted in large part specifically to school/public library cooperation, such as Martin's landmark investigation entitled Students and Pratt Library, revealed that much of the library service obtained by high school students was given by the public library. He also found that three-fourths of the students in Baltimore preferred the public to the school library. As a result of this study, Martin recommended that the responsibility for providing materials be divided between the school and the public libraries, with the school library to become the working collection and the public library the larger, more specialized collection. 68

In their regional study of the Pacific Northwest in 1960, Drennan and Wenberg also reported a great dependence by students in many localities on the resources and services of the public library. However, they noted that in metropolitan areas public librarians were withdrawing classroom collections even though they had doubts that school libraries would adequately fill the gap. In
rural areas, the researchers concluded that school administrators were content to accept book service from the public library. Additional findings in this study indicated that there was virtually no professional consultation between school and public librarians and that there was a great need for improved communication between the two agencies.69

In his study of the Chicago Public Library in 1969, Martin also stressed the need for formal and regular contacts between the different types of libraries in order to develop systematic planning and joint projects. He especially emphasized the need for school libraries to define and maintain a sharing of responsibility to students while anticipating that an increased share would be carried by the school.70

Other studies in the 60's generally supported the findings stated by Martin and Drennan and Wenberg. Lack of communication between school and public libraries was frequently cited, as was the minimal number of efforts to develop policies and activities to facilitate cooperation. In 1967, Brewer surveyed each state to determine outstanding examples of school/public library cooperation. She concluded on the basis of her findings, that, in general, there was "gross lack of initiative" in the area.71

In the 1970's most of the studies examined have continued to focus on the status of cooperative programs. However, there also appears to be increased emphasis on investigating professional attitudes and perceptions, and some attempt to evaluate factors which have influenced cooperation between school and public libraries.

Woolls surveyed the status of cooperation and communications between public libraries and public elementary schools in Indiana in 1973.72 Questionnaires were disseminated to school library supervisors, school librarians, public librarians, and fifth grade students at their elementary schools to obtain relevant data. Major conclusions of this investigation were that there was little communication between public libraries and schools; cooperative activities which were occurring were of a very conventional nature; many times "cooperative" activities were not cooperatively planned by school and public librarians; elementary students and teachers received many services from the public library; sufficient personnel existed to maintain the present level of cooperative services; librarians believed that improved services could result from increased cooperation; and librarians participating in the study reported few unserved needs.73
In her 1977 survey of public library directors and school library media supervisors in Florida to determine the status of school/public library cooperation,\(^74\) Aaron reported findings similar to those of Woolls. Cooperative activities which were prevalent were traditional kinds carried on between libraries of the same or similar types through informal agreements. Additional cooperative activities proposed by respondents focused largely on improving and broadening currently existing traditional practices. However, the majority of school media supervisors responding indicated that they did not desire additional cooperative services. Those who did want additional services recommended that these services be obtained from other school media programs rather than from other types of libraries.

In this study Aaron also attempted to determine elements which should be present in order for school/public library cooperation to be successful in Florida. The following were mentioned most frequently by respondents: better communications channels; incentives to encourage libraries to participate; adequate financial support; commitment and support from administrators and staff; cooperative long range planning; and a more realistic idea by staff and administration of the tangible and intangible rewards of cooperative activities.\(^75\)

Libraries of the Southeast were the subject of Anders' regional study conducted from 1972 through 1974.\(^76\) This investigation confirmed the existence of a number of problems that librarians could effectively approach on a cooperative basis. It also showed that many school and public libraries were informally providing services to other than their primary clientele. Further, the study indicated that the lack of clerical staff in school libraries would affect their ability to participate in cooperative activities.\(^77\)

Three additional studies performed in the 70's are national in scope, but they explore different aspects of school/public library cooperation. The first is a study conducted by Applied Management Sciences, Inc., which evaluates the impact and effectiveness of the Library Research and Demonstration Program of the Higher Education Act (HEA II-B), and Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation, of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA III) to aid in developing and improving library and information services. In addition to an evaluation of each project, this study also provides a model describing the transformation of library related innovations into basic library information services.\(^78\)

The second investigation, essentially a status study, was carried out by members of the Children and Young Adult Section of the Westchester Library
Association of New York in 1979. They queried 70 American and Canadian agencies to determine avenues of potential school/public library cooperation. The responses indicated cooperation was taking place informally and/or formally and that the subject was a concern to many organizations and associations. Cooperative activities reported by participants ranged from simple information exchange to elaborate combined libraries.79

The last study, by Dyer in 1976, explored professional attitudes toward cooperation of a group of leading public library administrators, public school superintendents, coordinators of children's services, media supervisors, library educators, and state and federal officials. She used the Delphi technique to obtain panelists' projections about the probable and desirable occurrence of selected events with regard to public school and public library services to children (K-6) in the next 15 years.80 Dyer concluded that the results of her study "constituted a refresher course in institutional rigidity. The highest priorities for both institutions are self preservation and protection of territory. Cooperation is viewed as an implicit threat to autonomy and as such stands little chance of implementation.... It will not be overtly resisted, but neither will cooperation be actively pursued unless external forces such as the community or other funding agencies foist such requirements upon these traditional institutions."81

Careful analysis of the findings and conclusions of the research studies discussed in this section suggests that attitudes of many professional library personnel toward cooperation must be changed significantly if strides are to be made in the area of school/public library cooperation. In addition, research studies must progress beyond surveying the current status of cooperative programs to identify the specific levels and types of cooperative library activities that would serve children and youth more effectively, and how these activities can best be implemented. Without this information, cooperative activities are likely to gain little real acceptance or support in many library programs.

Combined School/Public Libraries82

The research studies on combined school/public libraries, like those of other cooperative activities, have chiefly been initiated by local, state, or federal agencies, or by individuals attempting to complete the requirements for
a degree. Frequently these studies are unpublished and are not reported in the literature. Other reports, surveys, and studies on combined libraries are only one part of a document dealing with broader concerns so they also fail to be indexed and identified.

In 1963 White performed a landmark study of the school-housed public library. This investigation was based on questionnaires sent to 154 public libraries located in schools. This study made no recommendations but summarized the replies of librarians who had first hand experience with the combined program. She found that:

1. Seventy-two percent of the people questioned opposed placing public library branches in schools; 14 percent thought the location was possible under certain conditions; 7 1/2 percent were noncommittal; and 6 1/2 percent were in favor.

2. Library literature of the past 20 years has been almost unanimously opposed to the combination.

3. Combining school and public libraries is not new. It was tried more than a hundred years ago and is now outdated. The trend for years has been away from this combination.

In 1975 Unger resurveyed White's respondents to determine if any of the originally identified school-housed public libraries had discontinued the combined program and to determine the current status of those which had remained combined. Twenty-five school-housed public libraries in White's survey had relocated in separate facilities. Unger was unable to discern any trends responsible for these changes. However, she found that adult use of those public libraries which continued as school-housed facilities was handicapped by the location in the school. She concluded that the major users of the library were students of the school in which the library was located.

A more recent study was performed by Woolard. She sent questionnaires to a sampling of libraries which resulted in the identification of 55 combined facilities. Personnel in these programs were asked to provide specific information relating to governance, staffing, and management procedures. The questionnaires also gave respondents an opportunity to identify other information they considered pertinent.

Woolard concluded that "it would appear to be possible for school and public libraries to combine under certain conditions and circumstances. The optimum environment would be communities with 10,000 residents or less, and which need a school and/or public library facility and/or professional staff."
In Phase I of a study sponsored by the State Library of Florida in 1977, Aaron and Smith utilized a different methodology to study combined school/public libraries. Seven combined libraries in the United States and Canada were visited to obtain data for this investigation. The case study method was employed to gather in-depth, objective information which would bring to light the factors involved in the success or failure of these programs.

Based on the findings of Phase I of this study, there were two major conclusions. First, it is unlikely that a community able to support or now supporting separate types of libraries will offer better school and public service through a combined program. This is because the combination of factors required to promote a successful program seldom occurs.

Second, when a community is unable to provide minimum library services through separate facilities and no option for improved services through system membership exists, the combined program presents a possible alternative to limited or non-existent services under certain conditions. However, communities seeking a cheaper way to provide better library service should be aware that there is no documented evidence that economy results from combining school and public library programs. Therefore, communities with limited resources should not select the combined program unless the implementation of the concept: (1) allows the hiring of professional personnel where none previously were employed; (2) provides a means for strengthening resources; (3) offers an adequately planned program to meet the needs of all community members; and (4) utilizes a systematic evaluative procedure to assess the status of the program and provide future direction.

Phase II of the three phased investigation employed the case study and survey methods to assess the present status of combined school/public libraries in Florida. The conclusions of Phase I were reinforced through this study of Florida libraries. In Phase III, completed in 1978, a model procedure was developed to help a community decide whether a combined library or another organizational alternative would offer the best library services in a particular locality.

Amey and Smith's study differs in its approach from the preceding investigations, but also deals on a broader scale with the concept of combined programs. This study was designed to discover whether school librarians and public librarians differed in their attitudes toward combining school and public libraries. The response indicated substantial differences of opinion between the
two groups of librarians in such areas as circulation of materials, sharing of
tasks, and perception of roles. Areas of agreement were concerned with
economy, provision of controversial materials, and the basic purpose of the
libraries. The findings suggested the need for an objective evaluation of the
total library needs of a community for the present and future before any
commitment should be made to plan a combination library.90

Dyer's study contributes another dimension to the broad scaled investiga-
tion of professional attitudes toward combined libraries.91 Major findings of this
investigation particularly pertinent to the consideration of combined libraries
follow:

1. Panelists believe it both undesirable and improbable that public
   school services will decline or suffer elimination; but public
   library programs for children face a more nebulous future,
   particularly in urban areas, for which there is no agreement as to
   prospects.

2. In general, participants believe that any change in the present
delivery system, i.e., two separately administered services, is
both undesirable and improbable...Even if facilities undergo
merger, respondents project that administrations will nonethe-
less remain separate.

3. In general, panelists believe that cooperation is desirable but
that few pertinent alternatives are actually viable. However,
since cooperative programs respect the lines of authority of the
separate institutions, they fare better in the prospects for
implementation than do proposed changes in administration.

States in which studies of combined libraries exist include Michigan,
Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and North Dakota. The major conclusion in these
studies was that this type of program usually results in inadequate public library
service and suffers from the lack of money and personnel. However, in the
North Dakota study, the investigator found "that the advisability of locating a
public library in a school must depend on a particular community and the type of
library service they want. If the concern is for better public library services,
then the move might be to larger systems and networks such as a county or
regional library."93

On the local level, studies such as "The School-Housed Public Library
Committee Report" developed in Fairfax, Virginia, in 1973 do exist, but they are
difficult to identify since they often are not indexed. The study which led to this
report was initiated to consider the feasibility of providing community library
service in a high school in Fairfax. Actual case studies, laws, regulations, standards, and other research techniques were used to gather data. The case studies revealed that none of the 14 library systems trying this approach were considered a complete success. Further, 57 percent eventually closed their school-housed public library. On the basis of this and other findings, the committee recommended that the joint facility was not feasible for a growing community such as Fairfax.

The Philadelphia Project, which involved the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia public schools, the Archdiocesan schools, and the private and independent schools, was another locally directed study, but it was supported by federal funds. Although the Action Library Demonstration Center initiated by this project did not assume the same role as the other libraries discussed in this section, it did represent a combining of school and public library resources in the same facility to bring youth and learning resources together in an inner city community.

The two year research study which led to the demonstration center focused on student use of learning media. The results of this investigation showed that even though the library collection sometimes did not meet student needs, the answer to the problem was not to increase the size of the collection. In fact, it became clear in this study that students did not even take advantage of the resources which were available to them. It also was found that as students (especially inner city students) progressed through the educational system, a large percentage tended to use learning resources less and less frequently until they actually rejected the use of these materials. Further findings indicated the need especially among students in lower socioeconomic groups for more audiovisual than printed materials. As a result of this information, the Action Library was created in a low income area in central Philadelphia to try a fresh approach to bringing young people and learning resources together to build positive skills and attitudes and meet student needs. The Action Library continued from 1972 until approximately 1977. No real explanation of why the project was terminated was found in the literature.

The review of the research literature appears to indicate that there is some possibility that combined programs may be successful under certain conditions. However, until there is more research done in this area, it will be difficult to reach a final conclusion about the feasibility of this type of program even in selected situations.
CONCLUSION

Whether school and public libraries will successfully achieve a pattern of library service which channels the resources of all of the cooperating libraries to the youth of any one of the libraries remains to be seen. Much will depend upon the ability of school and public librarians to overcome the human and institutional barriers which are presently obstacles, and to seek systematic means of planning, implementing, and evaluating cooperative activities. Until librarians in both institutions have addressed these problems adequately, it will be very difficult to offer children and young people the quality and types of library services they require to meet their educational and personal needs.
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