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Devil's Advocate 
from page 79

Of course, these are national trends and some states will do well and others will do poorly and how libraries are funded is a factor. I started to investigate this question about whether some methods of funding public libraries are better and I can’t say I have gotten very far along because there are intervening variables such as the health of a state’s economy. It may be that some methods of financing public libraries do better in good times than bad and this is a question worth investigating.

But, I can tell you that the experience of the states varies considerably. Almost all beat inflation in income and expenditures but five (Hawaii, Illinois, New Mexico, Nevada, and Alaska) had declines in inflation-adjusted income from 1992-2003. Hawaii’s income per capita figures fell in absolute terms and about $5 in terms of purchasing power. Expenditures per capita fell in inflation-adjusted terms in Hawaii, New Mexico, and Alaska.

The change in 2003 was rather more stark. 24 states had declines in inflation-adjusted income per capita — 12 in actual dollar figures. There were 16 states that showed a decline in expenditures.

Some states showed increases. Rhode Island increased the greatest amount for the whole period, for instance, its inflation-adjusted income per capita up 62% from 1992-2003. Expenditures per capita rose 69% in real terms in Oregon. In 2003, income per capita rose the most in Tennessee, Missouri, Kentucky, and Vermont. Expenditures rose the most in Delaware, Missouri, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Increases and decreases in per capita dollar figures only tell a part of the story. Ohio’s per capita total operating expenditures in 2003 was $54 and if it declines by 20%, it will still be above Mississippi’s ($13) if it were to increase by 20%.

Clearly, there is more work to do.

Endnotes
1.  http://www.libraryndp.info/
3.  No, there is no personally identifiable information in the system.

IMHBCO (In My Humble But Correct Opinion) — Three Kinds of “Research” and Two Kinds of Researcher

by Rick Anderson (Director of Resource Acquisition, University of Nevada, Reno Libraries; Phone: 775-784-6500 x.273) <rickand@unr.edu>

An English professor I once knew had an exercise that he used with all of his classes at the beginning of each semester. He stood at the front of the room and wrote the word “dog” on the chalkboard, then asked the class what the word meant. As the discussion unfolded, the students, varying (yet all equally valid) definitions would be offered: “dog” is a noun that denotes a canine animal; it’s a verb meaning “to follow obsessively,” it’s an adverb (as in “dog-tired”); it’s a metaphor for failure; and so on and on.

His point, obviously, was that words are slippery. Sometimes two people use the same word in the same conversation to mean completely different things, and end up wasting a lot of time arguing — each of them thinking the other has utterly lost his mind — before they finally realize that they actually agree on the substantive issue. But that’s not actually the worst-case scenario. Much worse is when the conversation continues without either party realizing that they’re talking past each other — or when everyone in a group simply goes along happily using the same word to mean fundamentally different things, not arguing or contending, but also not making much progress because all are unwittingly pulling the project in slightly different directions.

I’d like to suggest that this is exactly where we are in the library profession regarding the word “research.” And that this state of affairs is holding us back from realizing our potential for good in a recently and radically changed information marketplace.

All of us agree that we’re here to support research, and that our patrons need good research skills in order to function well as scholars and citizens. But what do we mean when we say “research”?

As I understand it, that word can be used equally well to refer to three very different activities (and maybe more, but for our purposes I think these three are the most relevant). The first is what happens in a laboratory or in field investigation: scientists test hypotheses against the observed properties of the physical world, or against the actual behavior of animals and people. Obviously, this type of research doesn’t really happen in a library, though a library may support it in various ways. Of more relevance to us as librarians are the two general types of research that remain: first, the process of identifying, locating and gathering materials that you need to master (which I’m going to refer to as Finding/Gathering), and second, the process of actually exploring the content of those materials: reading, evaluating, selecting, rejecting, absorbing, and synthesizing their content (a process I’ll call Reading). The problem is that we use the word “research” to refer to both activities, despite the fact that they’re fundamentally different activities.

But wait — aren’t Finding/Gathering and Reading just two sides of the same intellectual coin? There’s a reason we use the word “research” to describe both of them — isn’t it because both are an important and integral part of the learning process?

No. In fact, I would argue that the Finding/Gathering process is little more than a necessary evil, a process that is unavoidable but not especially beneficial in itself. I think it’s much like the process of gathering wood for a campfire. There’s not much benefit to be had from the gathering itself; the benefit isn’t realized until the wood is piled up and the fire is started. That’s not to say that there’s no benefit whatsoever to the process of wood-gathering (it does involve some physical exercise, after all, and you’re out walking around in the fresh air, which is nice), but real, useful heat isn’t generated until the wood is gathered and you start burning it. No rational person would walk farther than necessary to find the needed firewood, or fell a tree when a pile of usable logs is already on the ground nearby, or gather a month’s worth of fuel to feed a one-night campfire. The fire, not the gathering of wood, is the point.

The same is true, I think, of education and the research process. Finding/Gathering — one of the activities that we commonly call “research” — may have some small intellectual benefit (you’re thinking about your topic, you’re out walking around in the literature), and in some disciplines it may yield more direct benefits than it does in others. But compared to the benefit that comes from actually reading those resources, the benefit is minimal. It seems to me that an hour spent Finding/Gathering yields far less intellectual growth than an hour spent Reading. Education is about reading, evaluating, selecting, rejecting, absorbing, and synthesizing content; it’s not about walking across campus, checking the sorting shelves, photocopying articles, or learning how to use the OPAC or some other user-hostile search interface. The Reading, not the Searching/Gathering, is the point.

What makes this whole question even more
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In this issue’s column, I would like to catch up with an old friend — the scholarly monograph. Once a mainstay in the academic library, the monograph has been in retreat over the last several decades. In the UK, for example, academic libraries are purchasing 26 percent fewer monographs than they did in the early 1990’s (see http://www.lib.ac.uk/Future/crisis.html for a thorough analysis). In the US, longitudinal Association of Research Libraries data indicate libraries are running to stand still — monograph spending is up 76% since 1986, but the number of monographs purchased is basically flat. At smaller libraries, ever-increasing allocations for serials and database products have more severely impacted monograph acquisition.

With the market for monographs contracting, the supply side of the equation has felt the pinch. Fixed costs (printing, binding, etc.) mean that even a modest drop in sales cripples profit margins. The combination of smaller markets and set expenses has prompted some to predict the impending demise of the monograph.

University presses have traditionally been at the fore of scholarly monograph publishing. Some have taken novel approaches to this perceived crisis. For example, the University of California Press has moved much of its monograph operation into the California Digital Library’s Scholarship Repository (see http://repositories.cdlib.org/ucpress/ for details). The American Council of Learned Societies and several university presses, including the University of Michigan Press, Harvard University Press, The MIT Press, and Oxford University Press have teamed to launch The History E-Book Project. This electronic collection of history monographs is available for subscription as a single database. Beyond the university press realm, what is intriguing is the recent entry of several new commercial publishers into the monograph space. Why would firms seek to run into the burning building? I spoke with two of them to find out.

NOW Publishers (http://www.nowpublishers.com) and Morgan & Claypool (http://www.morganclaypool.com) were both founded in recent years by executives with long scholarly publishing resumes. NOW Publishers, headed by Mike Casey and Zachary Rolnick, has recently launched its flagship Foundations and Trends (F&T) series.