

December 2010

Random Ramblings-A Digital Dilemma for Public Libraries

Bob Holley

Wayne State University, aa3805@wayne.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Holley, Bob (2010) "Random Ramblings-A Digital Dilemma for Public Libraries," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 22: Iss. 6, Article 28.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5706>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

CANADIAN
ELECTRONIC
LIBRARY

BIBLIOTHÈQUE
NUMÉRIQUE
CANADIENNE

Canada's Largest eBook Collection for Libraries



Three growing collections, updated monthly:

Canadian Publishers Collection

Over 12,000 titles from more than 60 leading publishers

Canadian Public Policy Collection

In excess of 16,000 titles from think tanks and policy institutes

Canadian Health Research Collection

More than 5,000 titles from health research agencies



Delivered on the ebrary™ platform under a multi-user institution-wide license with MARC records for all titles included.

Canadian Publishers Collection
now available worldwide through
ebrary, YBP and Swets

For more info:

info@gibsonlibraryconnections.ca

www.canadianelectroniclibrary.ca

PO Box 1029,
Saint-Lazare, QC, J7T 2Z7

Toll free 1-866-458-2264

From the University Presses
from page 62

presses far outweigh the differences. If we take a few quiet moments we will recognize that in many ways we are cut from the same cloth: we love words, we believe ideas matter, we are all, ultimately, members of the academy. We are adapting to a digital world as rapidly as we can and as rapidly as we can afford to. We also know, intuitively, that in the midst of information hyperabundance, society depends on us to develop and disseminate and archive reliable scholarship for the common good. My experience at **Georgetown** and my conversations with **ARL** librarians lead me toward hope about the future of effective collaborations between academic libraries and university presses — but it is a hope that must always be framed by a modest and realistic agenda. 🌱

Endnote

1. In 2004 **Nancy Eaton** and **Bonnie MacEwan** of **Penn State Library** and **Peter Potter** of **Penn State University Press** wrote a helpful and prophetic essay about their experiences: "Learning to Work Together": <http://www.aaupnet.org/arlaaup/projects/pennstate.html>.

Random Ramblings — A Digital Dilemma for Public Libraries

Column Editor: **Bob Holley** (Professor, Library & Information Science Program, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202; Phone: 313-577-4021; Fax: 313-577-7563) <aa3805@wayne.edu>

An undergraduate student at the library of a local mid-size university didn't like the fact that the only copy of a book she needed to read for class was available only as an eBook. She asked the reference librarian if the library would order a print copy because she preferred that format. The librarian took her request and sent it up the administrative chain. After a bit, the answer worked its way back down to the student. While the response was phrased a bit more politely, its essence was "tough." This academic library, like many, had a policy of not ordering material in multiple formats even if a user specifically requests another version for whatever reason.

This story, which I heard from a student in one of my classes, got me to thinking about how this scenario would play out in a public library. I can't believe that the answer would be the same. In fact, a public library might have the same popular book

in multiple formats — book, large print, CD audio book, CD audio cassette, and eBook. The public library would have even bought multiple copies of those items in high demand so that patrons didn't have to wait forever.

Why the difference? The academic library has a captive audience that must complete required assignments with whatever information resources that the library provides unless students buy their own copies or have access to other libraries. If this student has required readings, she had better learn how to manipulate the eBook reader. If she had complained, I expect that the authority figures would repeat the standard response: "By avoiding buying books in multiple formats and in multiple copies, the collection has much more breadth and can therefore support the needs of more users." I might then respond, "But not this one." Finally, one student has virtually no power to change this decision. I'm not even sure that a faculty member could unless the faculty member were particularly powerful or influential within the academic community.

The public library, on the other hand,

continued on page 64



has to be more responsive. If the public library turned down the user in such a situation, this user would potentially vote “no” in the next millage election, could complain to the mayor or the city manager, might write a letter to the local newspaper, and possibly tell friends and family about the negative experience with the public library. Unlike the student in the academic institution or even in the school media center, a single user has much more leverage in the public library. This leverage has limits, since I will admit that a user who wanted the library to purchase a vinyl record, a betamax tape, or even an audiocassette might get turned down; but this decision would rest upon policies that eliminated entire classes of formats rather than not duplicating a permissible format for the user who wanted it.

A corollary from this principle is that moving into the digital age may have more costs for the public library because it can’t abandon users who aren’t ready for the transition. For early adopters, the public library will be asked to consider eBooks in multiple formats, lots of computers with Internet access, and downloadable films and music. Yet the public library won’t be able to abandon the traditional formats for those who want them. This principle may even extend to at least some reference materials for those patrons who will tell the librarian: “I don’t like those new fangled inventions like the computer. I don’t know how to use one and would like to continue to find the

materials I need on the shelves.” I doubt that many public libraries will have a good response other than continuing to provide at least the most used materials for pre-computer users.

I also don’t want readers to assume that the public library is looking at a generation gap. A modest computer and an Internet connection are luxuries that a family facing foreclosure might decide to forego. (I’ll admit that cell phones may be an exception to this rule.) The children of parents who don’t like computers may not see their importance for their children. Last week at a local library conference, I heard the story of parents who wouldn’t let their children bring home free computers because the parents would be financially responsible for their loss. Given the possibilities of damage or theft, I would judge that the families were making a rational decision to turn them down. Those of us in the middle class are too likely to assume that the rest of the world is just like us.

I don’t see any easy answers for public libraries except to wait until the world changes enough that no one will seriously protest taking away the pre-digital products. Doing so will require monitoring use before eliminating older formats. The public library may be able to do so more quickly for less popular items as their use falls or for subject areas where digital expertise can be assumed. The computer books could go digital while the cookbooks would stay in print. Finally, the public library might simply have the policy of saying yes whenever a user, like the student at the beginning of this column, asks for a different format. “We aim

to please. How quickly do you need it?”

As an addendum to this column, I asked the readers of the Colleges Libraries Discussion List if their library would buy a print copy of an eBook already in the collection if a reader requested a duplicate print copy. I also asked for comments whether the status of the user (faculty or student) or an explicit mention of a digital divide issue would make a difference. Out of the eleven responses, seven libraries would purchase a duplicate print copy. Four didn’t have any conditions. Three did: “after checking with faculty;” “for compelling reasons;” “for a faculty request.” One response was “perhaps” with more weight given to a faculty request. Three responses stated that the library wouldn’t buy a duplicate print copy. One librarian said that the library would get a print copy on interlibrary loan.

Broader issues included comments on how important eBooks had become because the eBook packages provided so many books at a relatively low cost per title, but one librarian brought up the concern about whether these were the titles needed by faculty and students. One response to a “no” answer asked why the library wouldn’t purchase the format that a user wanted, the main point of this column. One library still had a policy of strongly preferring print to digital. The digital divide issue wasn’t all that important in the responses but might be a small factor for some. One response indicated that their institution required all students to have a laptop so that the digital divide didn’t apply. 🐾

Papa Abel Remembers — The Tale of A Band of Booksellers, Fasicle 12: What’s Your Role? Executive or Staff?

by **Richard Abel** (Aged Independent Learner) <reabel@q.com>

After four years, the approval plan forms and the “backlist” of titles were available electronically, with the input provided by punch cards. We modified the approval plan for non-subject parameters to eliminate superfluous forms, and libraries now received only forms for titles in the library’s profile subject areas or for titles selected by managers as suitable for their collection.

A request by a couple of the **Atomic Commission Agency** libraries inaugurated the firm’s first venture into cataloging as the **ACA** libraries awaited **Library of Congress** cataloging for newly purchased titles, that created a backlog and delayed circulation. Therefore, we agreed to perform original cataloging if the **Library of Congress** provided no catalog record within a brief period. This worked out so well that we began to provide this service to other libraries. All of this, of course, meant that we inputted **LC** cataloging on a regular basis. We studied our cataloging process for

purposes of timing, comparison, and other future uses.

In the meantime, several libraries asked us to select and provide books for new “undergraduate libraries” that were under construction. We carefully reviewed those institutions’ current course catalogs to determine a balance among subject areas. (We were always given a dollar amount, a budget timeline, and the final size of the planned opening collection.) Then it was back to a far more extensive body of bibliographies to assist me in making the selections. One of the more interesting and challenging collections was the **University of California at Los Angeles**. I met with the acquisitions staff and a group of faculty library advisors on this project. One of the faculty advisors included a quite distinguished professor of Classics. The advisory committee decided that our firm should send in 10,000 books initially so that they could judge the content quality and subject distribution of the selected titles. If they found our

performance satisfactory, we would then provide an additional 40,000 titles, employing the same criteria of selection. As the assembled group was leaving the table, the Classics professor approached me and voiced grave doubts about my capacity to select the best of the Classics literature. Now this was a distinct challenge to a **Reed** graduate who still breathed the air of the humanities curriculum. So when I began selecting the 10,000 trial titles, I provided a selection of **Loeb Library** titles that met the curricular distribution percentage at hand. At our next meeting, about six months later, the Classics professor authorized us to proceed with the 40,000 balance and kindly told me that he could not have done a better job himself, which was a significant and gratifying comment for a bookman.

continued on page 65

