CHAPTER IX
Opinion Survey

Twenty issues in the effectiveness model under discussion here were found to be rather difficult to resolve. These issues are presented below. The principal problem was of quantification and it become all the more difficult as no guidelines could be found to exist on the total effectiveness of a library. An attempt to introduce quantitative dimensions in assessing a library's effectiveness is promptly faced with criticism. It is prone to raise controversies. Truly, it is an attempt to measure the immeasurable. Library service easily lends itself to qualitative, rather than quantitative, assessment. It was, therefore, decided to obtain the considered opinions of persons of wide experience and long standing in the profession on the quantitative measures in the library effectiveness model. Such an opinion survey, it was thought, would finally lead to an agreed upon formula for assessing the effectiveness. The opinion survey, the results of which are presented here, thus, became an attractive proposition in order to check the validity of the suggested measures.

When the standards and norms were prescribed for the various aspects of library service, quantitative approach had been generally common. But it will be observed that almost all of these standards and norms had to be qualified by certain conditions peculiar to say, the place the library is situated at,
age of the library, social conditions and so on. These standards were basically designed to ensure the efficiency of the library. The present study is extending their use to measure the effectiveness of the library. It is necessary that one must be careful in this exercise and that was another reason why the opinion survey was resorted to.

For the selection of the library and information specialists to be approached for the opinion survey, certain criteria were adopted. The first and foremost was, of course, the seniority which represented the long practical experience in the field. This criterion was adopted because library science is a practising profession and theory will have no relevance unless the practice is used as a touchstone of it. The second criterion was the representation of various groups such as university librarians, information specialists, professional association activists, teachers of library science and special librarians. The third criterion was that the librarians must have been associated with large libraries of reputed institutions. Fourthly, they should as far as possible represent all parts of the country. The last, criterion was that their reputation as librarians, particularly in providing innovative services to the users, must have been well established.

Thirty-eight names were identified by applying these criteria. Although many of them could answer more than one criterion mentioned above the classification given below is by the primary criterion considered while approaching them:
1. University librarians in office 7
2. University librarians retired 5
3. Librarians of reputed institutions of national importance 7
4. Teachers of library science 3
5. Information specialists 4
6. Librarians associated with professional associations 4
7. Persons of eminence 8

All of them were practising librarians and came from different parts of the country.

The questionnaire technique was adopted for getting their opinions. Wherever necessary, it was supplemented by interviews. One question each was formulated for an issue. The context in which it was raised as well as its background in brief was also written down. For the majority of the questions a hypothetical solution was suggested and the respondent was asked to state whether or not he agreed with the solution. If he did not, he was requested to give his alternative. Only in a couple of instances alternatives were not provided. These questions were kept open. In these two cases, it was found necessary to avoid even the slightest possibility of influencing them by a suggested solution. This open question strategy could also indicate whether the respondent was catching up with the tone of inquiry and not just playing safe by agreeing with whatever suggested, nor taking a cynic view by rejecting everything suggested.

The letter addressed to the respondents along with the enclosures is appended to this chapter.

After much persuasion, 26 out of 38 persons responded. 23 of them replied through the questionnaire sent to them and three
presented separate statements.

Thus the effective response was 26 which works out to 70%. The categorisation of response is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Approached</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>University librarians in office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>University librarians retired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Librarians of reputed institutions of national importance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teachers of library science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Information specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Librarians associated with professional associations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Persons of eminence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that there was a very poor response from teachers of library science and from information specialists. Response from university librarians and librarians of national institutions was not poor (57%) but it would have been better if more persons belonging to this category had sent in their opinions.

It would be appropriate first to consider the three responses which are not based on the questionnaire. This is because they rejected the approach adopted in this study. These three respondents belong to category of 'persons of eminence'.

First of these three states that there is no library that can be ineffective. Every library is effective. The library

* Three of them kept on writing that they would be sending but never sent the questionnaire nor the views. One person who was a very senior librarian and information specialist, associated with a number of international and national committees and associations and was on the board of studies and selection committees of many universities and national institutions replied that he was not competent to give the replies and the replies, if he gave, would be speculative in nature. This is specifically stated to bring home two aspects of this study. One is that this a difficult subject. It is difficult in this sense that even an experienced librarian would be hesitant to commit on some issues; second aspect is that the subject has been neglected by many librarians.
sponsors, viz. the managers of the parent organisation, are in the controlling position and they decide the library-need of the organisation. In other words, effectiveness is their concern and its level can be anything as they find suitable. According to this view, it would not be proper to impose any effectiveness perception on the library. This respondent also argues that it is the prerogative of the users to use the library. Nor should their use or non-use affect the library in whatever manner. Every organisation has to provide the library service to whosoever wants it. It is like a public utility that the government provides. What is really important, according to this respondent, is that the librarian must see to it that he is able to give the best service possible out of the resources provided to him. In other words, it is the efficiency of the library that matters. The librarian should be concerned with the measurement of its efficiency. The effectiveness as defined in this study is not acceptable to this respondent. He goes to the extent of saying that the parent organisation also should not bother about effectiveness of the library. The librarian certainly need not.

This view, at best, could be accepted in the case of public libraries as public library service is a public utility. But it cannot be accepted in the case of institutional libraries. There are several distinctions between the two. The basic one relates to the funding pattern. Public libraries are financed by the mechanism of public finance. The funding agency has the authority to create funds if the service needs them. Whereas the funding agencies of the libraries that are being discussed here do not have that authority. They have to operate within the limits of a given budget.
Other distinctions between public and non-public libraries are very well-known. The most important point that is overlooked by this respondent is that in the final analysis it is the librarian who has to play an active role in the survival of the library. The natural tendency of any social organisation is that it slowly marches towards disintegration, decay or entropy. This tendency has to be arrested by picking up the warning signals and by taking the corrective steps. This has also to be achieved by identifying the strong points and strengthening them. This is to be done by the 'man on the spot'. The librarian is the person who has to do this in the case of a library. It would not be proper to leave it entirely to the sponsors to look after this.

The primary presumption in this view, viz. that every library is intrinsically effective cannot be accepted at a theoretical level also. The library is not just a piece of information. It comprises of several other things in addition to information. It is necessary to take into consideration these factors also when effectiveness of the library is to be discussed.

According to the second respondent who also rejects the approach in this study the application of open-system approach to the library is far-fetched. He also observes that tying the results of the library service to figures is misleading. The first argument cannot be accepted as the open-system concept has been designed for social organisations and library is a social organisation which happens to be a social subsystem and there is, thus, no difficulty in applying the open-system model to a subsystem also. This has been
successfully shown by Merchant and Bhushan Lal and Kaushik, and others. The second argument is against quantitative approach. While there should be no difficulty in accepting that quantification alone cannot reveal the library effectiveness and that other factors should be taken into consideration along with quantitative data, it is difficult to accept that quantitative measures be totally rejected, whatever is quantifiable must be counted. It is the shortest and the most convincing way that guides one in the total effectiveness analysis. Any mature research work calls for quantification. User reactions in day-to-day work is the effectiveness measure suggested by this respondent. There is no doubt that these reactions are helpful. User satisfaction as has already been considered is one of the several aspects of measuring library effectiveness.

The third respondent also rejects the approach on the grounds that 1) effectiveness cannot be a matter of statistical inference; 2) efficiency will not necessarily lead to effectiveness; 3) provision of physical factors will not lead to effectiveness. He has suggested two measures of library effectiveness: 1) user satisfaction as judged from the opinion survey based on sampling and


2) existence of sufficient data on library use leading to creativity (may be, generation of literature, or achievement of efficiency in fine arts etc).

The first objection is similar to the earlier one and it has been answered. The second and third observations can be answered, if the concept of efficiency is made more clear. The concept of efficiency that has been used in this model is the state of a library reached as a result of the inputs and throughputs. The inputs as defined in the model are not only physical ones but also include environmental factors as organisational role, organisational set up etc. The efficiency concept here thus is a much wider concept. Therefore, it is argued that it should lead to effectiveness. The library survey conducted to test the model corroborates with this argument.

The two measures suggested by this respondent are only two of several measures. Both of these are covered in the model. This model, in fact, advocates many more measures.

Having examined the three responses which were received in lieu of completed questionnaire, the analysis of the 23 questionnaires is now attempted and the consensus, as it has emerged, is presented in the discussion on each of the issues. Where consensus has not emerged the possible conclusions drawn are presented.

**Issue No. 1** - This relates to the facet 'organisational set up' in the input component of the model. It is stated as

Organisational set up is one of the facets of the input components of the model. It relates to various aspects such as status of the library in the organisation, statement of the role of the library, librarian's
power and authority etc.

While measuring, the information about this input will be sought from the librarian. Many times it is found that there is a mismatch between librarian's perception about these aspects and the fact as recorded in the official statements. Sometimes no such statements exist at all. It is, therefore, necessary that replies to all such questions must be supported by documentary evidence. If they are not supported by documentary evidence, the reliability of response becomes weak.

In order to get a realistic picture, it is suggested that the score gained on account of the questions in this facet be scaled down by 50% if the replies to the questions are not supported by documents.

15 respondents out of 23 agree with the scaling down by 50%. Three more agree to scaling down but suggest different percentages. One suggests 30%, whereas another suggests 75% and the third suggests reduction proportionate to the strength of elements in the facet. There are 23 elements in this facet against 64 in the component. So the scaling down according to him works out to roughly 35%. So the overall average works out to 49.5 per cent. One respondent takes a very extreme view that the librarian should not be believed at all. Only documentary proof may be held reliable. He even doubts the usefulness of a written document. But it is not necessary to be so cynical. A written document does come to help ultimately. Another respondent states that the argument is partially correct but he does not qualify or elaborate on this any further. Two respondents oppose scaling down stating that the librarian must be believed in fully. Whereas, theoretically this could be acceptable, practical experience shows
something else as has been explained in the question itself and also in the chapter on inputs. There is only one respondent who does not believe in the idea of scaling down or up or attaching any importance to insistence on written documents. His view cannot be accepted, as sufficient literary evidence can be cited in support of documents/statements being taken as proof. This evidence has been examined in the fifth chapter.

It can be concluded that there is a general consensus on the issue of insistence on documentary support concerning organisational set-up and scaling down by 50% of the score on this count in the absence of such documentary support.

Issue No. 2

This issue relates to the 'Balanced Collection' facet in the efficiency component of the model. It is stated as

This issue relates to **Balanced Collection**. It is argued that at a macro-level the collection can be called balanced only if the books on Core subjects, Peripheral subjects and Alien (apparently unrelated) subjects are in certain proportion. Suggested proportions are as follows:

- **In libraries where core subjects are less than 5:**
  - Core subjects: 40%
  - Peripheral subjects: 40%
  - Alien subjects: 20%

- **In libraries where core subjects are more than 5:**
  - Core subjects: 60%
  - Peripheral subjects: 30%
  - Alien subjects: 10%

Only 7 respondents agree with the percentages given. 11 respondents have given varying percentages. One respondent states that core subjects should get more percentage, another states that
rigidity of percentages need not be emphasised. One respondent observes that this is a subjective and situational issue (without clarifying what he means by situational). Two respondents do not agree with this concept of collection evaluation. Both of them argue that there cannot be anything like core, peripheral or alien subjects. All subjects be treated alike because one does not know when core will become peripheral and vice versa. These two respondents happen to be university librarians, and they hold, what Ashworth calls classical view, according to which future needs are as important as present wants. They do not believe that of the total quantum of knowledge, only a certain band of it is active at any given time and the librarian should concentrate only on this band.

Eighteen of the 23 respondents agree with the idea of balanced collection. Of these 18, seven even agree with the percentage suggested in the model, viz. 40:40:20 and 60:30:10 respectively of core, peripheral and alien subject composition in the case of libraries with less than and more than five core areas. Eleven, however, while accepting the idea, suggest different ratios. By resorting to statistical exercise of the various combinations given in the response one arrives at the consensus of 60:30:10 and 70:20:10 for two different situations stated in the problem.

What is possible to deduce from the analysis is that the resultant ratios are applicable in the case of special libraries. As far as academic libraries are concerned it is advisable to

confine to Ashworth's concept of the active band of knowledge and the library's acquisition must concentrate in these active areas.

Issue No 3

This issue relates to the qualitative aspect of issue no. 2, viz. book-collection. (see annexure)

With the exception of four, all others agree with the suggested composition of core, peripheral and alien subjects. However, practically no one agrees on the percentage of periodicals given. The numerical composition of periodicals as suggested in the model was found to be on a higher side and a separate study will be needed to decide the nature of periodical collection. Two of the three respondents, who do not agree, hold the view, that they do not accept the concept of core/peripheral/alien. The third respondent argues that such a wholesale composition for all types of libraries will not be desirable. For smaller libraries it will have to be different. The last dissident argues that there should be no place for alien subjects. It can be concluded that with the exception of periodical collection, the qualitative norms for the library collection suggested in the model are acceptable and hold good in the case of special libraries only. The composition of periodical collection calls for further research.

Issue No. 4

The issue relates to Updated collection in Efficiency component. It is suggested that in deciding whether the library has updated collection, the composition of one year's acquisition should be as follows:
Among the books acquired, say, in 1985, those published in India

1. in 1985 should be 50%
2. in 1984 should be 30%
3. in 1983 should be 10%
4. in 1982 & earlier should be 10%

Those published in other countries

5. in 1985 should be 30%
6. in 1984 should be 30%
7. in 1983 should be 20%
8. in 1982 & earlier should be 20%

There is really a wide difference of opinion on this issue. Two respondents have not replied to the question. Another two consider the measure as unrealistic. (They don't say anything further). One respondent says that he does not agree, but gives neither explanation nor alternative. One respondent suggests different percentages for sciences, social science and humanities. Science collection must be up to date, but in the case of humanities, the library can acquire old material. (It is not correct to hold his view. The librarian must acquire the latest collection whatever is the discipline). One respondent does not like to confine to percentages. Eight respondents have answered by giving alternative percentages. But there is such a wide range of percentages that it is difficult to arrive at the consensus. Only eight agree with the percentages given in the suggested solution. The only trend emerges out of the responses is that the collection must be updated and the books acquired in a particular year must have a larger part of books published in that year than those published in the previous years, be they foreign or Indian books. From this point of view the opinion of a senior eminent librarian can be accepted. He suggests
the percentages of 60 and 40 for current and retrospective publications respectively, irrespective of whether they are Indian or foreign.

**Issue No. 5**

This and all the other issues that follow are the issues relating to Effectiveness component of the model. Issue five is relating to the registration of users. A library is established for all potential users. They are expected to use the library. Library effectiveness will take place only if the library is used. For this, the users must come to the library. Registration of the user is the first stage of the library use by him, and it can be measured. It is from this point of view that this finds place in effectiveness measurement exercise. The issue stated is

In an effective library the number of registered readers should be

100% of potential readers in university library?

90% of potential readers in college library?

50% of potential readers in school library?

100% of potential readers in advanced research library?

100% of potential readers in advanced training institute library?

Ten respondents out of 23 agree to the percentages suggested in the solution. One has not answered the question. Another simply says that this is wrong without giving a reason or an alternative. There are minor variations in the alternatives
suggested by the remaining eleven. On examining all these and considering the views expressed by all 21 respondents, the following percentages arise as the consensus:

- University libraries: 90%
- College libraries: 90%
- School libraries: 50%
- Research libraries: 100%
- Advanced Training Institute libraries: 100%

**Issue No. 6 A & B**

These two issues are taken together because they are very closely related. The idea was to project both the issues in proper perspective to the respondents.

After the registration of the user the next thing relevant to the use of the library is the frequency of visit to the library. Except in the case of extensive use of the computer with a terminal on the user's desk or in the case of extensive use of xerography machines which can take copies of reading material to the user outside the library, visit to the library by the user is essential. As both the aforementioned situations are not prevalent in this country, this norm of 'visit' is still valid for measuring the library effectiveness.

In the first part of question (6A), it was suggested that 50% of the registered users should visit the library every day. Nine respondents agree with this view. However, it cannot be taken as a basis for the consensus. Two respondents did not reply. Five do not consider visit a valid criterion. The remaining 10 respondents give various alternative percentages. The percentages suggested by them range from 10 to 40; in one case it is
65. One of them says that percentages will change according to the type of the library. Thus the consensus does not evolve. If the data obtained in the library survey (which is presented in the next chapter) proves anything, it is that with the increasing number of registered users, there is a corresponding decreasing percentage of visits.

The second part of the issue (6 B) relates to the frequency of visit to the library by every registered user. The suggested solution, viz. that each registered user must visit at least once in a week is acceptable to 14 out of 23 respondents. Two have not replied. One respondent does not think that this issue is related to effectiveness. Two respondents suggest once in a month, three suggest once in two weeks. From all evidence, the issue of the frequency of visit is more an ideal than a factor of effectiveness.

Issue No. 7 & 8

As is stated earlier the use of books is another important stage in the effectiveness of the library and that is measurable. The use of books can be judged by two measures: 1) Number of books issued out of the library and 2) Those consulted in the library. These two issues were taken up separately. The seventh issue concerns with the daily use. It is stated as

Normally the practice is that two books are issued to a reader for a period of two weeks. It is suggested that minimum number of non-text books issued every day should be 20% of the number of potential readers. (If there are 100 potential readers, the daily issue of books should be at least 20).

(Issue of text-books has no relevance to library effectiveness)
Eleven respondents agree with the suggested solution that the number of non-text books issued be 20% of potential users. Five respondents offer higher percentages. Two respondents offer as low as 10%. Another two respondents do not accept this criterion for effectiveness but give no reasons. Yet another two of them overlook the text book part of the issue. One respondent does not agree with the percentage without giving either the reasons or alternatives. Thus, 16 respondents agree to 20%. There should be no difficulty in accepting 20% as the consensus figure. With the increase in the number of users the percentage in all probability may go down.

Next issue relates to the number of books consulted in the library every day. In this case the solution was not provided in the model. There emerges no agreed upon formula in this respect. The respondents suggest varying percentages from 10 to 125 of the potential users. In the circumstances, the lowest of the percentages, viz. 10, be taken as desirable use.

Issue No. 9

This also relates to the use of books. The issue is that each book must be consulted at least once in ten years.) Thirteen respondents agree with the view, six recommend less than 10 years (once in five years and once in three years). One respondent does not reply. Three respondents do not agree that this is a measure of effectiveness. But since the majority is for 10 years it can be taken as a consensus. This holds good particularly in the case of small libraries. In university
and research libraries some exceptions will have to be made to certain types of books.

**Issue No. 10**

This issue relates to the number of short range reference queries being asked in an effective library. It may be reiterated here that the effectiveness of the library is reflected in the increased number of questions that are asked in the library. Thirteen respondents agree with the suggested norm that the library should receive in a day reference queries equal to 10% of registered users. One respondent suggests a higher number than this. Two respondents suggest the number of queries to be equal to 5% of the registered users. Another two suggest even less than five percent. Yet another three do not answer the question and two state that they do not agree with the measure.

The majority of respondents agree with 10% of the registered users as the number of reference queries received in a day. However it must also be stated here, that as the number of users increases the number of queries may be less than 10 percent.

**Issue No. 11**

This issue relates to second aspect of reference service, viz. long range reference service. It is argued that in an effective library, the reference wing will be busy for half the working time engaged in the work that can be categorized as long-range-reference work. The logic is explained in the last chapter. Fifteen out of 23 respondents agree with the proposal. One more agrees with the suggestions but warns against the dangers of quantification. Another
respondent does not reply. Six do not agree with the suggestion two of whom would like less time, whereas three would allot more time to be devoted to the work. One of these six respondents does not give any alternative.

It can certainly be said that the suggested solution can be treated as a consensus.

Issue No. 12

This issue is relating to the use of the bibliographical service. This was the second issue that was kept open. No solution was suggested. There is a wide range of percentages given in the response. Four choose not to reply. One states that it is irrelevant. Four have not been able to specify the percentages but agree that this is a measure for effectiveness. Replies given by 13 range from 25% to 100%. Even the library survey does not provide any indication, since such data are not available in the library. There is no consensus on the quantity, but as this is accepted as a measure of effectiveness by a majority, it may be concluded that at least 25 percent of the items in a bibliography provided by the librarian should be sought by the users one way or another.

Issue 13 A & B

Effectiveness of the library can be measured by the number of books being acquired against the firm orders with booksellers. This has been explained in the previous chapter. The issue has two aspects. Therefore, two issues have been made out of it but placed together to bring home their interconnection. Issue 13 A relates to the percentage of books procured against firm orders. Ten respondents agree with the given percentage of 50. Three opt for a higher percentage.
One agrees but advises caution while using this criterion. Respondents agree with the concept but state that the percentage could not be specified as it might vary according to the type of the library, efficiency of the book trade, or efficiency of the book selection policy. Six do not agree of whom three do not give reasons or alternatives, one does not give reply and two consider it as irrelevant. But since 14 out of 23 respondents agree 50% can be taken as the consensus having been reached.

Issue 13 B relates to books ordered at the initiative of users. The proposed minimum percentage of 50% of the books procured against firm orders for books recommended by users has been accepted by 12 respondents, one of whom again, cautions against the misuse of the criterion. Five respondents suggest a lower limit ranging from 20 to less than 50. Out of the six respondents who do not agree three do not provide any alternative, nor do they state the reasons why they do not accept. One feels that the percentages would vary according to the type of the library. One of the respondents states that it would reflect on the efficiency of the librarian if 50% of books are procured against the initiative of the users. This need not be the case as book selection is not entirely the prerogative of the librarian but is a joint activity of the users and the librarian. The fact that users recommend books for purchase only confirms that the user is kept up-to-date because of the library use. One respondent feels that this criterion is irrelevant to effectiveness. Twenty percent, it being the lowest of the percentages suggested by the 17,
can be taken as the consensus.

**Issue Nos. 14 A, B, C**

Three issues grouped here relate to the use of the inter-library-loan service offered by the library. The first issue, viz. 'the books borrowed from other libraries must be in the peripheral areas is generally acceptable as 15 out of 23 agree with the suggestion. Where no agreement could be reached included alien areas which is reasonable. Even books in core areas could be borrowed, if the borrowing library is young in age and books needed happen to be old and out-of-print. However, these are exceptional cases. On issue B about the number of books borrowed and lent the general feeling among the respondents is that the age of the library is a very crucial factor and therefore the number of books lent and borrowed could never be equal. This is acceptable. On the third issue, viz. that the books lent out would be mostly from core areas, there is a majority agreement supporting the view, 15 out of 23 being in favour.

**Issue No. 15**

This issue relates to the use of equipment that the library holds. The extent to which they are put to utilisation is one measurement. A certain measure of use of equipment is suggested. For example, it is argued that if a microf...m reader is used at least once in a week it can be said that it is effectively used. Thirteen respondents agree with this view, although as many as six opine that this could not be the measure in the effectiveness study. It would be, however, helpful to
reiterate why it is considered as a measure. Equipment like microfilm reader is costly, it needs a lot of care and money to maintain. It is bought because there is a need for it. It is necessary to justify the expenses incurred in purchase and on maintenance of this. The use of the equipment will establish the cost-effectiveness of equipment purchased. It is therefore a measure of effectiveness. One respondent does not answer. Another insists on the constant use. Two agree that it must be used but state that it is not necessary to quantify this use. As 14 out of 23 agree, it can be concluded that the suggested measure can be considered as a consensus.

**Issue No. 16**

This issue is also same like the previous one. Here of course, the major emphasis is on the use of material. The issue is "Each film must be used at least once in a year". Thirteen respondents agree with the view. Two do not answer. Five argue that this could not be a measure of effectiveness. One argues for more frequent use (once in a month), one leaves the use at the initiative of the librarian and one states that the number would depend upon the type of the library. But all agree on the use as a criterion for measurement. The suggested quantification can be treated, therefore, as consensus.

Through this opinion survey it was thus possible to resolve the 20 issues affecting the effectiveness model. Some of the solutions suggested in the model got confirmed, while some
others warranted modifications. The model was also tested by applying it to real situations. The test results are presented and discussed in the next chapter.

The matter circulated for the opinion survey is presented in three annexures to this chapter.
January 27, 1987

Shri S R Ganpule
M.A. M.Lib, Sc
Librarian
National Institute of
Bank Management
P B No. 1
Kondhve Khurd
PUNE - 411 022.

Dear

I am approaching you with a request to help me in my research leading to Ph.D. I am working under the guidance of Prof. M R Riswadkar of the University of Poona.

The topic I have selected for my research is 'Measuring Library Effectiveness'. I am trying to develop a model based on systems thinking. A brief outline of the model is enclosed herewith (Annexure I).

During the course of my study I have come across some issues which have not been clearly resolved. I have also identified some issues that need a fresh thinking in the context of the Library Effectiveness. Literature published on the topic does not provide any guideline in this respect. I have, therefore, decided to draw on the rich experience of persons of eminence in the field like your goodself to arrive at a consensus on these issues.

These issues are listed in Annexure II. You are requested to give your opinion on them and send the completed questionnaire to me. This being an academic study, the identity of the respondents will not be revealed.

A word about the scope. The study confines to libraries serving a parent organisation. Public libraries, therefore, are out of the scope of this study.

I propose to complete my study by the end of March 1987. I shall be extremely grateful to receive your views at your earliest convenience.

With high regards

Yours sincerely

S R Ganpule

Encl : A/a
CHAPTER IX
ANNEXURE 2

OUTLINE OF THE MODEL

Model

All the theories of social organisations have been very much concerned with organisational effectiveness, as only an effective organisation can survive and grow. The search for the tool which will facilitate the measurement of organisational effectiveness has therefore assumed importance.

Open-system theory of social organisation provides a better analysis of the working and survival of the organisations. It also shows the direction for measuring organisational effectiveness. Open system theory establishes a relationship of the organisation and environment. According to this theory, open organisation imports energy from the environment (input); processes and transforms the imported energy into a product (throughput); and exports this product into the environment (output). The theory further stipulated that this pattern of activities has a cyclic character. The product exported into the environment becomes a source of energy which again is injected into the organisation. The effectiveness of the organisation can be decided by the organisation's contribution to the environment as well as the maximisation of the returns from the environment to the organisation.
Effectiveness of the library can be explained by applying the open-system theory to the library as an organisation.

In this study, attempt has been made to build up a model based on the open-system theory for measuring the library effectiveness. This model has four components - Inputs, Throughputs, Efficiency and Effectiveness.

Inputs

Are the resources like staff, funds provided by external environment.

Throughputs

Are the processes or the management techniques used by the librarian to make maximum utilisation of the inputs to produce a library service. The management techniques are planning, organising, staffing, etc.

Efficiency

Is the total library service that is offered to the readers.
Effectiveness

Is the impact the library service makes on the working of the parent organisation. (It could be such as improving reading habit, developing a self-study skill or the extensive use of the library services offered).

Each of these four components has been further analysed. First, the facets of these components are worked out. Each then is further analysed to get its elements. For example; Input has 12 facets and further analysis of each facet gives 64 elements. The facets of 4 components, number of elements have been listed in the table enclosed herewith.

The study maintains that if the library has been provided with all the necessary inputs and these inputs are properly managed an efficient library will emerge. Such an efficient library alone can be effective. To put it in other way, the effectiveness of the library depends upon its being efficient. It's efficiency will be highly dependant on the inputs and through-puts. One cannot talk about the effectiveness of the library without ensuring that it is efficient.

The measurement of library effectiveness in quantitative terms can be possible if the scoring method is used. This also has been done in this study. The elements in each category have been grouped in three sets according to their
degree of importance. Those that are most important belong to category 'A' those that are important, to category 'B' and those that are normal belong to category 'C'. Categories A, B, and C have been assigned a score of three, two and one respectively. To facilitate assigning the score, a question has been formulated for each of these elements. A positive response to the question (depending upon the context, of course) entitles the library to get a score. Thus the score of the library under each of the four components can be measured. The score assigned to each facet is also indicated in the table. It is argued that the scores under each of the components are inter-related.

Thus, the model takes a view of the library as a total system. The model will be helpful not only to assume the existing service of a given library but it would be useful to diagnose the problem if there is any and facilitate taking corrective measures.

This model was tested, on experimental basis in one library. The library scored 65 on inputs, 63 on throughputs, 66 on efficiency and 65 on effectiveness. The hypothesis was proved. Further analysis showed that the library scored less on effectiveness mainly due to the weakness in inputs. It was found that some inputs so are strong that their absence cannot be balanced by strong throughputs.
It is planned to test this model further in two or three libraries each belonging to six types of the libraries: university library, college library, school library, institute of advance research library, institute of advanced training library and a one man-band library like a bank library or an industrial library.

**OPINION SURVEY**

Some problems are being faced while assigning scores to some elements belonging to all the components in general and the effectiveness component in particular. These are the issues where no standard has been developed so far. It is possible that they have not been considered in the context of the effectiveness so far. For example, the concept of 'balanced collection' has been introduced in the model. It is defined as the judicious mixture of core, peripheral and alien subjects. First, it is necessary to define the concept of core, peripheral and alien subjects of a library and secondly it is necessary to decide the proportions of these to form a 'balanced collection'. No guideline relating to this is available in the published literature. There are twenty such issues in the model. It is necessary that some guideline is provided so that the measurement could be real.
In the absence of the literature, I have decided to use the consensus of views of eminent librarians in the country as a measure in these 16 issues. (Not that, the existing literature totally ignores these issues but the solutions suggested are not relevant to the conditions prevailing in our country. They are suited to the advanced societies where the library sector is fully developed. Child grows with a library and the library service accompanies him even in the hospital where he breathes last)

I have, therefore decided to approach 40 eminent librarians in the country who have established their eminence by rendering exemplary service to their patrons.

All such issues are brought together in the opinion survey sheets enclosed herewith. Each issue has been briefly stated, a solution has been suggested. The experts will be requested to state whether the suggested solution is acceptable to them. If it is not they will be requested to give their own solution. The views expressed in the survey will help evolve a consensus. Consensus, thus evolved, will be used to give the final shape to the model and present the survey results of the pilot study. (For the experimental study referred above the suggested solutions were used)
## Table

**Facets of the Components of Model, Elements and Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Through-put</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facet</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Facet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planned Housing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2. Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5. Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading Material</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mechanical gadgets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Computer services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Peripheral environmental inputs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Break-up of organizational set-up
  - Role (3)
  - Structure (6)
  - Power & Authority (8)
  - Policy (10)
  - Procedures (4)
  - Supporting services (3)

(The numbers in brackets refer to the score)
In each of the following 16 questions, the problem is briefly explained. A solution has been suggested. You are requested to state if you agree with the suggested solution. If you do not agree you are requested to give your own solution in the space provided. Kindly send the questionnaire duly filled in in the self-addressed envelop enclosed herewith.

ISSUE RELATING TO INPUTS

1. Organisational set up is one of the facets of the input component of the model. It relates to various aspects such as status of the library in the organisation, statement of the role of the library, librarian's powers and authority etc.

While measuring, the information about this input will be sought from the librarian. Many times it is found that there is a mismatch between librarian's perception about these aspects and the fact as recorded in the official statements. Sometimes no such statements exist at all. It is, therefore, necessary that replies to all such questions must be supported by documentary evidence. If they are not supported by documentary evidence, the reliability of response becomes weak.

In order to get a realistic picture, I suggest that the score gained on account of the questions in this facet be scaled down by 50 percent if the replies to the questions are not supported by documents.
ISSUE RELATING TO
EFFICIENCY

2. This issue relates to BALANCED COLLECTION. It is argued that the collection can be called balanced only if the books on core subjects, peripheral subjects, and alien (apparently unrelated) subjects are in certain proportion. Suggested proportions are as follows:

a. In Libraries where core subjects are less than 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core subjects</th>
<th>Peripheral subjects</th>
<th>Alien subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. In Libraries where core subjects are more than 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core subjects</th>
<th>Peripheral subjects</th>
<th>Alien subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The issue relates to the qualitative aspect of the Book collection. The type of books "that should constitute the collection" in Core, Peripheral and Alien subject areas of a given library are indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>PERIPHERAL</th>
<th>ALIEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Classics</td>
<td>Representative books by standard authors</td>
<td>Introductory books only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All books by standard authors</td>
<td>One reference work of each type (encyclopedia, dictionary, statistical data source etc.)</td>
<td>One or two reference works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All major reference works</td>
<td>Selected standard textbooks</td>
<td>No research journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All prescribed textbooks</td>
<td>20% of Quarterlies in English listed in Ulrich Dictionary</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All prescribed additional readings</td>
<td>Audiovisuals introducing the subject</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from unconventional sources</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Dissertations</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of Quarterlies in English listed in Ulrich's directory</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications of Institutes of similar nature</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Clippings</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visuals on micro topics or specialised aspects</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick (\/) the items you consider appropriate and cross (x) the items you consider inappropriate in the above list. Kindly add in the space provided the categories in respective group which, you feel, have been omitted.
4. The issue relates to Updated collection in Efficiency component. It is suggested that in deciding whether the library has updated collection, the composition of one year's acquisition should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>I suggest that percentages should be as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Among the books acquired, say, in 1985, those published in India</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. in 1985</td>
<td>should be 50 %</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. in 1984</td>
<td>should be 30 %</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in 1983</td>
<td>should be 10 %</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in 1982 &amp; before</td>
<td>should be 10 %</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Those published in other countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in 1985</td>
<td>should be 30 %</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. in 1984</td>
<td>should be 30 %</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. in 1983</td>
<td>should be 20 %</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. in 1982 &amp; before</td>
<td>should be 20 %</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. This is about the number of registered users vis-a-vis potential users.

In an effective Library the number of registered users should be:

100 percent of potential in university library? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

90 percent of potential users in college library? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

50 percent of potential users in school library? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

100 percent potential users in advance research library? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

100 percent of potential users in advance training institute? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

6. This relates to the use of the library:

A) In an effective library, average daily visitors should be 50% of the registered users? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]

B) In an effective library each registered user must visit at least once in a week? \[\text{Yes/No, If not, \%}\]
7. This relates to use of books

Normally the practice is that two books are issued to a user for a period of two weeks. It is suggested that minimum number of non-text books issued every day should be 20 percent of the number of potential users. (If there are 100 potential users, the daily issue of books should be at least 20).

(Issue of text-books has no relevance to library effectiveness)

8. Again, relating to use of books

Kindly suggest the number of books consulted every day (they may not be issued out, necessarily)

9. Do you agree that each book must be consulted at least once in 10 years?

10. This relates to Reference Service

It is proposed that the Library should receive that number of short term queries in a day which is equal to 10 percent of registered users.

11. This also relates to Reference Service

Long-range reference work should engage Reference Librarian for half a working day
12. This relates to Bibliography Use

Kindly indicate what percentage of references cited in a bibliography prepared at the request of a user be consulted by him.

I suggest

13.a. This relates to the qualitative aspect of library use

It is suggested that percentage of books procured against firm orders with the total number of books purchased should be 50.

Agree
Do not agree

13.b. It is suggested that percentage of books ordered at the initiative of users with the total ordering of books should be 50

Agree
Do not agree

14.a. This relates to interlibrary loan

It is argued that books borrowed from other libraries must be in a peripheral subject area?

Yes/No

b. It is suggested that the number of books borrowed from other libraries should be more or less same as books loaned to other libraries.

Yes/No
If not

Yes/No
If not

15. This relates to equipment use

It is suggested that effective use of microfilm reader should be at least once in a week.

Yes/No
If not

16. This relates to use of audio-visuals

It is suggested that each film must be issued at least once in a year.

Yes/No
If not