ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL ATTITUDES

REGARDING PUBLIC LIBRARY FINANCIAL ISSUES IN TEXAS

BY

LISA GATLIFF

AN APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT (POLITICAL SCIENCE 5397)
SUBMITTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

(Fall 1996)

FACULTY APPROVAL:

Patricia M Shields

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Imagine a typical scenario of a city council meeting in which the city's budget is being considered. The city council's constituents do not support a tax increase to cover increased service costs. In order to make up for revenue shortfalls or increased service costs in areas such as public safety, the city council asks the city manager for budget "savings," a euphemism for "cuts" in other service programs. The city manager asks the library director, among other department directors, for cuts.

In this scenario, the library director senses that the library customers will not appreciate a cut back in the variety of offered library serves. The library director also understands that the book buying budget is cut to the bone and that there is no redundant staff to target for layoffs. The only option remaining is to close branch libraries outright or to cut back on the hours that branch libraries are open to the public. Reluctantly, the library director proposes that a "redundant" or "underutilized" branch library is to be closed. During a subsequent public budget hearing to consider this option, the public protests against the idea of closing the branch. As a result, the city council backs down on the idea of closing the branch. The branch remains open with no budget savings accomplished. If the library director chooses the other option, that of cutting back service hours, a public outcry results in reinstatement of the cut hours with no budget savings accomplished. The city manager's staff may even work closely with the library director to consolidate or reorganize library facilities to effect budget savings, but even such a proposal faces the same sort of public resistance to change that face proposals to close branches or cut hours.

At the same time library directors face such external pressure to reduce the budget

of public libraries, library directors endeavor to respond to pressures to increase their

budgets for the sake of increasing service to their customers. Such scenarios have been

common in personal professional experience.

Constantly dealing with opposing financial pressures such as these, year in and

year out, would drive any normal public administrator to the brink of nervous breakdown.

Fortunately for those they serve, public library administrators are not "normal" public

administrators. It is only a slight exaggeration to suggest that library administrators

appear to be superhuman individuals who energetically and passionately believe in their

work of providing library service to the public. Library administrators realize that the

"financial" cards are stacked against them in their efforts to provide ever increasing levels

of service. And yet, they continue to work hard to reach their service goals.

However, personal professional experience witnesses that even superhuman library

administrators complain to time to time, just like mere mortals. Administrators complain

about resistance from those political players who may block access to more financial

resources. Are these complaints unique to library administrators? Probably not. Is there

something about these complaints that is worth further investigation and research? The

germ for this research sprang from curiosity about the possibility of complex relationships

between political resistance and administrative financial dissatisfaction.

A politician with an unsympathetic attitude may pose a unique roadblock to

administrative efforts to obtain and manage resources for the library organization. When a

difference in financial attitudes exists, recognition of the difference is important so that

administrators may work through or around that difference. Without adequate sensitivity

and understanding of existing differences in attitudes regarding financial issues, the administrator may face excessive resistance in their efforts to obtain and manage the financial resources necessary for adequate service provision. Therefore, an understanding of the relative political and administrative attitudes regarding financial issues matters to savvy administrators.

Purpose Of The Research

How was the focus of the research purpose chosen? A recent graduate student, Darlene Berghammer, analyzed library administration policy issues from an economic perspective.[1] In her conclusion, Berghammer states that quantitative economic analysis is a useful tool in considering policy options in libraries. While the application of economic theory can contribute much to decision-making in real-life library administration, it is certainly not the only useful approach. And, it is certainly not always a readily accepted approach in social service organizations such as libraries, where a long tradition of a strong commitment to serving the clients of the organization has been the predominant focus. Berghammer notes that there are three considerations that go into good decision-making regarding library policy issues: "equity" (fair and equal service), economics, and politics. These three considerations of good decision-making are somewhat similar to what at least one other scholar has suggested as a similar triumvirate of possible approaches to settling policy issues in social service administrations.[2]

---

[1] See Berghammer (1995, p. 80.)
[2] See Shields (1989) where human services are considered in terms of the social work tradition, economic efficiency, and pragmatic balancing of interests in a politicized environment. Also see Shields (1996) where the approaches of practitioners, theorists and pragmatists are considered.

While Berghammer has successfully taken an economic approach in the analysis of library administration issues, duplicating such an economic approach would not be feasible. Duplicating Berghammer's approach is not feasible because not enough time has elapsed to merit a replicative study. Without a personal background formal training in the professional library science discipline, neither is a traditional library and information science approach practical. In addition, personal curiosity bends the research focus towards consideration of administrative frustration with perceived political resistance. For these reasons and owing to a strong academic background in public administration, this research project is focused through a somewhat political approach on library administration. At the same time, the available body of literature acknowledges other possible approaches to library finance administration. Therefore, the literature review touches on each of these three approaches – economic, traditional, and political – in keeping with the public administration tradition of pragmatic use of various applicable approaches.[3]

The purpose of this research is two-fold. First, the attitudes of two groups of decision-makers, library administrators and politically-elected officials (herein, subsequently referred to simply as "politicians"), regarding public library financial issues in Texas are assessed. Secondly, the attitudes of these two groups are compared.

Inherent in the topic of public finance in any agency is the issue of resolving competing claims for scarce resources. Obviously, decision-makers do not have a blank check. Different groups have different priorities, and these different priorities can be reflected in how these groups perceive public finance decisions.

---

[3] Shields, (1996, p. 399), suggests that the public administration tradition of pragmatism recommends

Personal observation indicates that there is a gap of perception between administrators and politicians. Both groups are vital to the allocation of resources to and among library programs. If these groups cannot come to a common understanding or agreement, library organizations may suffer negative impacts. Are there commonalties between the attitudes of the two groups that would indicate hope for the future of public libraries? Are there political attitudes that administrators can capitalize on or change for the benefit of public libraries? Thus, the research question: Is there a relationship between the attitudes of library administrators and politicians regarding public library financial issues in Texas?

Chapter Summaries

Chapter One has introduced the topic area of this research. Chapter Two reviews the literature from which sprang the conceptual framework, the variables to be measured, and the focus of this research. Chapter Three delineates the technical and practical aspects of the methodology chosen and implemented in this research. Chapter Four discusses the results of the research efforts. Finally, Chapter Five summarizes the conclusions that may be drawn from the results of the research.

---

being comfortable with a variety of approaches to policy issues.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction To The Literature

Library Mission

The American Library Association (ALA) is continuously developing standards for professional conduct and industry objectives (Office for Intellectual Freedom, 1992, p. 3). According to ALA standards, libraries are to serve as forums for the free exchange of ideas and information resources for all people. Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 137) call for libraries to seek to increase the public's awareness. Molz (1978, p. 416) argues that democratic societies are obligated to provide library service so that the citizenry has adequate access to information and knowledge.[4] In providing information for the general interest and enlightenment of the public, public libraries are to represent all current and historical perspectives.[5]

This research paper and the literature considered herein are primarily concerned with public libraries. There are two other general kinds of libraries: private libraries (such as those libraries developed by, and for, private corporations and professional organizations for reference in private research and development efforts) and academic libraries (such as those at universities and schools, regardless of the public or private status of the academic institution). These private and academic libraries serve different audiences and have different organizational cultures than public libraries. For the purposes of this paper, and by common practice, public libraries are general purpose libraries which exist to serve the general populace in a particular political jurisdiction. The

---

[4] Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 52) also discuss the common basic public library mission to provide access to information and knowledge.

term "public" in "public library" is a reference to the general populace "public" in the particular political jurisdiction, more than it is a reference to the method of funding the library.[6]

As Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 52) point out, the Public Library Association encourages its member libraries to guide customers in the customers' efforts to locate, to use and to evaluate information. Generally, libraries should provide user-friendly ways to help customers meet their educational goals in using the library system and services. The Office for Intellectual Freedom (1992, p. 3) of the American Library Association urges libraries to stand firmly against censorship as a matter of policy. Libraries are to cooperate with advocates of freedom of expression and freedom of access to ideas. Libraries are to grant access to all individuals to library resources regardless of the background of the individual. Libraries are to be equitable in the distribution of their resources. Libraries must be able to determine how to fund, purchase and distribute those resources in light of community needs and preferences in an efficient, effective and equitable manner. In this section, the reader has gained some exposure to the common public library mission. The next section will begin to consider financial aspects of public libraries.

Financial Issues

The variety of financial issues found in the public library administration literature is demonstrated in Table 2.1. According to Bookstein (1981, p. 410), the economics of

---

[5] See, for example: Office of Intellectual Freedom (1992, p. 3); Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 137); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 52).

TABLE 2.1. Examples Of Financial Topic Categories In Literature

AUTHORS	PUBLIC LIBRARY FINANCE ISSUES			
	COMMUNITY CONTEXT	REVENUE SOURCES	COSTS	PROGRAMS & SERVICES
Berghammer (1995)			✓	✓
Bookstein (1981)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Carrigan (1994)		✓	✓	
Dannelly (1993)	✓		✓	✓
Dunn & Martin (1994)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Goudy & Altman (1994)	✓	✓	✓	
Hicks (1980)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keene (1989)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Office for Intellectual Freedom (1992)				✓
Ottensmann & Gleeson (1993)				✓
Quirk & Whitestone (1982)	✓	✓	✓	
Raber (1995)	✓	✓		✓
Ramsey & Ramsey (1986)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reed (1992)	✓	✓		✓
Sweeney (1994)	✓			✓
Van House (1984)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Van House & Childers (1991)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Weingand (1995)	✓		✓	✓

library finance is concerned with the distribution of scarce resources[7] to maximize social benefit.

Indeed, library resources are usually scarce or, at least, limited. Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 566) suggest that library management can make better decisions regarding how to conduct library business when management has a clearer knowledge and understanding of costs. However, as Bookstein observes, even if libraries could perfectly manage the

---

[6] Although the method of funding for public libraries usually includes some revenues from a public tax base.

[7] Shields (1988, p. 61) observes that "Ultimately, financial decisions concern choices about allocating scarce resources among competing ends." In her assessment of the financial issues in the field of human services, Shields considers topics quite similar to those discussed in this literature review, topics such as costs (p. 68), revenues (p. 74), and "Building Funding Capacity" (p. 80, similar in spirit to the "community context" topic). However, rather than duplicate the details of discussion presented by Shields in the considering human services, this review considers public library finance in light of the public library finance literature available, which does not always dovetail with Shields's discussion of human services.

distribution of resources, there is high competition to acquire these resources in the first place. Raber (1995, p. 168) contends that, for governmental financial support to occur, elected officials must buy into the idea that funding public libraries is legitimized by the need to secure access to information for all citizens.

The body of literature included in this research covers the complexity of these public library finance issues. While no one source comprehensively covers all possible financial issues in public libraries, the reviewed articles do overlap to varying degrees in covering topics in public library finance, such as costs, community context, revenue sources, services and programs. Table 2.1 demonstrates the diversity of topics covered in the reviewed literature. This section has provided a brief overview of issues related to library finance. The next section will consider the variety of perspectives evident in the literature's discussion of these issues.

Perspectives: Library Service Tradition, Economic Theory, Accountancy, And Politics

The body of literature on public library finance encompasses a diversity of perspectives.[8] As Table 2.2 demonstrates, authors sometimes draw from more than one perspective in approaching their topics even when the selected perspectives are drawn from academic disciplines which do not represent the authors' primary training.[9] Even so, it is clear that inclusion and consideration of multiple viewpoints can lead to a more

---

[8] Perhaps this is because librarians are so widely well-read and well-educated that they are able to draw from their exposure to a variety of disciplines.

[9] I observe from professional experience, that many public library administrators are expected to demonstrate mastery of many disciplines. A savy library professional should be able to weigh the implications of multiple perspectives to make balanced decisions.

TABLE 2.2. Examples Of Perspectives Presented In Literature

AUTHORS	PERSPECTIVES			
	SERVICE TRADITION	ECONOMICS	ACCOUNTING	POLITICS
Berghammer (1995)		✓		
Bookstein (1981)		✓		
Carrigan (1994)	✓			
Dannelly (1993)	✓	✓		
Dunn & Martin (1994)	✓		✓	
Goudy & Altman (1994)			✓	
Hicks (1980)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keene (1989)	✓		✓	✓
Office for Intellectual Freedom (1992)	✓			
Ottensmann & Gleeson (1993)	✓		✓	
Quirk & Whitestone (1982)	✓		✓	
Raber (1995)				✓
Ramsey & Ramsey (1986)	✓		✓	
Reed (1992)				✓
Sweeney (1994)	✓			
Van House (1984)	✓	✓	✓	
Van House & Childers (1991)				✓
Weingand (1995)	✓		✓	✓

balanced, comprehensive discussion of library financial issues.

A traditional professional perspective focuses on service to patrons. Serving the maximum number of patrons takes priority over economic or political considerations.[10] For instance, imposing fees may limit the access of potential patrons to library services. Therefore, from a strictly traditional library service perspective, fees would not be recommended.

---

[10] Lancaster (1988. p. 8-11) discusses the traditional service paradigm approach to library services as an approach in which the focus is on maximizing circulation, satisfying the needs of customers, publicizing and promoting library services and resources available to customers, making services and resources conveniently and readily accessible to customers, and adapting to changing needs and technologies. Notice a lack of focus on political responsiveness as well as a lack on fiscal accountability. This does not mean that librarians are not concerned about politics or fiscal matters – it is simply not their primary concern.

Economic theories focus on such concepts such as economic efficiencies,[11] supply,[12] and demand[13]. For instance, imposing fees may successfully ration consumer demand for over-used "private good" library services and thereby achieve certain economic efficiencies. Therefore, from a strictly economic efficiency perspective, fees would be recommended.

Political perspectives focus on what the voters and other political actors will accept.[14] For instance, political considerations may prohibit the elimination of duplicated services. Certain "for fee" library services may actually duplicate services available in private markets. For example, if a library were to circulate videotapes for a minor fee, the library would be duplicating services available in video rental retail stores. In an effort to placate and win the maximum support from all possible constituencies, the politician may opt to have libraries provide video services for nominal rental fees. Pursuing such an option might strike a politically feasible compromise between two groups of constituents. One group of constituents – customer service-oriented librarians and videotape customers who wish to open up videotape circulation services to free access with the elimination of fees – might settle for a more inexpensive access to videos than the private sector would otherwise provide. Another group of constituents – economists and competing videotape

---

[11] Savas (1987, p. 40) identifies libraries as economic toll goods. However, Savas (1987, p. 52) also recognizes that, through government provision, society often seeks to provide more of certain "worthy" toll goods than would be economically efficient through private market mechanisms alone. Van House (1984. p. 415) suggests that efficiency can be measured by the ratio of inputs (resources) to outputs (goods) and outcomes (services).

[12] Supply can be thought of in terms of the supply curve, an economic model which describes the relationship between the price of a good and the quantity of the good supplied. See Aronson (1985, p. 601) and Mansfield (1991, p. A32.)

[13] Demand can be thought of in terms of the demand curve, an economic model which describes the relationship between the price of a good and the quantity of the good demanded. (Aronson, 1985, p. 592; Mansfield, 1991, A25.)

retailers who might wish to eliminate this seemingly inefficient duplication of services altogether – might settle for sharing the videotape market on a limited basis with libraries charging competitive user fees. Political perspectives often seek such compromise factions between opposing constituencies.

Literature Review Purposes

While clearly there are many possible perspectives to consider, what is the focus of this literature review? The purpose of this literature review is to examine the issues involved in how libraries manage and augment their finances. This review also considers some of the factors which influence, or are influenced by, library financial management. From this consideration of the literature, the researcher has constructed a conceptual framework of topics and working hypotheses regarding perspectives on those topics. The subsequent discussion of the literature is organized around the components of the conceptual framework.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework provides the structure for this exploratory research. The relationships between two categories of people (politicians and administrators) regarding their opinions about four loosely defined categories of issues that impact library organizations (community context, revenue sources, costs, services and programs) are explored. These issue categories are types of issues apparent in the professional and scholarly literature of the last several decades in fields concerned with public library

---

[14] Wildavsky (1992, pp. 106-126) discusses political budgeting strategies, particularly at the federal level,

finance administration.[15] In the body of literature reviewed, regardless of the approach

(traditional, economic, accounting, or political), these four issue categories cover the

topics of scholarly discussions in the literature. These issue categories reflect concerns

from all identified approaches to library administration policy decisions, each to a varying

degree.

As the conceptual framework allows for exploration of potential relationships

between political and administrative attitudes, it is only natural that the research developed

reasonable expectations of results or findings of relationships in the form of working

hypotheses. These working hypotheses[16] include the following predictions which were

tested during the course of the research:

> WH_1: The attitudes of administrators regarding public library financial issues are similar to each other and are not neutral.[17]
>
> WH_2: The attitudes of politically elected officials (herein referred to as simply "politicians") regarding public library financial issues[18] are similar to each other and are not neutral.[19]
>
> WH_3: The attitudes of the administrators regarding public library financial issues differ from the attitudes of the politicians regarding the same issues.[20]
>
> WH_4: The administrators are more interested in making their attitudes[21] known to the researcher, than the politicians are.[22]

---

at great length.

[15] For instance: Reed (1992) discusses methods for developing and maintaining a community context or environment that is favorable for libraries; Carrigan (1994) discusses fund-raising for alternate revenue sources; Bookstein (1981) discusses costs as they relate to the economic production function of libraries; and all library finance discussions in the reviewed literature presume a need to provide library services and programs in some capacity.

[16] At first glance, these working hypotheses may seem simplistic and uninformative. However, please keep in mind that a comparison of attitudes will be undertaken for each issue area. Therefore, the analysis results will be "issue-rich."

[17] Null hypothesis: The attitudes of the administrators (in each of the four issue areas) are neutral.

[18] Specific issues include the topic categories of programs and services, community context, revenues, and costs. These categories are presented, tested, and discussed in no particular order. These categories are interlinked. The order of presentation does not indicate relative importance. All four categories are equally important.

[19] Null hypothesis: The attitudes of the politicians (in each of the four issue areas) are neutral.

[20] Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the administrators and the attitudes of the politicians (in each of the four issue areas).

[21] Regarding public library financial issues.

How these working hypotheses were tested will be discussed in the methodology chapter, following this literature discussion. Having now considered how these issue or topic areas will be considered in the original research portion of this paper, the next sections will consider how these topics have been treated in the existing literature, beginning with the topic of library services and programs.

Programs And Services

Perspectives On Programs And Services

A focus on services is the natural orientation of the traditional library service perspective.[23] Maximizing service and program delivery is a major component of traditional library objectives. However, library scholars have used the language and tools of economic theory to determine how best to achieve their service objectives.[24] In addition, administrators may take into consideration the focus of a political perspective in determining what service mix is appropriate for their organization.[25]

Focusing Evaluation On Programs And Services

Many years ago, Hayes (1979, p. 122) pointed out focus on program and service delivery is important, at least in part, because libraries can be producing unwanted shelves of books at maximum levels and still not meet the specific needs of the customer market. Keene (1989, p. 106) suggests that beyond a certain point, additional investment in library

---

[22] Null hypothesis: There is no significant association between the number of surveys returned and the group affiliation of the participants who returned surveys.

[23] See Office For Intellectual Freedom's (1992, p. 3) coverage of the "Library Bill of Rights" for a detailed coverage of this perspective.

[24] For instance, Cooper, a library science scholar, considers "The Economics of Library Size" (1979.)

resources does not necessarily result in increased customer satisfaction. Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 62) recommend that libraries evaluate the degree of performance objective achievement to determine whether resources have been used in the best possible way. As Van House (1984, p. 409) observes, decision-makers for libraries must determine an appropriate service mix, including how much of each service to supply. Library administrators need to budget realistically in light of the services they wish to offer and the cost of those services. Library managers may need to readjust service levels to bring costs in on or under budget.

According to Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 565), the most complex kind of library budget is the program budget. Weingand (1995, p. 402) suggests that expenses from line item budgets need to be related to the cost of service measurement of program budgeting.[26] As Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 19) explain, program budgets group costs by program. Keene (1989, p. 97) observes that program budgeting focuses on program spending to make budgetary decisions and that it takes a service delivery approach to budgeting.

Sweeney (1994, p. 67) suggests that library managers should focus on end results and how to satisfy the customers for library services, not on the processes, procedures, or inputs. The ends of a library service delivery process are often more important than the means of that process. Weingand (1995, p. 403) observes that, ideally, outcomes of library programs should reflect the service goals and missions of that program. However, Van House and Childers (1991, p. 276) contend that, even with program service

---

[25]Van House (1984, p. 416) suggests that at times, political influence determines service levels.

measures, comparing unique and different library organizations with each other can be problematic. Yet, according to Van House and Childers, there is still value in knowing how one library is faring in comparison to other libraries. The variety of purposes and types of service mixes make such a comparison complex. The next section will address this apparent variety.

Purposes And Types Of Programs And Services

As Molz (1978, p. 416) points out in general terms, public library service reflects democracy society's desire to provide access for the citizenry to information and knowledge. In contrast, as Hayes (1979, p. 120) points out, in specific terms, public library services vary from library to library. As Bookstein (1981, p. 413) observes, circulation is the most significant direct service of public libraries. According to Bookstein, use of other library services[27] generally is positively correlated with circulation. Certainly, Bookstein (1981, p. 414) admits that traditional circulation does not measure the complete benefits of library service to society.[28] For instance, some libraries also offer services such as basic on-line bibliographic database search services (Cooper, 1978, p. 419), preservation of historical records (Dannelly, 1993, p. 87), interlibrary loans (Dunn and Martin, 1994, p. 568), electronic collection development (Dunn and Martin, 1994, p. 570), exhibit spaces (Office for Intellectual Freedom, 1992, p. 3), meeting rooms,

---

[26] What Weingand is suggesting is that administrators need to translate line item costs into costs associated with specific programs. Although program budgeting primarily focuses on outcomes, it does not altogether ignore the costs of achieving preferred outcomes.
[27] Such as use of non-circulating materials.
[28] Goddard (1973, p. 193) agrees with Bookstein on this point.

homework resource centers (Van House and Childers, 1991, p.275), preschool programs, summer reading programs, and reference services (Van House, 1984, p. 412).

Appropriate Measurements

In the previous section, the reader has gained some exposure to the variety in library services. This section considers how to measure the adequacy and success of these services appropriately. Van House (1984, p. 410) cautions that it can be difficult to adequately measure library service outputs in a comprehensive and meaningful way. As a measurement, service transactions underestimate the value of service readiness.

Certainly, as Bookstein (1981, p. 414) emphasizes, circulation does not measure the complete benefits of library services to society. Public libraries should not measure circulation to the exclusion of measuring other library service programs. An emphasis on book circulation increases circulation efforts. An emphasis on library traffic increases library events to draw in people. Many years ago, Goddard (1973, p. 193) cautioned that circulation, as an output measure, does not capture the entire social benefit or utility of library services.

However, as Hayes (1979, p. 121) pointed out many years ago, circulation statistics are generally reliable and consistent for comparison between public libraries. Circulation measures the success of the library efforts to provide books that library customers want.[29] In this way, circulation is a more significant measure of library worth than measures such as the number of books in a library collection.

---

[29] In economic terms, circulation volume is at the point where the supply and demand curves intersect.

Effectiveness measurements are also related to service capacity. As Bookstein (1981, p. 416) explains, these measures can include: the percentage of some baseline collection that the library owns, the fill rate, and the probability of finding a book where it should be.[30] Hayes (1979, p. 121) pointed out long ago that research resource service measurements are often weak because they can be hard to define and to measure with any kind of consistency or reliability. Nevertheless, as Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 59) suggest, sometimes imperfect measurements can be better than none at all when assessing library programs.

Making Adjustments

After having considered measurements of service, it is perhaps natural to consider how the service mix can be improved. Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 13) recommend that, beyond the minimum service level of giving the community what it needs, perhaps the goal of public libraries should be to provide services according to the desires of the "supporting community." While it may be relatively easy to decide to keep a high demand / low cost program or to eliminate a low demand / high cost program, Weingand (1995, p. 403) cautions that it is often difficult to decide on the appropriate service mix among programs that are high demand / high cost and low demand / low cost programs.

Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 13) observe that, with tightening revenues and increased costs, it is more difficult to maintain service levels. Budgeting for public library

---

[30] Cooper (1979, p. 64) also had much to say about such effectiveness measures along the same lines many years ago. In addition, Cooper (1979, p. 65) suggests that output can be measured in terms of the number of questions answered in a library reference section.

services requires realism about the services to be offered and the cost of those services. Once again, service levels may need adjusting to bring costs in on or under budget.

There are many ideas about how libraries should set appropriate service levels. Van House (1984, p. 416) contends that political influences and space and cost considerations initially determine the service level of new library programs and locations. Hicks (1980, p. 458) explains that during periods of fiscal stress, public libraries either can expand and diversify their revenue sources, or they can narrow and redefine their goals, roles, scope and function of offered services.

Objectives for library service performance should be measurable, quantifiable, and representative of expectations that are neither extremely high nor extremely low for optimum resource use. Weingand (1995, p. 403) recommends that performance objectives should be designed to meet library goals and missions. Many years ago, Molz (1978, p. 428) suggested that perhaps public libraries should not be concerned about maintaining historically comprehensive collections. Public libraries might be able to leave the development of historical collections to specialized research institutions. Perhaps public libraries should concentrate fewer resources on main central libraries with research titles and focus more resources on branch circulation with popular titles to meet increased demand in middle class suburbs and to encourage circulation of popular reading materials among central city low-income communities.

As Ottensmann and Gleeson (1993, p. 86) discuss, in terms of collection development services, public libraries can use circulation analysis software to determine whether certain allocation total amounts will be sufficient to reach circulation program goals. Such an automated linkage of historical circulation and historical allocation data to

current proposed allocation [and beyond current allocation to future circulation] may allow the public library budget process to become more results-oriented and more easily understood in terms of results.

Undoubtedly, this discussion of ways in which service mixes can be altered is not exhaustive. Now that this section has considered some of the myriad ways of changing service, the next section will consider how priorities are reflected in the choices between service change options.

Priorities

As Van House and Childers (1991, p. 276) observe, often the service mix is a political choice. Specific goals for service can be based on community needs. However, Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 49) recommend that, with limited resources, public library administrators need to limit library activities, services and programs to specific roles as much as possible. Expanded roles require expanded resources and perhaps should only be pursued if expanded resources are made available.

Public libraries constantly face pressures to deliver more service and to maintain current service levels with decreasing resources. Library organizations that regularly succumb to the pressures to deliver more "bang for the buck" may face a backlash as compromises are made within the organization and quality declines, morale declines, and criticism rises from customers who may perceive poorly funded service programs as poor service delivery. Reed (1992, p. 63) goes so far as to suggest that if the public is not willing to support public libraries through public funding, perhaps the public should feel the consequences of their neglect of the libraries rather than have the libraries raise money

from other sources. After libraries have prioritized and streamlined services, libraries can tactfully and vocally insist that revenue reductions mean service reductions.

According to Reed, if legislators oppose supporting libraries, library advocates should find out the reasons behind the opposition. It is possible that libraries can learn from critics how libraries might better serve the community. Raber (1995, p. 168) suggests that for federal financial support of local public library programs to occur, legislators may be persuaded to buy into the idea that the national need to secure access to information for all citizens legitimizes federal funding of public libraries. Van House (1984, p. 408) points out that, in the end, funding organizations, not the libraries, decide how much the library will spend on services.

Thus, services do not simply reflect the priorities of the professional library staff. Clearly throughout this discussion, service mix concerns do not determine the conduct of library financial administration independently of other library financial issues. The next section will consider another equally important library financial topic that has influence over the conduct of library financial administration – community context.

Community Context

The issue of community context for public libraries is at least two-fold. In one way, community context for public libraries concerns itself with how the library fits into the community and influences the community. In another way, community context for public libraries concerns itself with how the community influences the library. Such a description, however, is surely an oversimplification of a very complex and dynamic relationship.

The literature has much to say in exploring this relationship as it relates to public

library finance. An examination of different perspectives will begin this review of the

literature regarding the topic of community context in the consideration of public library

financial issues.

Perspectives On Community Context

Community context means different things to different people. The topic category

of "community context" is inclusive of many perspectives. Library professionals,

economists, and politicians understand and use concepts of "community context" in

slightly different ways. A traditional library service perspective views the community as

the recipient of library service.[31] This traditional orientation might persuade

administrators to customize library services to reach all groups in the community. Library

service focuses on customer service. The community is the customer. Economists seek to

quantify and predict community context for econometric purposes. Economic theory

considers community context only inasmuch as it translates into demand for a supply of

library goods.[32] Community context is only one factor in the economic equation for public

sector activity. Politicians pay attention to community context for political reasons. From

a political perspective, community context is a primary consideration, as community

values become political imperatives for services.[33] Political responsiveness to community

---

[31] This is similar to Shields' discussion of social welfare services (1989, p. 72), in which case workers view people as clients, according to their traditional service perspective.

[32] According to Shields (1989, p. 72), the economic efficiency perspective approaches people as units of labor or as consumers.

[33] Molz (1978, p. 428) observed many years ago that this is certainly the case when a community so values its neighborhood library that it exerts political force to keep the neighborhood branch library open, even when the branch is an inefficient allocation of resources or overlaps its service coverage area with that of other branch libraries in the vicinity.

context can mean making political decisions that impact public library finances. Lack of political responsiveness to community context can mean a loss of community support for the unresponsive politician. Thus, politicians may focus on community context for the sake of gaining voter support. This section briefly has considered community context as a customer service, community context as a predictor of demand, and customer context as responsiveness to voters. The next section considers what public libraries offer the community.

What Libraries Offer The Community

Given the variety of perspectives, it is perhaps not surprising that there are many reasons to support libraries in the community. Bookstein (p. 1981, p. 421) suggests that the presence of libraries contributes to the ability of the community to attract desirable residents. Bookstein contends that libraries attract well-educated, middle-class residents to the community and help maintain the value of local real estate.[34] Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) point out that libraries are thought to be good for economic development. As Van House and Childers observe, libraries help create jobs and help businesses.[35] Indeed, according to Bookstein (1981, p. 427), public library funds are

---

[34] Such a belief in the positive externalities of public libraries is wide-spread. It would be interesting to conduct a quantitative study to measure the impact of service quality on the ability of communities to attract migration to the community. Certainly, popular media ratings of communities include "quality of life" amenities such as library services. These popular ratings judge the relative attractiveness of communities on the basis of these amenities as well as other factors such as pollution, crime and cost of living. It is thought that these widely-published rankings of communities influence migration patterns among communities, but I have seen no specific statistical evidence to support or disprove this theory.

[35] The idea here is that budding entrepreneurs who are tight on financial resources in the beginning can use library resources to research their chosen field of enterprise and to build their knowledge basis for their new enterprise at a minimal cost using easily accessible and inexpensive library services. In addition, an unemployed person looking for a new career can educate themselves on possible new fields of endeavor without the expense of taking a course or buying a book themselves. Some libraries provide

thought to subsidize the publishing industry. Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) point out that llibraries are thought to attract money and businesses to the community. According to Van House and Childers, libraries stimulate work force quality through literacy enhancement. Many libraries also assist their customers in job placement and career planning efforts. This section has briefly addressed some of the ways in which libraries impact communities. The next section considers how communities may influence libraries.

Financial Influences

As Keene (1989, p. 96) observes, communities support libraries. Community demand for library services creates certain economic realities for library finances. According to Van House (1984, p. 415), the decision to financially support libraries is related to historical funding patterns, characteristics of the community, and current community economic health. Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) recommend that library administrators should understand and act on the community's priorities and needs. Library administrators are expected refrain from asking for more money when the community feels the need to cut back on public resources.

Economic hard times affect communities, as well as the libraries and other institutions in those communities.[36] Libraries cannot expect to overcome economic woes that are national in scope. However, Hicks (1980, p. 454) observes that even when

---

resources for unemployed patrons to type up their resume or investigate what kind of new jobs they might already be qualified for. For instance, Austin Public Library has a business information collection and has had a job information center. Austin Public Library also has an extensive "quality resource" collection that includes a myriad of books on the subject of business management practices.

[36] See, for example: Dannelly, 1993, p. 76; Hicks, 1980, p. 453; and Molz, 1978, p. 417.

24

federal financial assistance has been widely available to local governments, public libraries have not benefited from a proportionate share of those federal resources. Furthermore, as Goddard (1973, p. 194) observed many years ago, in the case of most any economic equation, municipal needs are always larger than municipal resources. Even so, according to Keene (1989, p. 94), the size of the municipal financial pie influences the ability to secure adequate library resources. As Molz (1978, p. 418) cautions, it is difficult to justify giving libraries more tax dollars when taxpayers are suffering their own personal financial difficulties and want to contribute fewer tax dollars to government operations in general.

Coping With Fluctuations In Community Needs And Expectations

Now that the reader has an understanding of how communities may influence libraries, this section considers how changes in communities might influence libraries. During historical periods of economic depression, library services have been in high demand. During the depression years, library budgets decreased dramatically while library circulation increased dramatically. Reed (1992, pp. 64-65) suggests that, as economic conditions decline, libraries are used more. Demand expands as resources shrink.

As Goudy and Altman (1994, p. 37) point out, even in periods of economic growth, tax revenues lag behind growth in the business cycle. Economic growth trickles down: after business grows, profits start to grow; after profits grow, tax revenues begin to grow; after tax revenues grow, public library resources may have an opportunity to grow. Particularly with this lag in resources, the community's needs for libraries will always be greater than the resources available to meet those needs. Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 13) suggest that effective library budgets should include social and economic

trend forecasts as these trends may result in certain impacts on the management of library goals. In light of restrict resources, library managers may be motivated to cooperate with each other to find more economical ways of doing business. These alternative business strategies may include: the centralization in common library facilities, jointly sharing library material acquisition, catalog maintenance and material processing; division in responsibility for developing specialty collections; loaning staff; and sharing storage facilities.[37]

The Impact Of Diverse Needs

Even in stable communities, where little or no change occurs, dealing with community diversity can offer a particular challenge to public library administrators. Community characteristics influence the financial picture of the public library. For instance, community factors that can influence customer needs and expectations include: education level, average income, age, ethnicity, and prior exposure to library services.[38] As Bookstein (1981, p. 414) points out, demand for circulation of library materials can vary as community interests vary.

For instance, changes in community interest can result in changes in the desire for library services and in changes in the usage patterns for those services. Public demand combines with the library's service capacity to result in circulation use.[39] As another example of how community characteristics can influence the demand for library services,

[37]These ideas for cooperative efforts are certainly not new. See Cooper (1979, p. 64).
[38]These community factors were identified long ago by scholars and practitioners such as Hayes (1979, pp. 123-124).
[39]Demand for circulation + capacity for circulation = size of circulation. This is a simplistic formula that overlooks occurrences of unmet demand and unused capacity.

Cooper (1978, p. 425) observed many years ago that poor communities use libraries less than communities with relatively higher incomes. In addition, according to Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 569), communities with low technology skills may need the library to provide expensive public technology training and training facilities to augment the community's ability to access library technological resources. Van House (1984, p. 415) observes that in these and other ways, different community groups differently value and demand different services and goods. It is clear that demographics and individual customer characteristics greatly influence the level of library use for that customer.[40]

According to the available literature on libraries and the community context of libraries, libraries need to appeal to the diversity of their communities.[41] Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 13) suggest that one of the goals of public libraries is to provide services according to the desires of the supporting community. Keene (1989, p. 104) points out that the Public Library Association recommends that libraries develop service standards unique to each community to better respond to the unique needs of each community. According to Cooper (1979, p. 65), library administrators should identify the different types of customer demands at each library location.

Unfortunately, public library managers are not always in touch with the reality of the surrounding community environment.[42] Without awareness of customer demands, an organization can have the perfect means of service production, and yet be missing the

---

[40]This observation is not new or unique. See Hayes (1979, p. 124).

[41] See, for instance: Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 13); Keene (1989, p. 104); Cooper (1979, p. 65); and Van House and Childers (1991, pp. 275-276.)

[42]Molz (1978, p. 424) offers this very same caution.

appropriate service ends altogether.[43] Furthermore, according to Sweeney (1994, p. 64), the needs of library users can change rapidly and may require library services that are better or newer than currently provided services. Staffing levels can even be adjusted to meet changes in patterns of program or service usage if the organizational environment allows for such staffing adjustments.[44] This section has considered the impact of diversity. Diversity in communities is often expressed in political terms. The next section turns attention to political considerations as discussed in library finance literature.

Political Considerations

There are many politically attractive reasons for supporting libraries, reasons that include perceived economic externalities as well as political posturing. Raber (1995, p. 162) suggests that federal grants to local libraries are relatively inexpensive pork barrel aid programs. Federal funding of local libraries can also be seen as a means to promote equal opportunity for individuals.

For instance, politicians can support library services because such library services grant the right to information access to the citizenry and enhance the prospects for upward mobility within the community for individuals.[45] Raber (1995, p. 167) contends that the provision of public access to information through libraries in greater quantities than individuals would otherwise secure for themselves reinforces the idea that public interest is different from the summation of individual interests. Raber points out that market forces

---

[43] While this should be self-evident, Hayes (1979, p.122) explains how efficient means can achieve inappropriate ends.

[44] Many years ago, Hayes (1979, p. 122) presented the demand for program services as an economic concept. Hayes recommended that the demand for program services should dictate the appropriate staffing levels for those programs.

do not represent the entire public interest. Therefore, Raber suggests that libraries may gain political support from democratically elected government officials to protect the society from the harmful excesses of pure market forces in the provision of information access.

Access to information produces certain politically desirable externalities. Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) observe that such externalities can include creating jobs, helping businesses, attracting money and business to move into the community, improving work force quality and literacy. In short, libraries can help make the community look good. Even so, it is certainly possible that public libraries generate no more externalities from providing public access to information than other public programs generate from their particular services.[46] Hicks (1980, p. 454) goes so far as to contend that libraries provide fewer collective benefits than public safety services provided by police or fire departments. This section has begun to discuss how political interests are related to the community context of library finance. The next section considers the relationship between public libraries and political leaders.

Political Leadership

Community political leaders are important to libraries. Keene (1989, p. 94) points out, for example, the involvement of civic leaders in the budgetary process can influence the library's success and control over its budget. Libraries are not unimportant to

---

[45] See Cooper (1978, p. 425).
[46] Clearly, Cooper (1978, p. 423) admitted to this possibility many years ago.

community leaders.[47] However, libraries are often not an important enough priority to award revenues to local libraries any more than they already are.

Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 14) suggest that support of community political leadership is important because people and organizations external to the library ultimately determine what revenues the library gets. Raber (1995, p. 168) observes that, even though library managers do not exercise complete autonomy in their management of public libraries, library management may be able to persuade politicians to grant greater funding to public libraries for reasons of the politicians' own making.[48] In addition, according to Raber, for even minimal financial support of basic library services to occur, politicians must buy into the idea that the need to secure access to information for all citizens legitimizes the public funding of libraries. Thus, the support of political leaders is of vital importance to the continuing survival of libraries. Clearly, political leaders influence public libraries and public library finances. The next section briefly considers how the general community indirectly influences libraries, specifically through community influence over politicians.

---

[47]Molz, (1978, p. 422) made this common sense assertion many years ago.

[48] For instance, if a politician supports the promotion of technology, the library may be able to approach that politician for the creation of a special technology collection, with additional resources made available for that purpose. This may seem like an ethically questionable tactic. However, in communities where technology development is a high priority of the citizens, such a tactic would be responsive to the needs of the citizenry, would appeal to the "higher" interests of the politician, and would augment library resources. Such a tactic simply involves identifying what is important to the politician, what is important to the library, and what is important to the community.

Community Influence Over Libraries

Communities control the fate and fortunes[49] of libraries to a large extent. Community pride and political consideration of that community pride often do not permit the closure and dismantling of libraries even if the libraries are inefficient, ineffective or out-of-date.[50] Keene (1989, p. 94) suggests that it is more common for the size of the library budget to be influenced by how much the community values the library. Input from the community may influence the library budgetary process.[51]

While the relationship between libraries and the community and politicians may result in greater resources for libraries, the relationships between other public agencies and the community and politicians may result in fierce competition for resources between the libraries and other public agencies. The next section shall turn attention to some considerations regarding this political competition for resources.

Political Competition For Resources

The literature suggests that library administrators have always had the need to consider the political context of libraries.[52] According to Bookstein (1981, pp. 410-411) a public library manager's ability to secure resources usually depends on political processes.

---

[49] The topic of community context is closely related to the topic of resources in this section. Of course, the topic of community context is also related the topics of "programs and services" and "costs." None of the topic categories are mutually exclusive. The topic categories are simply a useful way to organize consideration of material issues of the literature and research of public library finance. While this approach may appear somewhat artificial, this pragmatic approach uniquely encompasses all the interrelated literature while providing an original framework for surveying the literature.

[50] In my professional experience, this has certainly been the case. Also see Molz (1978, p. 422).

[51] Hayes (1979, p. 124) suggests that communities that generously allocate resources to libraries through the political allocation process often coincide with high library use levels.

[52] Many years ago, Molz (1978, p. 424) suggested that libraries may not have always been responsive to this need for political acuity. Public libraries have not always been in touch with the political realities of their community environment to the degree that they might have been.

Public budgets have been the result of competing special interests. Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 38) observe that, historically, libraries have not competed well for local tax dollars.[53] Hicks (1980, p. 456) points out that many other local government functions have developed strategies for justifying their services as rights of citizenship. Because libraries as a group have had no such successful strategy, the general populace has remained with the perception of library services as privileges or benefits of citizenship rather than as necessary rights. Libraries have not been viewed as essential service providers. Libraries have not had a seemingly legitimate strategy for claiming that libraries are critical to protecting public welfare. Therefore, libraries have not competed well for resources. Keene (1989, p. 94) contends that the size of the library budget has been influenced by how effectively the library management has marketed the library in a political context in the community.

More recent literature, such as Van House and Childers (1991, p. 277) suggests that politics is still the "lifeblood" by which libraries survive. Weingand (1995, p. 407) for instance, contends that a politically viable rationale is still vital for acceptance of budget presentations. In addition, it is important for the success of library budget presentations that the presenter of the budget proposal has sufficient professional, organizational, and personal credibility to secure the respect of those who are able to approval the final budget request. It is equally important that the funding authority is able to accept the library's

---

[53] According to Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 38), public library service expectations increased during the period of "Great Society" federal funding. With the general demise of "Great Society" program funding, when federal funding diminished, service expectations for public libraries remained high. While this high post-Great Society expectation was not unique, public libraries did not replace federal dollars with state dollars as well as some other Great Society causes did. Even when state funding for public libraries peaked in the 1970s, library support consisted of an estimated one or two percent of total local and state expenditures in the United States.

concerns and needs for funding without the perception that the library is simply protecting its own vested interests.

Reed (1992, p. 86) recommends that library administrators use the rhetoric of current hot priorities and issues to argue for greater funding for public libraries. As Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) point out that those library advocates who present library budgetary proposals on the behalf of libraries must know the concerns and interests of those politicians with whom the library advocates wish to communicate if the library advocates wish to communicate persuasively the need for more adequate public library funding. In this way, library advocates can closely align their communication in terms of the politicians' concerns, the politicians' interests, and the politicians' language.

People who control funding usually have an agenda that is larger than libraries. There is an expectation that libraries should participate in contributing towards the fulfillment of that larger agenda. Libraries can make their communities and their leaders look good in the public eye.

At the same time, libraries can educate funding and governing bodies about what the library can do for the community with the resources it needs. Library advocates must understand and respond to the community's political priorities and needs. The public library management may find it necessary to adjust to community political realities rather than try to isolate or insulate themselves from these political imperatives. This section has examined the political nature of this competition for resources. Due to the political nature of this competition, it may be useful for administrators to develop advocacy skills. Because advocacy is useful and therefore important to administrators, the next section

begins to consider advocacy in terms of how the role of advocacy is viewed from multiple perspectives.

Perspectives On Advocacy

Library professionals are not always comfortable with advocacy. Advocacy is not a role that the traditional library service perspective is concerned with except in the general philosophical passive sense for the promotion of enlightment and freedom of information through provision library services. Thus it is natural for library administrators advocate responsiveness to diverse community audiences in the provision of library services. Regardless of the particular situation, library service tradition is particularly strong in advocating accommodation and inclusion of each segment of the community in the provision of library services.

Economists are more limited in their support of library administrators as advocates. Economists may support intellectual advocacy when what is being advocated is the pure application of economic principles. If economic models indicate that a particular library service is underutilized, the economic perspective may support the administrator's advocacy efforts to increase utilization or to discontinue the service. Similarly, the economic perspective may stand in agreement with the administrator's advocacy efforts to ration service or increase service capacity when economic models indicate that a particular library service has exceed its service capacity.

Advocacy is the natural domain of the political perspective. The political perspective encourages active advocacy on the behalf of libraries.[54] However, politicians may resent the advocacy of administrators if such advocacy appears too aggressive or self-serving.[55] This section has considered three perspectives on advocacy – advocacy for service, advocacy in reaction to an economic model, and advocacy as a part of the political scene. The next section takes up the discussion of how advocacy can facilitate the political process by developing a mutual understanding between politicians and administrators.

Dependence On Political Processes And Understandings

It is evident that there is a basic need for a mutual understanding regarding financial issues between libraries and legislative bodies, whether these bodies consist of city council members, state legislators, or members of Congress. Bookstein (1981, pp. 410-411) points out that the ability of public libraries to secure public resources depends on political processes. Hicks (1989, p. 458) agrees that public library administrators usually depend on the political allocation process to provide the support necessary for programs and services whether or not library administrators recognize their dependence.

---

[54] Reed provides a notable example of a political perspective of public library finances in her 1992 book, Saving Your Library: A Guide to Getting, Using and Keeping the Power You Need.

[55] It is my personal experience that some politicians do not wish to hear the views of administrators except when administrators are called upon to address clarification of technical matters. There is definitely a difference between lobbying and developing a rapport of mutual understanding between administrators and politicians. In the name of advocacy, administrators may be able to advise politicians of probable impacts of political decision options. The advocacy administrator even may be able to recommend policy direction. There is a fine line between advocacy and political activism. The advocate should not antagonize the politician by applying or instigating direct political pressure when the political environment does not invite or authorize such activism on the part of the administrator. The administrator should show some respect for the traditional politics-administration dichotomy in this regard.

Library administrators depend on the political allocation process, whether or not they choose to facilitate the political process. Hicks suggests that librarians may tend to fear that involvement in the political processes of government such as advocacy in resource allocation. Library professionals may fear that such political involvement might contaminate the librarians with dirty partisanship.

Nevertheless, Sweeney (1994, p. 68) contends that awareness of the motivations of all political actors in the process can be important, because these political actors can play a part in helping or hindering the resource allocation process. After all, as Van House (1984, p. 408) points out, it is these political actors who ultimately decide how much public financial support libraries will receive. This section has considered the necessity of developing understanding between politicians and administrators. The next section considers how administrators might develop a savvy approach to communicating with politicians in an ethical, yet effective, manner.

Developing Political Muscle

Weingand (1995, p. 407) suggests that public library administrators may need to actively pursue positive relationships with politically elected officials who control budget decisions. According to Weingand, negotiation skills are particularly needed in the context of budget presentation. In presenting the library's budget, it behooves the library to include the development of a common understanding regarding library needs, library user needs, community needs, and service level improvements possible with appropriate

levels of funding support.[56] To promote such a common understanding, according to Hicks (1989, p. 456), most other local government functions have developed strategies for justifying their services as rights of citizenship. Often public libraries have no such strategy and do little to contradict the perception that library services are merely privileges or benefits of citizenship. Public library organizations would like to be viewed as essential service providers but often are not viewed in such a light. Hicks recommends that libraries should develop convincing strategies for presenting public libraries as critical to the public's welfare.

Public library administrators can find adequate resources and strategies to augment their relationships with legislators. Weingand (1995, p. 407) cautions that it is important that the funding authority accept the library administrators concerns without the perception that the public library administrator is simply protecting the library organization's own vested interests. Nevertheless, Reed (1992, p. 42) and Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) observe that while governing political bodies may look favorably on public libraries, such bodies have bigger, broader agendas to attend to.

With these broader agendas in mind, Reed (1992, p. 86) suggests that library advocates can adopt the rhetoric of current hot political priorities and issues to argue for greater funding of public libraries, without compromising their personal integrity. For instance, if unemployment issues are a political priority, library advocates can promote libraries as career information centers. On the other hand, if literacy issues are a political priority, library advocates can emphasize youth services and adult education services. In

---

[56] As mentioned earlier in this report, Molz (1978, p. 424) points out that public libraries are not always in touch with the reality of their surrounding political environment. Molz suggests that public library administrators need to develop their advocacy abilities and their sensitivity to their political environment.

other words, library administrators can give political officials legitimate and honest reasons to support libraries, in terms that the politicians can agree with and understand.

Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275) recommend that, in order to communicate effectively, library advocates should know the concerns and interests of those politicians with which the advocates wish to communicate. In this way, library advocates can closely align their communications with the politicians in terms of their political concerns, their interests and their language. Reed (1992, p. 42) suggests that library advocates can show political officials how library services benefit their community, benefit their political constituents, and benefit the political officials personally. Reed goes so far as to recommend that library advocates cultivate the support of politicians before the politicians become elected. At the very least, library advocates can carefully develop strategies to convince politicians that the need to secure information access for all citizens is a real need and that this need legitimizes public funding of library services. Developing such a successful strategy might be possible if library professionals are willing to apply concerted, thoughtful effort to work together towards that end.

A previous portion of this chapter considered the topic of programs and services. This portion of this literature review chapter considered another topic in public library financial issues – the topic of "community context" and the political realities that arise out of community context. The next portion of this chapter will consider another predominant topic in public library finance literature. A comprehensive discussion of library finance would not be complete without consideration of the topic of revenue sources.

Revenue Sources

Perspectives On Revenue Sources

From a traditional library service perspective, revenues are simple necessary "evils" required for the provision of services.[57] The library science professional seeks to deliver the most service at a given revenue level. When the perceived price of the service is zero for the individual direct customer, demand is maximized. This maximization of demand is a desirable outcome in the tradition of library service. This rationale supports the argument for "free" provision of library services through tax subsidies.

However, the consideration of revenues is also an important concern for the economist. What is the character and scarcity of resources available as inputs for the economic production function for libraries? What is the most economically efficient means of raising revenues? The argument for fee-based services is supported by the efficiency of fees in rationing library services among potential customers.

From a political perspective, the consideration of revenues is simply a matter of political decision-making. After having estimated what the voters will tolerate in the form of fees and taxes and what is considered to be "fair" by society,[58] the politician makes a political policy decision regarding form and level of funding for the public library organization.

The politician wants a politically favorable revenue structure. The economist wants an economically balanced and efficient revenue structure. The library professional

---

[57] According to Hicks (1980, p. 458), library staff may wish to "insulate" itself from such "dirty" tasks as raising adequate funding through political channels..

[58] Savas (1987, p. 49) identifies the consideration of how much individuals will pay for services as an example of a typical political decision in a public finance context.

is left wanting ever more revenues to increase service capacity. The next section begins to address the library professionals' common perception of revenue shortages.

Resource Shortages

From a traditional library perspective, when library administrators want to deliver more service than they can afford, these administrators experience a perception of revenue shortages.[59] According to Keene (1989, p. 94), in the 21st century, libraries will not have the financial resources that they need and want – but then, this scarcity of resources is not an unusual state of affairs. Libraries face high competition for scarce revenue resources.[60] As Reed (1992, pp. 64-65) points out, typically, as libraries are used more and demand for library services expands as a result of declining economic conditions, the libraries' financial resources shrink at the same time. Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 17) and Carrigan (1994, p. 35) observe that sometimes tax revenue sources are inadequate. According to Goudy and Altman (1994, p. 37), often revenue growth lags behind business cycle growth.

Yet, Hicks (1980, p. 453) observes that public libraries face chronic problems that are common to everyone due to trends in politics, society and the economy. Libraries are particularly susceptible to these problems because of their dependence on local revenue sources. Although taxpayers are not always discontented with the government activities, which their taxes are supporting, taxpayers are sometimes discontented with the regressive form of property taxation. In light of limitations of tax revenues, according to Dunn and

---

[59] This researcher is not expressing a belief that this perceptions is justified or unjustified.
[60] See for instance: Bookstein (1981, p. 410); Goddard (1973, p. 194); and Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 38).

Martin (1994, p. 571), fees are often seen as a means to provide an additional revenue source. Unfortunately, fees do not usually cover the full cost of service for those programs where fees are charged. Similarly, federal grant revenue sources have reduced their participation in covering overhead costs.

Despite these perceived shortages from tax based revenue sources, the literature includes some discussion of rationale for maintaining tax-based revenue flows to libraries to provide "free" services. The next sections will discuss tax-based revenues before discussing fee-based revenues and private funds.

Rationales For "Free" Access.

If a library customers have free access to library services, then these library services can be described as a "public good." However, what is meant by a "public good" is not necessarily consistent throughout the literature. Table 2.3 points out the different ways that free access library services are treated as public goods in the literature.

The decision to financially support libraries with tax-based revenues is meant to ensure equal access to information for everyone.[61] Raber (1995, p. 169) contends that reliance on general tax revenues provides this freedom of equal access to information, regardless of the individual's ability to afford the information if the individual should have to pay directly for access to the information.[62] According to Raber, democratic government should protect the individual from the harmful excesses of pure market forces.

---

[61]See, for example: Casper (1979, p. 305); Keene (1989, pp. 94-95); and Molz (1978, p. 416).
[62] Also, see Cooper (1978, p. 425

TABLE 2.3. Examples Of How "Public Good" Characteristics Are Thought To Describe Library Services

AUTHORS : description of library service	CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLICLY PROVIDED GOODS[63]				
	Joint consumption	Exclusion impossible[64]	Difficult to measure performance	No individual choice to not consume	No individual choice in quality and quantity of goods consumed
Bookstein (1981) : in-house use of circulating and shelved reference materials	✓	✓	✓		
Bookstein (1981) : restricted or assisted reference services	✓		✓		
Bookstein (1981) : historical preservation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bookstein (1981) : community enhancement	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bookstein (1981) : creating demand for book production[65]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keene (1989) : right of free access to information	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Van House (1984) : information	✓		✓		

---

[63] Criteria are from Savas (1987. p. 50). Savas refers to those goods which meet these criteria as "collective goods".

[64] Or, in some cases. exclusion is "highly undesirable".

[65] This "service" may seem unusual to the reader. Libraries buy more books than the private markets for books would demand. High library demand for books can encourage the range and profitability of publishing companies in the business of printing books. In this way, public library expenditures are thought to "subsidize" the private publishing industry by increasing the quantity and variety of books sold.

On the other hand, as Hicks (1980, p. 454) points out, as a market mechanism, user fees tend to focus service delivery on specific paying customers instead of serving the citizenry in general. Van House (1984, p. 417) contends that taxes are often preferable over fees when the institution of fees might influence library service behavior in shifting the service focus away from "free" services for all toward fee services for the few.

Although Bookstein (1981, p. 413) is a library academic professional, he acknowledges economic theory regarding public sector subsidies when he suggests that if library services are like other appropriately publicly provided goods, then funding libraries through taxpayer subsidy may be appropriate.[66] Bookstein (1981, p. 411) claims that, like other goods provided by the public sector, some benefits of public libraries are intangible and shared. While not a perfectly appropriate public sector good,[67] library services are not a purely private good either. Because an organization can give and keep information at the same time, Van House (1984, p. 408) suggests that information goods and services are neither exclusively appropriate public sector goods nor exclusively private goods.[68]

Carrigan (1994, p. 35) observes, regardless of the particular appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of taxation for libraries, tax revenues continue to play a significant part in the public library funding equation, often because the institution of fees for services faces frequent opposition.[69] Van House (1984, p. 416) suggests that the fee or free

---

[66] Casper (1979, p. 305) contends that library services do resemble appropriate public sector goods.
[67] Library services are not a perfect public sector good, because you cannot check out a book right now that someone else already has checked out and has not yet returned. It could be argued that, because library services are imperfect public sector goods, fees may be appropriate or possible.
[68] Cooper (1978, p. 422) suggests that the tax base often supports library information services as a merit good.
[69] Many years ago, Casper (1979, p. 305) observed that demand for on-line services is particularly price sensitive to a shift from "free" tax support to fee price structures. Underutilized services may need the "free" price structure of tax support to encourage higher customer demand or use. Casper suggests that tax based revenues are often preferable over fees because tax support is simply the traditional method of

decision can be made while keeping in mind the goal of maximizing society's greater

benefit. There is often no consensus regarding the fee or free debate.

The tax or fee debate notwithstanding, some library goods and services clearly are

appropriate for tax based support.[70] There are at least some positive externalities from

public provision of access to information.[71] In the tradition of library service, Van House

(1984, p. 408) suggests that information is valued for its usefulness, and the library serves

as a means to provide access to information without diminishing the store of that

information when it is distributed to information consumers. Bookstein (1981, pp. 411-

413) contends that at least some of the service benefits that libraries provide are intangible

and shared, and therefore, are appropriately public sector goods. If these service benefits

are an appropriately publicly-provided good, then funding these library services with

taxpayer subsidies is appropriate.[72] This section considered the rationales presented for

tax-based services. The next three sections will examine the various tax bases.

---

funding public libraries. According to Cooper and DeWath (1977, p. 304) and Cooper (1978, p. 422), library services are traditionally provided for "free," due to the existence of perceived spillover benefits. And finally, according to Casper (1979, p. 305), oftentimes, taxes are easier to administrate than fee collection.

[70] This suggests that library services may be unbundled. Certainly, nothing in the literature suggests that multiple sources of revenue would be inappropriate. In practice, many, if not most, libraries are supported by a combination of user fees, local taxes, private contributions of time and money, and state and federal funds. Most controversies arise over issues of: which services are appropriate for particular funding sources; how much funding is appropriate; and when should economic efficiency be sacrificed to maximize access to services.

[71] While it would seem logical for libraries to associate themselves with the externalities of juvenile literacy, there is no evidence in the literature that the libraries have been successful in sustaining this theoretical connection. Access to reading materials has not been equated with acquisition of reading skills.

[72] As Cooper (1978, p. 424) observed many years ago, taxpayers are willing to pay for indirect service benefits to the community even though they do not always directly benefit as individuals.

Local Taxes

Local taxes are one possible tax source of revenue support for libraries.

According to Hicks (1980, p. 453), public libraries are particularly susceptible to chronic

problems because of their dependence on local revenue sources. The major source of

revenues for public libraries is the property tax.[73] Hicks (1980, p. 454) observes that the

public is often discontent with property taxes. According to Hicks, local property tax

bases are strained beyond capacity on occasions when federal funding is withdrawn from

programs. And yet, the expectation for local service delivery at the federally-funded level

remains. Furthermore, during those rare periods of relatively plentiful local revenues,

local municipal spending levels rise, creating rising expectations for future service delivery

that can not be met easily during periods of less plentiful local revenues.

It bears repeating that, even in the best of times, libraries do not compete well for

local tax dollars as Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 38) have suggested. According to

Van House and Childers (1991, p. 275), in times of greater financial stress in municipal

governments, municipal leaders expect library administrators to be an example of fiscal

restraint. Furthermore, Van House and Childers suggest that municipal view libraries as

an easy target for funding cuts.

State Taxes

State taxes are another possible tax source of revenue support for libraries.

Methods of state support include general aid grants, flat grants to geographic regions,

discretionary funds to aid libraries on the local level, and reimbursement for certain

expenses.[74] According to Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 18), state revenues for public

libraries are usually restricted to dedicated uses that reflect state priorities for local public

library service. Reed (1992, p. 86) suggests that library administrators should use the

rhetoric of current hot state priorities and issues to advocate greater state funding for

public libraries.[75]

Hicks (1980, p. 457) suggests that, on a statewide basis, library financing methods

could be reformed using a common school finance reform model.[76] Such a reform calls

for the redistribution of locally raised property tax revenues through the state for

equalization of per capita funding of public libraries across the state. However, this

method is not perfect in that state redistribution on a per capita basis is not favorable to

rural communities.

Federal Taxes

Finally in our consideration of taxes, federal taxes are yet another possible tax

source of revenue support for public libraries. As Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 38)

observe, federal funding of local public libraries increased in the era of "Great Society"

programs, but then dependable federal revenue sources dried up. According to Hicks

(1980, pp. 455-456), when federal assistance has been available to local governments,

---

[73] For many years, property taxes, on which public libraries rely, have been considered regressive. See Cooper (1978, p. 424) and Molz (1978, pp. 417 - 418).

[74] The observation that Molz (1978, p. 423) made many years ago, that methods of state financial support to local public libraries vary widely from state to state, still holds true.

[75] Many years ago, Molz (1978. pp. 420-421) suggested that raising state revenues for local libraries has been difficult where there are no state income taxes, as income taxes are thought to be the most efficient means of raising revenues. Furthermore, sales tax is thought to be a too regressive and an already over-used method of raising revenues.

[76]Also, see Molz (1978, p. 420).

local government functions expanded. As Hicks observes, local governments lacked

incentive to conserve local financial resources when federal financing was so readily

available. When the federal government withdrew its financial assistance, local

governments were expected to maintain service levels in spite of lower resource levels.

According to Hicks, this higher expectation level caused financial strain on all local

government programs including public libraries. With the withdrawal of federal support,

local governments drew more heavily from local property tax revenue sources. On those

occasions when federal financial assistance has been widely available to local governments,

public libraries have not benefited from a proportionate share of those federal resources.

Furthermore, Hicks suggests that the federal government sometimes ineffectively filtered

federal funds through state agencies to local libraries.

Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 572) suggest that, even when available, federal grants

have reduced their participation in covering those overhead costs associated with federal

grant programs at the local level. Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 18) point out that federal

revenues to local public libraries are usually restricted to specific uses. According to

Hicks (1980, p. 457), federal funds for public libraries primarily assist capital development

efforts and are not reliable as on-going streams of future resources for public libraries.[77]

This and previous sections have considered the rationale for and sources of tax-based

revenues for public libraries. The next section considers the literature regarding rationales

for fee-based revenues for public libraries.

---

[77] As has been pointed out earlier in Molz (1978, p. 422 - 423), libraries are not unimportant. Yet,
libraries are not an important enough priority for the federal government to award revenues to local
libraries any more than the federal government already does. Molz observed that federal appropriations
for local public libraries often have been less than federal legislative authorizations. At times, federal

Rationales For Fees

If a library customers have to pay directly for access to library services, then these library services can be described as a "private good." What is meant by a "private good" library service is fairly consistent throughout the literature. Table 2.4 points out the different ways that user fee library services are treated as private goods in the literature.

Bookstein (1981, p. 413) contends that if the outputs of public libraries are private goods, then funding library services with service fees is appropriate. Hicks (1980, p. 454) suggests that libraries provide private services as outputs that can be chargeable on a received benefits basis. Van House (1984, p. 417) points out that, in some respects, fees are thought to be more equitable than taxes on the poor. According to Van House, taxes

TABLE 2.4. Examples Of How "Private Good" Characteristics Are Thought To Describe Library Services

AUTHORS : description of library service	CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIVATE GOODS[78]				
	Individual consumption	Easy exclusion	Easy to measure performance	Individual choice to not consume	Individual choice in quality and quantity of goods consumed
Bookstein (1981) : circulated materials	✓[79]	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hicks (1980) : non-residents' services	✓[80]	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dunn & Martin (1994) : database searches	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dunn & Martin (1994) : photocopy services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

government revenues for local public libraries have been only a quarter of what would have been necessary to meet American Library Association goals.

[78] Criteria are from Savas (1987, p. 50).

[79] While a book is checked out to one individual, it cannot be checked out to another individual for that period of time. This is not perfect individual consumption, but neither is it perfectly joint consumption.

[80] For instance, when a hypothetical "Town A" Library provides service to a particular "Town B" citizen, in direct competition with "Town B" Library, tangible individual benefits are thought to be transferred to the Town B citizen, without a similar transfer of intangible joint consumption benefits to Town B.

on the poor are thought to be less equitable because the poor are not thought to get as much benefit from public libraries as they contribute in taxes in comparison to other economic classes.

Even so, Carrigan (1994, p. 31) suggests that often, fees can be charged when tax revenue is inadequate to support library services.[81] According to Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 571), fees can be attractive because they are revenue generating, demand rationing, and value measuring.[82] For instance, nominal fees can prevent abusive waste of otherwise "free" services.

Also, fees in the library marketplace, for a variety of library services, may be useful as measures of comparatively how much customers value and are willing to pay for certain "fee" library services in comparative preference over other "fee" library services. In this way, customers can vote with their dollars on an ongoing basis to indicate where the library consumers of specialized services would like the library to concentrate the library's development of these services. The customers' willingness to pay fees directly for special services indicates the demand for these services.[83] If administrators can anticipate the potential volume of services that will be accessed by patrons, administrators can better plan to provide the immediate resources for those services[84], particularly in adjusting personnel schedules at appropriate levels to meet anticipated user needs.[85]

---

[81] Also, see Cooper (1978, pp. 419, 421-422).

[82] Also, see Casper (1979, p. 304).

[83] Many years ago, Cooper (1978, p. 424) suggested that taxpayers often are willing to pay additional fees directly for additional services that they use directly.

[84] This is particularly useful in making personnel scheduling adjustments to meet the fluctuating needs of variable numbers of users. For instance, if typically the customer traffic into a library is lower at certain times of the week or the year, why staff at high levels during those periods? Why not partially reallocate staffing resources to cover the needs of busier times?

[85] Other past suggestions of how fees may result in increased allocation efficiencies include the Cooper and DeWath (1977, p. 317) claim that fees may even motivate library staff to deliver fee-based services more

Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 571) would point out to those who might object to charging fees that the "fee or free" discussion is misleading because nothing is actually free.[86] Charging fees is an alternate method of payment, with perhaps a different distribution of payment among the population. "Fee" or "free," someone always pays.

Library administrators may be able to unbundle library services. That is to say, library customers can pay all or part of the cost for certain services directly with fees while they pay for other services indirectly through taxes. Keene (1989, p. 95) suggests using fees to supplement basic tax-supported services with additional specialty services.[87]

Keene observes that the trend in library services has been towards fee-based specialty services for individual users and away from tax-based service structures.[88] According to Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 571), public libraries often charge fees for making copies.[89] Another typical fee is for non-resident library cards.

Hicks (1980, pp. 460, 471-473) and Van House (1984, p. 417) explain non-resident card fees as a method to charge suburbanites for their use of municipal libraries. Suburbs outside a municipal boundary are not taxed to support municipal libraries. Non-

---

efficiently in light of the knowledge that the staff person will have to face the paying customer personally and be ready to justify the value of the services rendered at a direct cost to that customer.

[86] Many years ago, Cooper (1978, p. 420) observed that sometimes the private sector information industry supports the institution of fees in public libraries, because it is difficult for the private sector to compete against "free" public services, even though those "free" public services are tax supported and are not really free.

[87] Many years ago, Casper (1979, p. 307) recommended that fees be charged when library service goods behave like alternative or substitute goods for more expensive, privately obtained information service goods. Also, see Molz (1978, p. 426).

[88] Historically, fees often have been charged for on-line search services, because such database information services are perceived to be different from other traditional library services. See Cooper and DeWath (1977, p. 304) and Cooper (1978, p. 419). The public library acts as a middle-man between bibliographic database vendors and users. Vendors charge the library for each search, and only the individual requester can use the search results. Therefore it is simple to charge the user a direct fee for the easily identified service unit of one search.

[89] Other services for which fees have been charged have included multimedia rental collections, reserving books, and book or copy delivery. See Cooper (1978, p. 420).

resident fees are a way to fairly export benefits and costs of municipal libraries to suburban communities. Non-resident user fees can be an efficient link between the paid price and received services. Perhaps surprisingly, in light of the tradition of maximizing library service without regard to political boundaries, non-resident fees effectively decrease use of library services by non-residents.[90] Nevertheless, non-resident user fees may achieve greater equity because, without fees, inner city property taxes would have to go up to support non-resident use of library services. Thus, non-resident fees exist as a compromise between the desire to provide service and the need to pay for the service.

Several fee structures are possible for library services. The more recent literature reviewed for this project has little to say about fee structures. However, earlier literature does include fairly extensive discussions of possible fee structures. For example, Casper (1979, p. 305) recommends a sliding fee structure based on the ability of the individual user to afford a fee. Molz (1978, p. 427) suggests that libraries can provide their services to individuals on a "free" basis, while charging businesses modest fees for those same services. Cooper (1978, p. 422) explains how libraries could grant access to their services to groups which merit access for "free" up to certain usage levels and then charge for services rendered once those usage levels have been exceeded.

---

[90] Of course, this is in keeping with the natural economic law of demand. For all but the most inelastic demand curves, as prices increase, the quantity of demand for most products decreases at the higher prices as compared to the quantity of demand at lower prices.

This surprising contrast between library service tradition and the use of non-resident fees exists because library service tradition embraces concepts of "literacy" and "freedom of information" which are not confined to the geopolitical boundaries of the tax base. Maximizing universal literacy and freedom of information services is juxtaposed with minimizing use of these services through charging user fees. This is a paradox. Although to be fair, proponents of user fees would explain that limiting service, to allow service to only those who pay, increases the library's ability to afford better quality service to those paying customers.

Casper (1979, p. 305-306) considers models for setting fee pricing structures which concentrate on either maximizing revenues or maximizing benefits to the users. Focusing on maximizing revenues, libraries can set their fees at a point where marginal revenue equals marginal cost. The more inelastic the demand, the higher the price can be.[91] According to Casper, to ration services equally among users, fees for users with highly elastic demand should be set at a lower rate than fees for users with a more inelastic demand. The fee can be set at a point that reflects the inverse relationship between the user's willingness to pay the fee and the user's willingness to privately supply their own information through private channels. As Casper points out, focusing on maximizing benefits, libraries can set their fees at a point where the fee equals the cost of one extra individual service unit so that use of library services is maximized in terms of quality and quantity of service.

However, faced with large fixed costs, libraries cannot survive on marginal cost-based fee revenues alone. Cooper cautions that public library fees usually reflect only the partial cost of service, sometimes reflect the full cost of service, and rarely reflect a profit. More recently, Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 572) observe that fees seldom cover overhead costs of space, equipment, hardware and software maintenance, and training involved in the service delivery. This section has concluded a consideration of taxes and fees (and the relative merits of each.) The next section discusses an often overlooked, underdeveloped

---

[91] The point is not that library services are absolutely inelastic or absolutely inelastic. At issue is the relative elasticity or inelasticity for each individual user. The idea is that different users have different elasticities. Casper contends that there is no significant single average value for the elasticity of demand for library services to represent all library customers. However, Casper theorizes that there are different elasticities for different classes of library customers.

revenue source. The literature includes some consideration of private donations to public libraries.

Private Funds

When public libraries do not wish to turn to over-burdened tax-based or fee-based revenue sources for additional funding, public libraries sometimes choose to raise private funds to augment their financial support.[92] Carrigan (1994, p. 31) suggests several avenues for donations from private money including individuals, companies and charitable foundations. Many of the active fund-raisers for public libraries include: library directors; boards of trustees; friends' organizations;[93] tax-exempt foundations; permanent staff such as a development directors; and fund-raising professional consultants. Carrigan cautions that, before libraries rush headlong into private fundraising, they should consider any possible risks. Reed (1992, p. 62-63) contends that raising funds from private sources for public libraries can erode public support of libraries in the long run. As funds from private sources become temporarily accessible, politicians may expect the libraries to raise more and more private money to meet library needs. Politicians may be tempted to rely too heavily on the future availability of private money rather than raise unpopular taxes. Reed warns that it may become easier for politicians to cut library budgets when they believe that the library has private contributions to fall back on that will supplement public

---

[92] See, for example: Carrigan, 1994; Keene, 1989, p. 97; Quirk and Whitestone, 1982, p. 9; and Ramsey and Ramsey, 1986, p. 18.

[93] Friends' organizations are independent non-profit groups outside of the government structure. For instance, "The Friends of the Austin Public Library" is a non-profit group that exists as a means for community involvement through volunteerism and fund-raising efforts which support the local public library. The Friends are not controlled in any way by the public library's administration. The Friends groups often work in collaborative efforts with the public library organizations to promote the goodwill of public libraries in the communities.

money. Reed suggests that the politicians may even begin to see libraries as charities rather than as service providers worthy of public funding.[94]

In previous portions of this literature review, this chapter has addressed the topics of "programs and services" and "community context." Now in the most recent sections, the reader has been briefed on the literature regarding where and how libraries get their financial resources. But what happens between resource allocation and service delivery? Service delivery is produced at a certain cost. The final portion of this chapter moves the discussion to include these costs as the fourth and final topic considered in this literature review.

Costs

Perspectives On Costs

As in the case of revenues, from a traditional library service perspective, costs are simply the necessary means required for the provision of services.[95] Cost control is secondary[96] to service. The idea that cost control is secondary to service does not mean that the traditional librarian is not conscientious with public money. The idea that cost control is a secondary concern does mean that the traditional library service perspective relies on other perspectives to balance and complement it. In this manner, costs belong to the domain of the accountant who is charged with the responsibility of tracking the costs,

---

[94] It may be possible that private funding may be used as a lever to raise matching government support and that private funding can be viewed as a vote of confidence from the community. However, the literature does not recommend this approach as a reliable means of support.

[95] This seems to be an odd definition of costs, but the reader should keep in mind that the traditional perspective does not focus attention on costs unless there is a compelling reason to do so.

[96] In practical terms, cost control may be even less of a priority for traditional librarians.

particularly the cost of service, on the behalf of the library service organization.[97] The

consideration of costs is also a concern of the economic perspective. Given certain costs,

are there possible economies of scale? Given certain costs for services, can libraries meet

the demands for services?

From a political perspective, the consideration of costs is hardly a concern, except

when fiscal crises emerge, either from within or from without the library organization.

Politicians seldom find library costs a large enough issue to focus the larger political

debate. Hence, the issue of library costs only really emerges when voters threaten to

become outraged by government extravagances or when exogenous fiscal pressures arise.

Measurement Of Costs

Those non-accountants who are not familiar with library operations may be

surprised at the full range of costs incurred by libraries for personnel, facility operation,

commodities, books and other circulation materials, and other capital. Accountants are

more concerned with the accurate reporting of costs and with staying within legally

mandated appropriation limits[98] than they are with developing any sort of cost

"philosophy." Table 2.5 provides examples of the kinds of costs incurred by modern

---

[97] As a practicing accountant, I observe that most literary discussions of library costs are simple, dry and unimaginative. This is typical of the no-nonsense, straight-forward, bottom-line approach that is common to the accountancy profession.

[98] A single library organization can have multiple appropriation limits. This is due to the fact that there may be multiple sources of appropriations. For instance Austin Public Library has: one operating appropriation unit, approved and funded by the municipal government through general tax revenues and fees; multiple capital appropriation units, approved and funded by the municipal government and the general electorate through bond elections; multiple intergovernmental grant appropriation units, approved by the municipal government and funded by state and federal governments; and multiple private donation appropriation units. Other appropriation structures are possible in other public libraries.

TABLE 2.5. Examples Of Costs In Libraries

Type of Cost	Examples
Personnel costs[99]	regular professional salaries
	non professional wages
	overtime costs
	payroll benefits
	training
	temporary staff
Facility operation costs[100]	utility expenses, such as heat, power and light
	cleaning costs
	equipment service contracts, such as typewriter cleaning and microform reader maintenance
	insurance
	facility leases and rents
	phones
	bookmobile maintenance and operation
	indirect allocated expenses
Commodity costs[101]	binding and other library specific supplies
	supplies to support audiovisual programs and services
	professional memberships
	travel
	software programs
Books and circulation materials costs[102]	general books
	professional and reference books
	audiovisual materials
	periodicals and other serials
	microforms
Capital costs[103]	buildings
	capital depreciation
	furniture
	equipment for audiovisual materials
	vehicles
	computers

---

[99] Personnel costs are discussed by several authors, including: Cooper (1979, pp. 66-69); Dunn and Martin (1994, pp. 565-566, 573); Molz (1978, pp. 416, 421, 425); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, pp. 19, 25, 31, 77-79).

[100] Facility operation costs are discussed by many authors, including: Cooper (1979, pp. 63-65, 67); Dunn and Martin (1994, pp. 565-566, 569, 575); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, pp. 25, 81).

[101] Commodity costs are discussed by many authors, including: Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 111); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, pp. 19, 26, 59, 80-84).

[102] Costs for books and other circulation materials are discussed by many authors, including: Carrigan (1994, p. 31); Quirk and Whitestone (1982, pp. 4-5, 13, 90); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, pp. 16, 19, 27, 85-86).

[103] Capital costs are discussed by many authors, including: Hayes (1979, pp. 119-120, 122-127); and Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, pp. 16, 85-87).

public library systems. Clearly, operating a public library costs more than simply the cost of a book, a shelf and a librarian.

Accurate cost measurements are necessary for responsible library financial management in many ways.[104] Surprisingly, a common assumption is that library costs generally can not be reduced by better management.[105] Rather, cost measurements are used in order to project the probable cost of additional levels of service, assuming that marginal costs remain constant.[106] As administrators measure costs of different services, decisions can be made about which service mixes the library can afford and how much service the library can afford to provide its customers.[107] In addition, costs can be monitored so that the desire to provide service does not outpace the organization's ability to pay the costs of providing that service.[108] Finally, accurate cost estimates are necessary in preparing adequate budget proposals.[109]

Controlling Costs

Now that the previous section's discussion has identified library costs, this section will direct attention to cost control. Libraries are continuously challenged to control

---

[104] Dunn and Martin (1984, p. 565) suggest that knowing costs is essential for fiscal restraint.

[105] According to Van House (1984, p. 410), analyses of library finances and services generally assume that the libraries are using their allocated resources to produce the maximum possible outputs, as efficiently as possible.

[106] For instance, Van House (1984. p 415) recommends that library management use efficiency measures to consider the ratio of resource inputs to commodity outputs and service outcomes, rather than recommending using efficiency measures to focus on efforts to increase efficiency, per se.

[107] Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 566) suggest that as public library administrators gain clearer knowledge of costs, administrators are able to make better decisions regarding how to conduct library business.

[108] According to Quirk and Whitestone (1982. p. 5), understanding spending patterns can help administrators be prepared to cope with the ramifications of those spending patterns for the organization, both in the short term and in the long run.

[109] Keene (1989, p. 97) discusses the line item budget, which is a common type of budget that relies on accurate cost estimates. Although this is not the only type of budget which relies on costs estimates, line

---

costs. As Van House and Childers (1991, p. 276) explain, there is not much flexibility in

library budget allocations because so much of the library budget is spent on salaries.

According to Dunn and Martin (1994, pp. 565-566), the combination of the size of

libraries, the long hours that libraries are open to the public, and the heavy traffic through

library facilities means significant building maintenance costs for the library. Efforts to

renovate or build new library facilities can easily overextend the financial resources of the

library if the added burden of additional maintenance costs is not taken into account in the

planning stages of such projects. Automation adds power, heating, ventilation, and air

conditioning requirements, which are seldom included in cost projections. Automation

results in new concentrations of machines and people with new concentrations of noise

and heat.

Library systems often must endure the cost of fitting new systems into old

facilities. It can often be difficult to adapt old buildings to meet new demands. An

increased reliance on electronic equipment means higher replacement and upgrade costs,

which results in further strain on the library budget. Telecommuting of users to the library

is often seen as an opportunity to cut costs. Dunn and Martin (1994, pp. 565-566)

observe that such proposals usually overlook the cost of telecommunications, the cost of

training staff, equipment and installation costs and ongoing maintenance costs.

Weingand (1995, p. 406) cautions that new library technologies can mean both

volatile expenses and improvements for public libraries. If appropriately used, great

benefits can be realized in terms of time saved. Even so, technology is costly for public

libraries.

---

item budgets expressly focus on expenses, category by category, to aid in budgetary decisions. This is a

With or without electronic media technology, libraries invest heavily in traditional

collection development, as would be expected. Dunn and Martin (1994, p. 570) caution

that technology acquisition can also encroach upon traditional collection development

resources. However, according to Van House and Childers (1984, p. 276), even

traditional reference resources are expensive. Furthermore, as Dannelly (1993, p. 75) and

Goudy and Altman (1994, p. 38) observe, the periodicals price index often increases much

faster than the book index or the general price index. As new journals have flooded the

market, specialized journals drove the journal price index up higher than the consumer

price index. A competent administrator knows how to control costs. However, a

competent library administrator is sensitive to the relationship between cost and service.

The next section shall consider this relationship.

Linking Costs to Service

Changes in the use of library services often precipitate changes in costs. [110]

Changes in expenditures can result in changes in service capacity. Often, public libraries

can increase the capital resources at the disposal of the employee, and thereby increase the

amount of service the employee can provide to the public. However, Keenes (1989, p.

106) points out that beyond a certain point additional investment in library resources such

as buying more copies of a particular title or more titles does not necessarily result in

---

"shopping list" approach to budgeting costs.

[110]Public library organizations seek to balance the costs of materials and human capital to provide library services to the public. Hayes (1979, p. 119) suggests that the staffing levels should fluctuate with the changes in the needs for service. In other words, when the library is busy, staffing levels should be increased. When the library is not busy, staffing levels should be decreased. And within the library, when one service program is busier than another service program, the busy service program should have more staff allocated to it, while the less busy program should have fewer staff allocated to it, according to Hayes (1979, pp. 122-123). This does not mean that jobs or services in the library are directly interchangeable.

increased customer satisfaction with services. Hicks (1980, p. 458) observes that,

unfortunately for library customers, a trend of increasing costs can mean that libraries have

to cut back staff levels, cut back on specialization of services, cut back their hours of

operation, cut back on collection acquisitions, or postpone (or even cancel) plans for

customer demanded expansion.[111] Quirk and Whitestone (1982, p. 1) suggest that

libraries can also choose to reorganize or share resources with other libraries when faced

with rising costs. Ramsey and Ramsey (1986, p. 14) recommend readjusting service levels

to bring in costs on or under budget.

This chapter has successfully reviewed a body of literature regarding public library

finance issues. The topics of service, community context, revenues and costs are

intertwined. In the following chapter, the researcher will review how consideration of

these four topic areas was extended through the conceptual framework's working

hypotheses. The methodology chapter will discuss measurement of attitudes about the

topics as well as those statistical methods used to test the working hypotheses.

---

[111] Also, see Molz (1978, p. 421).

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the technical considerations and steps taken to operationalize the research design. This detailed discussion includes consideration of the working hypotheses, variable measurement and the statistical tests used in this study. Justification of the research design is presented throughout this chapter.

The Decision To Use Surveys

This research project used a combination of survey techniques. The research included the limited use of a preliminary survey instrument with open-ended questions, and the wider use of a subsequent survey instrument with closed-ended questions. This methodology allowed for the exploration of attitudes concerning library finance issues as well as the exploration of the possibility of the existence of relationships between the attitudes of administrators and politicians regarding those library finance issues.

Yin (1994, p. 6) sees little advantage of any research strategy over another when it comes to exploratory research – each possible method is adequate for most exploratory research purposes. Babbie (1989, p. 237) also recognizes the appropriateness of survey research methodology as a tool in the exploratory research of attitudes. Surveys may be the best technique for gathering information from populations that would otherwise be cost-prohibitive, time-prohibitive, or distance-prohibitive to observe more directly. O'Sullivan and Rassel (1995, p. 177) consider self-administered questionnaires to be the most convenient opinion-gathering tools when soliciting responses from busy, difficult-to-reach professionals like administrators and politicians.

Scholars are quick to point out the potential weaknesses and strengths of survey research. According to Babbie (1989, p. 258) among the potential weaknesses of survey research can be artificial questions and superficial responses. In addition, as O'Sullivan and Rassel (1995, p. 175) caution, personal interviews can drive up research costs, mailed questionnaires typically have low, slow response rates, and long telephone surveys may tend to be too imposing. Despite potential weaknesses, survey research has much to recommend it. Babbie (1989, p. 258) suggests that survey research can be economical and can effectively gather data from a larger population than would be practical using other research techniques. Potential weakness of survey methodology can be overcome and compensated for with careful planning.

Working Hypotheses

As discussed in previous chapters, the conceptual framework of this research encompasses the working hypotheses that derive from the combination of the topic areas (from the literature review) and intellectual curiosity about possible attitude conflicts regarding those topic areas. Once again, the working hypotheses are:

WH_1: The attitudes of (library) administrators (in Texas) are similar to each other, and are not neutral.

WH_2: The attitudes of politicians (in Texas) are similar to each other, and are not neutral.

WH_3: The attitudes of the (library) administrators (in Texas) differ from the attitudes of the politicians (in Texas).

WH_4: The (library) administrators (in Texas) are more interested in making their attitudes known to the researcher, than the politicians (in Texas) are.

From this point forward, references to findings regarding "administrators" will be

understood to mean "library administrators in Texas." Similarly, references to findings

regarding "politicians" will be understood to mean "elected politicians in Texas."

Relationship Between Working Hypotheses

WH_1 and WH_2 seek to establish whether administrators and politicians have

opinions at all. Certainly, WH_3 cannot be legitimately tested to compare opinions if no

truly representative opinions exist on which to base a comparison. Therefore, WH_1 and

WH_2 are prerequisite working hypotheses on which WH_3 builds. WH_4 qualifies and aids in

interpretation of WH_3 results as the Results and Conclusion chapters shall demonstrate.

Therefore, WH_3 is the central working hypothesis because it compares the opinions of the

two groups.

Identification Of Populations

For the pilot study, the preliminary survey involved purposive or judgmental

sampling. Such a non-representative sampling approach was possible because the purpose

of the pilot study was to generate more specific questionnaire items, rather than to test for

and representative statistical significance. The participants included seven locally elected

officials[112] and ten municipal administrators at various levels of municipal government.[113]

These participants were close at hand and known to the researcher.

---

[112] The seven members of a city council, including a mayor.
[113] Including one of each of the following: city manager, assistant city manager, library director, library grant program manager, library grant financial analyst, library assistant director, library administrator, library financial manager, library technology manager, and library organizational development coordinator.

For the final study, the full survey included the population of Texas public library directors and Texas state legislators. The full survey targeted the population of library directors as a comprehensively representative source of library administrator views in Texas. It is relatively simple to address surveys to be sent to the attention of the generic title of "Library Director" with a readily available list of the names and addresses of all public libraries in Texas. While some head library administrators may hold different titles other than "Library Director," such a designation was sufficient for the purposes of this survey. Clearly the response rate did not suffer as a result of such a designation. Naturally, there are probably other library administrators (such as assistant directors and the like) who are not library directors but who have opinions that influence library finances in Texas. For the sake of simplicity and convenience, such potential library administration actors were not included in the population of "library administrators."

The research design depended on the reliability of the list. In retrospect, the reliability does not appear to be a problem, because only one survey was returned as "undeliverable." The research design also relied on the comprehensive nature of the list – certainly if there are more than 492 public libraries in Texas, the number of additional public libraries excluded from the population list cannot be significant.

The full survey targeted the population of Texas state legislators as a somewhat representative source of political views across Texas. State legislators are elected locally to represent their local communities in the larger state-wide arena.[114] It is relatively simple

---

[114] I recognize that state legislators do not perfectly or comprehensively represent local political views because local government body elected officials are not included in the population of the final study. I regrets that time did not permit identification of all local politicians in Texas for inclusion in the population of this study. Certainly if such an identification process were feasible, which it is not, such a list would include thousands of local politicians from which to select a random sample.

to address surveys to be sent to the attention of individual legislators with a readily available list of the names and addresses of all Texas state legislators.

The Lieutenant Governor of Texas, while officially a significant participant in the Texas legislature, is not included in the survey population for two reasons. The first reason is that Lieutenant Governor's political influence is significantly different from that of other state legislators. Secondly, the Lieutenant Government is elected in a state-wide political race for state-wide representation rather than in a local district political race for local representation at the state level of government.

Prior to the preliminary survey, a systematic sampling of fifty percent of public library directors in Texas and fifty percent of state legislators in Texas was included in the research design for the final survey. However, after the preliminary results, it appeared that there might be a risk of inadequate politician response for testing purposes. At that point, the research design was revised to include 100% of the directors and legislators in the final survey. The population of directors include those from 492 public libraries in Texas, while the legislators include all 181 senators and representatives in the State of Texas Legislature. Both lists are available via Internet downloads (from the federal government and the State of Texas).[115]

A fifty percent response rate for administrators and a fifteen percent response rate for legislators was anticipated. If less than twenty-five percent of the administrators or less than ten percent of the politicians had returned their completed surveys, a follow-up mailing would have occurred. Response was sufficient to forgo a follow-up mailing.

---

[115] See Appendix A for the detailed population list.

Identification Of Issue Topic Categories

The issue topic categories of "programs and services," "community context,"
"revenues," and "costs" are developed from the natural content of the literature, as
discussed in great detail in the previous chapter. Identification of issue topic categories is
instrumental to providing the issue content for the open-ended questions for the pilot
study. Thus the working hypotheses regarding "opinions" are made specific with regard
to the issue focus of those opinions. Consider now how this combination of working
hypotheses and categories drove the development of the pilot study instrument, and the
subsequent development of the final survey instrument.

Pilot Study Survey Instrument

The purpose of this first survey was to identify community context, revenue
source, cost, and service issues of interest to politicians and administrators. The purpose
of this preliminary survey was not to show statistically significant relationships. In
keeping with this purpose of identifying specific items of importance to politicians and
administrators regarding library finance, open-ended questions asked both "what
enhances" and "what strains" library finances in each of the topic areas. For example, in
the case of the "community context" topic category, the survey asked both "1. In your
opinion, what community factors enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas?"
and "2. In your opinion, what community factors strain the financial status of public
libraries in Texas?" While this formulation may appear to be a duplication of questions,
such an approach seeks to avoid bias and to draw out comments regarding both the
strengths and weaknesses of library finance in Texas.

The results of this preliminary survey were tabulated for frequency of common

responses in each of these four issue areas. The open-ended questions allowed for

detailed responses from the participants. Appendix B provides an example of the

preliminary survey instrument. The preliminary survey was printed on a double-sided

sheet of paper for ease of handling. The surveys were coded with the designation of "A"

for administrators and "P" for politicians, in the upper right hand corner of each survey.

Operationalization Of The Final Survey Instrument

Table 3.1, on the following page, is the type of variable table was used in the

tabulation of pilot study responses. Once again, the purpose of the pilot study was to

generate more specific hypotheses in each of the four issue areas.[116] After tallying up the

responses, the top responses in each category were included in the development of the

final survey instrument. Table 3.1 details the most common responses to the pilot study

questions.

The common pilot study responses became the basis for operationalizing the final

questionnaire items for each topic category. For example, a typical response to the pilot

study question "6. In your opinion, what library-provided services and programs enhance

the financial status of public libraries in Texas?" was "Active, aggressive, 'no-limits'

reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas." This pilot

study response became the first questionnaire item in the final survey: "In your opinion,

how strongly do you agree or disagree that: Active, aggressive, 'no-limits' reference

services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas."

---

[116] See Appendix C for a paraphrased summary of responses to the open-ended questions.

TABLE 3.1. Most Frequent Pilot Study Responses

(Frequency of pilot study responses appear below in parentheses.)

[Positions of corresponding question in full study survey appear below in brackets.]

			Independent variable:	
			Administrators:	**Politicians:**
D **A**		*Community Context:*	enhance	satisfied customer advocates (3x) [12] strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups & citizens (3x) [13] wealthy communities (3x) [7] well-educated communities (3x) [8] stable economic base in community (2x) [14] community belief in the library's importance to cultural & educational life (2x) [19] vocal public interest (2x) [15]	community interest (3x) [3]
			strain	poor local economic conditions (3x) [17] lower education levels in communities (2x) [18]	political clout of "Big Interests" with whom libraries are not a priority (2x) [21]
		Revenue Sources:	enhance		
			strain	an ever widening funding gap (2x) [2] "Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas." (2x) [6]	the pressure of rapid growth (2x) [20]
		Costs:	enhance	lower labor costs (2x) [5]	
			strain	expense for technology services (5x) [4]	
		Programs & Services	enhance	technology (4x) [16] reference services (3x) [1] youth services (2x) [9] responsive tailoring of programs to meet community interests (2x) [10] well stocked current fiction collections (2x) [11]	
			strain		

(Left margin vertical text: Dependent Variable; Attitudes regarding ability)

The original responses were edited to remove any potentially inflammatory

language where possible. However, for the most part, the original jargon contained in the

responses was retained in order to reflect "typical" opinions of administrators and

politicians in words that they relate to and understand. Because the statements are based

on opinion, there is some degree of ambiguity in the interpretation of responses to these

statements. Furthermore, as opinions, the bias of the politicians and administrators are reflected in the content of the pilot study responses. Because opinions and attitudes are inherently biased by definition, such a bias is unavoidable. Nevertheless, the final survey instrument consisted of twenty-one Likert scale items[117] based on the responses from the preliminary survey. An example of the final survey instrument is found in Appendix D.

The final surveys were coded in three ways to ensure differentiation between administrators and politicians. The first "code" was a fleck of black ink placed in a certain position on the surveys for the politicians. This fleck was absent on the surveys for the administrators. The second "code" was a particular postage stamp on the return envelopes for the administrators surveys. The politicians' envelopes bore a different postage stamp. A third "code" was a serial number for each individual survey that was placed underneath the return postage stamp. The serial number was placed in order to track responses for the purposes of a follow-up mailing, had one been necessary. The serial number was placed underneath the stamp so as to be less conspicuous to the respondents.[118]

A traditional Likert scale was used to score the responses from "Strongly Agree" (+2), "Agree" (+1), "Neutral" (0), "Disagree" (-1), and "Strongly Disagree" (-2). Likert scores were collected for each returned survey item. Each returned survey has twenty individual item scores as well as four category scores. These four "category" scores

---

[117] It should be noted that individual responses did not always neatly correspond to the questions asked. For instance, when asked about "community context", one response focused on "tax dollars", which this researcher associates more closely with "revenue." Therefore, the researcher categorized "tax dollars" as a "revenue" issue response rather than a "community context" response.

[118] It was never the researcher's intention to intimidate potential respondents with any perceived effort to tie individuals to their responses. The researcher is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of individual responses. However, future researchers might wish to explore any relationships that might

consist of the sum of individual scores for items in a particular issue category. Where an item in a category of items has no response, a category score is not calculated for that individual survey.

Tests For WH_1 And WH_2

Frequency distributions of responses (including "no response" or skipped questions) to individual questions were tabulated. The frequencies were reviewed for each question and group affiliation to determine whether a meaningful central tendency exists or whether the pattern of response is random. This review of frequencies tested the working hypotheses that the attitudes of administrators are similar to each other and that the attitudes of politicians are similar to each other. By this test, the researcher initially determined whether administrators as a group and politicians as a group have a representative opinion on public finance issues. If single modal values are evident for each set of responses for each respondent group, the researcher assumes that an opinion exists.

The means for responses (to individual statements and issue areas) by respondent group were t-tested for neutrality. The t-test tested the null hypothesis that the mean equals zero. If there is a finding of a non-zero mean, the test establishes that the opinions held are not neutral "non-opinions." This test considers the working sub-hypotheses that attitudes of administrators are not neutral, and that attitudes of politicians are not neutral.[119] For these two-tailed t-tests, results are considered to be statistically significant

---

exist between political affiliation, geographical district representation, and attitudes regarding library finance.

[119] It should be noted that a finding of neutrality may indicate a myriad of individual attitudes ranging from confusion... to a lack of consensus... to reluctance to express an opinion, for whatever reason. Neutrality is not uninteresting, it is simply difficult to interpret.

at $p=.05$ or less. If the mean value for each set of responses for each respondent group is significantly different from zero, such findings establish that a non-neutral opinion exists.

Tests For WH₃

A preliminary chi-square test for association was conducted for responses to individual questions to determine if the possession of certain attitudes is particularly associated with administrators or politicians. Many of the chi-square test cells initially contained fewer than the required frequency of five expected responses; therefore it was necessary to consolidate some of the cells for chi-square testing purposes. The chi-square tests of association results were used to corroborate the findings of other tests of differences. A chi-square test finding of statistical significance would indicate that the possession of certain attitudes is particularly associated with administrators or politicians.

A non-parametric test of difference was conducted in order to determine the appropriateness of parametric testing for ordinal Likert scale items. The Mann-Whitney test was selected.[120] In those instances where parametric results contradicted non-parametric results, interpretation of the results relies on the findings indicated by the non-parametric results.

By these tests, the research design examines the working hypothesis that the attitudes of administrators differ from the attitudes of politicians. For all chi-square, Mann-Whitney and t tests, results are considered to be statistically significant at $p=.05$ or less.[121]

---

[120] As recommended by DiLeonardi & Curtis (1992, pp. 20-25 & 77).

[121] Statistics were compiled using *SPSS for Windows*, Release 7.0. December 19, 1995. Standard Version. Copyright © SPSS Inc., 1989-1995.

Test For WH₄

The possibility of a difference in response rate was tested with a chi-square test,

comparing the number of "returned surveys" with the number of "unreturned surveys" for

the two groups of potential respondents. For purposes of chi-square testing,

"returned/unreturned" status was converted to an ordinal scale for analysis. The

researcher used a chi-square test to determine if there is a statistically significant

association between the number of surveys returned and the respondent group. Although

other interpretations of such an association are possible, the researcher used this test of

association to examine the working hypothesis that administrators are more interested in

making their attitudes known than the politicians are.[122] For these chi-square tests, results

are considered to be statistically significant at $p=.05$ or less. Findings of chi-square

statistical significance indicate that responsiveness to the survey is associated with group

affiliation.

Assessment Structure

As discussed in this chapter, several statistical tests were conducted to assess the

working hypotheses. Table 3.2 summarizes how the working hypotheses have been

---

[122] Other interpretations might include considerations of differences in opportunity or mail delivery
service.

TABLE 3.2. Statistical Methodology Summary

Working hypotheses	Unit of measurement	Level of measurement	Testing for:	Statistical test:
WH₁ & WH₂	attitudes	ordinal	opinions exist?	Frequency (mode)
	attitudes	interval (assumed)	opinions are not neutral?	t-test (difference from zero)
WH₃	attitudes	ordinal	opinions associated with group affiliation?	Pearson chi-square
	attitudes	ordinal	difference in opinions held by groups?	Mann-Whitney U
	attitudes	interval (assumed)	difference in opinions held by groups?	t-test (difference between means)
WH₄	surveys	nominal	responsiveness associated with group affiliation?	Pearson chi-square

operationalized, including identification of the test statistics which were used to assess the working hypotheses. After having reviewed this summary of methods in this chapter, the next chapter proceeds to a discussion of the results of all these tests.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The previous chapter delineated how the statistical tests of the working hypotheses

were to be conducted. This chapter considers the results of the tests of the working

hypotheses. As developed previously, the working hypotheses are as follows:

WH₁: The attitudes of administrators are similar to each other and are not neutral.
WH₂: The attitudes of politicians are similar to each other and are not neutral.
WH₃: The attitudes of the administrators differ from the attitudes of the
politicians.
WH₄: The administrators are more interested in making their attitudes known to
the researcher than are the politicians.

Possible interpretations of the findings are explored in this chapter. Possible implications

of the findings will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

Working Hypothesis: Administrators Have Opinions

The evidence supports the working hypothesis that administrators have similar,

non-neutral opinions. The findings from a tabulation of the responses indicate that the

first part of the working hypothesis, that administrators have similar opinions, is correct.

Administrative response frequencies indicate a single modal value for each survey

statement. All frequencies are reported in Appendix E. On the basis of these single modal

values, the researcher assumes that central opinions exist for administrators.

For the most part, the administrators' responses are represented with a modal

positive opinion for all survey statements, with the exception of the item regarding "labor

costs" for which the administrators' modal opinion was negative. Table 4.1 summarizes

the administrators' modal response for each test statement.

TABLE 4.1. Summary Of Modal Administrator Attitudes

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
Libraries are financially better off because/when:	*Libraries are financially better off because/when:*	*Libraries are financially better off because/when:*
• There are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.	• Libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.	• There are low labor costs.
• The community believes in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community.	• Library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.	
• There is vocal public interest in maintaining support of libraries.	• There are active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services.	
• There are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.	• Libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.	
• There is community interest.	• Libraries have up-to-date technology for information services.	
	• In well-educated communities.	
	• There is a stable economic base in the community.	
	• In wealthy communities.	
	Libraries are financially worse off because/when:	
	• There is the political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority.	
	• There is demand for costly technology dependent services.	
	• There are poor local economic conditions in the community.	
	• There are lower education levels in the community.	
	• There is an ever widening funding gap.	
	• There is the cost of rapid population growth.	
	• Libraries are poorly funded.	

The findings from comparisons between the means and a neutral value of zero indicate that the second part of the working hypothesis, that administrator opinions are not neutral, is correct. The results of t-tests, which compare the mean values of administrative responses for each survey statement to a mean of zero, indicate that the response means

75

are significantly different from zero for each survey statement. Details of these "neutrality" t-test results are presented in full in Appendix F. On the basis of the results of these t-tests, without exception, the researcher assumes that the opinions of administrators are not neutral.

In summary, administrators have attitudes which are similar to each other and are not neutral, as predicted by the first working hypothesis. Administrators agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit from strong programs and services. In considering community context, three types of administrator response were evident. First, administrators strongly agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit from strong community support. Second, administrators agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit when the community is strong and healthy itself. And third, administrators agreed that public libraries in Texas suffer when other political interests in the community overshadow library interests. Administrators agreed both that public libraries in Texas suffer from increasingly inadequate revenues and that public libraries in Texas suffer when other competing governmental needs for revenues drain financial resources away from libraries. In considering costs, two types of administrator response were evident. Firstly, administrators agreed that public libraries in Texas suffer from bearing the cost of technology. Secondly, administrators disagreed with the statement that public libraries in Texas benefit from low labor costs. This section has demonstrated that administrators have identifiable opinions. The next section will consider whether politicians have identifiable opinions.

Working Hypothesis: Politicians Have Opinions

In most cases, the working hypothesis that politicians have similar, non-neutral attitudes regarding library finance usually holds up under scrutiny. For the politician group, this section examines the findings for each part of this working hypothesis.

For every survey statement, the findings from a tabulation of the responses indicate that the first part of the working hypothesis, that politicians have similar attitudes, is correct. Politician response frequencies indicate a single modal value for each survey statement. Once again, all frequencies are included in Appendix E. For all test statements, politicians expressed opinions which cumulatively indicated a modal frequency (in other words, a most frequently occurring opinion). In no case does the politicians' modal opinion express a negative attitude or disagreement towards the test statements. On the basis of these single modal values, the findings indicate that central opinions exist for politicians. Table 4.2 summarizes the politicians' modal response for each test statement.

For the most part, the politicians' responses are represented with a modal positive opinion for all survey statements. However, for a couple of test statements, "Big Interests" and "labor costs," the average mean response was not significantly different from zero, which is generally indicative of a neutral attitude.[123] This neutrality may be the result of poor test statement design. This neutrality also may be the result of a general reluctance on the part of the politicians to proclaim a more definitive opinion. It is even

---

[123] Once again, please note that a finding of neutrality may indicate are myriad of individual attitudes ranging from confusion... to a lack of consensus... to reluctance to express an opinion, for whatever reason. Neutrality is not uninteresting, it is simply difficult to interpret. A finding of neutrality does not necessarily invalidate further tests to compare politicians' attitudes with administrative attitudes, it may simply render the results from such comparisons less compelling and more complex.

TABLE 4.2. Summary Of Modal Politician Attitudes

AGREE	NEUTRAL
Libraries are financially better off because/when:	*Libraries are financially better off because/when:*
• There are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.	• There are low labor costs.
• The community believes in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community.	• Libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.
• There is vocal public interest in maintaining support of libraries.	
• There are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.	
• There is community interest.	
• Libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.	
• Library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.	
• There are active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services.	
• Libraries have up-to-date technology for information services.	
• In well-educated communities.	
• There is a stable economic base in the community.	
• In wealthy communities.	
Libraries are financially worse off because/when:	*Libraries are financially worse off because/when:*
• There is demand for costly technology dependent services.	• There is the political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority.
• There are poor local economic conditions in the community.	
• There are lower education levels in the community.	
• There is an ever widening funding gap.	
• There is the cost of rapid population growth.	
• Libraries are poorly funded.	

possible that the politicians have not given sufficient thought and study to the issues of how "Big Interests" and "labor costs" might influence Library finances.

The findings from comparisons between the means and a neutral value of zero indicate that usually the second part of the working hypothesis, that politician attitudes are not neutral, is correct. The results of the t-tests, which compare the mean values of politician responses for each survey statement to a mean of zero, indicate that the response means are significantly different from zero for each survey statement, with the exceptions

of the statements regarding "Big Interests" and "labor costs." Details of these "neutrality" t-test results are presented in full in Appendix F. On the basis of these results of these t-tests, the findings indicate that the attitudes of politicians are not neutral, with the exceptions of "Big Interests" and "labor costs."

In summary, politicians have attitudes which are similar to each other. Usually, these attitudes are not neutral. These two findings support the second working hypothesis. In considering programs and services, politicians agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit from strong programs and services, with the exception of fiction collections.[124] In considering community context, three types of politician response are evident. First, politicians agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit from strong community support. Second, politicians agreed that public libraries in Texas benefit when the community itself is strong and healthy. And third, politicians were neutral about whether public libraries in Texas suffer as other political interests in the community overshadow library interests. Politicians agreed both that public libraries in Texas suffer from increasingly inadequate revenues and that public libraries in Texas suffer when other governmental needs for revenues take precedence over library needs for revenues. In considering costs, two types of politician response were evident. First, politicians agreed that public libraries in Texas suffer from bearing the cost of technology. Second, politicians were neutral about whether public libraries in Texas benefit from low labor costs. This section has demonstrated that politicians have opinions which are usually identifiable. The next section will consider whether there are measurable differences in the attitudes of administrators and politicians.

---

[124] Politicians were neutral about whether public libraries in Texas benefit from strong fiction collections.

Working Hypothesis: Administrators' Opinions Differ From Politicians' Opinions

What can be guessed about the third working hypothesis? A comparison of Tables 4.1 and 4.2 is suggestive of differences between the administrators and the politicians regarding the strength of agreement to several test statements. But are these differences statistically significant? And, are there other less obvious statistically significant differences? And, are the answers to these questions different for each topic category?

WH₃ : Programs And Services

The literature on programs and services does not predict that administrators or politicians will have consistent opinions regarding specific programs and services. The literature does not suggest that administrative and political opinions will have similar or different attitudes about public library finances in reference to programs and services. What the literature does say is that programs and services are a reflection of priorities. It is natural that the attitudes of groups would reflect any variance in the priorities of the two groups. To measure specific attitudes about specific programs and services, one must look to the results of statistical tests such as those of this study.

The findings from statistical tests of association for this working hypothesis indicate mixed results for the "programs and services" category. Three out of five chi-square tests in this category indicate that certain attitudes are associated with administrators or politicians.[125] However, Table 4.3 indicates that the findings from more statistically-rigorous tests of differences for this working hypothesis consist of slightly contradictory mixed results. Three out of five tests of differences in this category indicate

---

[125] Specific chi-square statistics for this test are included in Appendix G.

TABLE 4.3. Comparison Of "Programs And Services" Means Between Groups

	n	mean	t	Significant difference?[126]
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			0	no
Administrators	327	.50		
Politicians	45	.49		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.			-1.6	no
Administrators	345	.59		
Politicians	47	.81		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.			1.3	yes[127]
Administrators	346	1.21		
Politicians	47	1.06		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.			2.1	yes
Administrators	339	.78		
Politicians	45	.47		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services.			.9	no
Administrators	341	.96		
Politicians	44	.84		

that there is no significant difference between the attitudes of administrators and the attitudes of politicians.

Indeed, there is no obvious difference in programs and services test items shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 (although these tables are not part of the formal tests for this particular working hypothesis.) Less pronounced statistical differences are found for the individual test statements regarding: "fiction collections" where administrators more strongly agree

---

[126] Significance is reported where p < .05, using a two-tailed t-test, comparing the mean value of administrators' attitudes to the mean value of politicians' attitudes.

[127] As measured by the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test, which contradicts and supersedes the parametric t-test for this questionnaire item.

that fiction collections are a financial asset; and "tailored programs services" where administrators more strongly agree that it is financially beneficial to tailor programs and services. These mixed findings are inconclusive for the working hypothesis that the attitudes of administrators differ from the attitudes of politicians regarding the topic of programs and services.

Administrators agree more strongly than politicians that public libraries in Texas are better off customizing programs and services to their customers. Administrators agree more strongly than politicians that public libraries in Texas are better off with strong fiction collections. Administrators agree as strongly as politicians that public libraries in Texas are better off with strong youth services, strong reference services, and strong technology-enhanced information services. In summary, administrators agree more strongly with regard to some aspects of programs and services than do politicians. However, with regard to other aspects of programs and services, administrator and politician attitudes are similar to each other.

WH₃: Community Context

The evidence of the first statistical test for this working hypothesis shows fairly consistent results for the "community context" category. Ten out of eleven chi-square tests in this category indicate that certain attitudes are associated with administrators or politicians.[128] The only responses that showed no significant association were those regarding the influence of "lower education levels." These chi-square test results are consistent with subsequent test findings.

---

[128] Specific chi-square statistics for this test are included in Appendix G.

The statistical tests of differences for this working hypothesis indicate fairly

consistent results for the "community context" category as shown in Table 4.4. Ten out

TABLE 4.4. Comparison Of "Community Context" Means Between Groups

	n	mean	t	Significant difference?[129]
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			1.9	yes[130]
Administrators	344	1.54		
Politicians	46	1.37		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities.			3.0	yes
Administrators	342	.94		
Politicians	47	.51		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities.			2.2	yes
Administrators	344	.99		
Politicians	46	.70		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.			3.0	yes
Administrators	345	1.58		
Politicians	45	1.29		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.			3.5	yes
Administrators	346	1.65		
Politicians	45	1.33		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community.			4.5	yes
Administrators	346	1.34		
Politicians	45	.82		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries.			4.4	yes
Administrators	345	1.58		
Politicians	45	1.18		
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community.			3.3	yes
Administrators	347	1.08		
Politicians	45	.67		

(table continued on next page)

[129] Significance is reported where $p < .05$, using a two-tailed t-test, comparing the mean value of administrators' attitudes to the mean value of politicians' attitudes.

[130] As measured by the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test, which contradicts and supersedes the parametric t-test for this questionnaire item.

TABLE 4.4. Comparison Of "Community Context" Means Between Groups
(*continued*)

	n	mean	t	Significant difference?
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community.			1.1	no
Administrators	345	.72		
Politicians	44	.55		
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			2.7	yes
Administrators	347	1.38		
Politicians	45	1.07		
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			7.0	yes
Administrators	346	.97		
Politicians	44	-.02		

of the eleven t-test findings for statements in this category indicate that there are

significant differences between the attitudes of administrators and the attitudes of

politicians. Only t-test findings for "lower education levels" indicate no significant

difference in mean average attitudes.

With regard to community context, there is generally an overall difference in

attitude, with a finding of statistically significant difference between the groups' attitudes.

Although Tables 4.1 and 4.2 are not part of the formal tests for this particular working

hypothesis, there is an obvious difference in attitudes about the community context items

shown in these tables, particularly where administrators strongly agree with several survey

statements and where politicians remain neutral regarding "Big Interests" and "fiction

collections." Not so obvious statistical differences are found for all other community

context statements, with the exception of the item regarding "lower education levels" for

which there was no significant difference.[131] Even keeping in mind this one incidence of

no statistically significant difference, for all community context statements, administrators

tended to agree more strongly than did politicians. On the basis of this cumulative

evidence, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis of "no difference" to accept the

working hypothesis that the attitudes of administrators differ from the attitudes of

politicians on the topic of community context.

The finding that administrators have stronger agreement regarding the influence of

community context is a pleasant surprise in light of the literature regarding public library

finances and community context issues. All of the literature on the subject suggests that

public library administrators should be more sensitively attuned to the community context

of their organizations. The findings of this study indicate that administrators have heard

the message of the literature and have responded. Public library administrators in Texas

appear to take their community context seriously, perhaps even more seriously that do

politicians.

Politicians agreed less strongly than administrators that public libraries in Texas

benefit from strong community support. Politicians agreed less strongly than

administrators that public libraries in Texas benefit when the community itself is strong

and healthy.[132] Politicians agreed less strongly than administrators that public libraries in

Texas suffer when other political interests overshadow library interests. In summary,

---

[131] This is in keeping with a finding of no significant chi-square association for this test item.
[132] With the exception of the issue of whether public libraries in Texas suffer in poorly educated communities. Politicians and administrators agree equally that public libraries suffer in poorly educated communities.

administrators agree more strongly than politicians with regard to aspects of community context.[133]

WH$_3$: Revenues

The evidence of the statistical test of association for this working hypothesis shows mixed results for the "revenues" category. Two out of three chi-square tests in this category indicate that certain attitudes are associated with administrators or politicians.[134] Similarly, the statistical test of differences for this working hypothesis indicates mixed results for the "revenues" category as shown in Table 4.5. In particular, two out of three t-test findings for statements in this category indicate that there are significant differences between the attitudes of administrators and the attitudes of politicians.

Any finding of differences in this category is a little surprising, because there is no obvious difference in revenues test items shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 (although these

TABLE 4.5. Comparison Of "Revenues" Means Between Groups

	n	mean	t	Significant difference?[135]
An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			2.3	yes
Administrators	342	1.26		
Politicians	47	.98		
Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas.			5.1	yes
Administrators	343	1.08		
Politicians	47	.34		
The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			1.7	no
Administrators	346	.78		
Politicians	45	.53		

[133] Again, with the exception of consideration of poorly educated communities.
[134] Specific chi-square statistics for this test are included in Appendix G.
[135] Significance is reported where $p < .05$, using a two-tailed t-test, comparing the mean value of administrators' attitudes to the mean value of politicians' attitudes.

tables are not part of the formal tests for this particular working hypothesis.) Less obvious statistical differences are found for the individual test statements regarding "an ever widening funding gap" and "poor funding." And, while responses regarding "population growth" were not significantly different between the groups, administrators tended to agree more strongly about all revenues statements than did politicians. These mixed findings do not provide overwhelming evidence to support the working hypothesis that the attitudes of administrators differ from the attitudes of politicians regarding the topic of revenues.

Even though these findings are mixed, they are not entirely inconsistent with the literature. The literature bears witness to the fact that public library administrators more strongly feel that their library organizations are inadequately funded. And yet, the literature indicates an awareness of other demands like those brought about by population growth that drain resources away from public libraries toward other programs such as public safety.

Administrators agreed more strongly than politicians that public libraries in Texas suffer from increasingly inadequate funding. However, politicians agree as strongly as administrators that sometimes public libraries in Texas suffer when other governmental needs for funding overshadow the needs of libraries for the same limited funding resources. The literature and the findings of this study describe perceptions of inadequate revenues and of rising costs for other public service programs that in turn can restrict resource availability for public libraries. In the next series of tests, this study examines how administrators and politicians perceive costs for public libraries.

WH₃ : Costs

The statistical test of association for this working hypothesis indicates mixed results for the "costs" category. One of the two chi-square tests in this category indicates that attitudes regarding "costly technology" are associated by group affiliation, while the other chi-square test in this category indicates no group affiliation association for "lower labor costs."[136] However, the evidence from the statistical tests of differences for this working hypothesis show consistent results for the "costs" category as shown in Table 4.6. The findings for statements in this category indicate that there are significant differences between the attitudes of administrators and the attitudes of politicians.

While Tables 4.1 and 4.2 are not part of the formal tests for differences, there is an obvious difference in reaction to the "labor costs" item shown in those tables. The more subtle yet statistically significant difference in attitudes regarding "costly technology" is not so readily apparent in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. In considering the "costly technology"

TABLE 4.6. Comparison Of "Costs" Means Between Groups

	n	mean	t	Significant difference?[137]
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			3.2	yes
Administrators	343	1.17		
Politicians	46	.74		
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.			-1.9	yes[138]
Administrators	337	-.28		
Politicians	46	.02		

---

[136] Specific chi-square statistics for this test are included in Appendix G.

[137] Significance is reported where p < .05, using a two-tailed t-test, comparing the mean value of administrators' attitudes to the mean value of politicians' attitudes.

[138] As measured by the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test, which contradicts and supersedes the parametric t-test for this questionnaire item.

statement, administrators agreed more strongly than did politicians; however, when considering the "labor costs" statement, administrators disagreed more strongly than did the politicians.

On the basis of the cumulative evidence of these findings, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis of "no difference" and accepts the working hypothesis that the attitudes of administrators differ from the attitudes of politicians on the topic of costs. This difference in attitudes regarding costs is in keeping with the literature on the subject of public library costs. Clearly, the literature supports the idea that administrators are more acutely aware of the costs associated with running public libraries than are politicians. With the literature in mind, the finding that administrators express attitudes of agreement and disagreement more strongly on the subject of costs is not surprising.

WH₃: Summary

Before moving on to the fourth working hypothesis, here is a quick summary of the findings for the third working hypothesis by topic category. For the categories of "Community Context" and "Costs," the results were conclusive. That is to say, there are significant differences between the attitudes of administrators and politicians regarding how community context and costs influence library finances. For the categories of "Programs and Services" and "Revenues," the results were not overwhelmingly conclusive. Yet even in these inconclusive instances in which differences were statistically insignificant, the administrators appeared to agree or disagree with the survey statements more strongly than did politicians.

Working Hypothesis: Administrators Respond More To Library Finance Issues

According to the evidence of the research findings, the working hypothesis that administrators are more interested in making their attitudes about library financial issues known than are politicians. Table 4.7 examines the findings of the chi-square test of association for this working hypothesis. As Table 4.7 demonstrates, the statistical chi-square test of association indicates that responsiveness, in the number of returned surveys, is associated with group affiliation.

The response to this survey research project has been phenomenal. Over 400 of the original 673 surveys were mailed back to the researcher. With this response rate of sixty percent, no additional follow-up mailing was required. The researcher interprets this vast outpouring of voluntary response as a measure of responsiveness to survey questions about library finance issues.[139] Seventy-one percent of the administrators and twenty-eight percent of the politicians returned their surveys to the researcher. The difference in this

TABLE 4.7. How The Quantity Of Returned Surveys May Be Associated With Group Affiliation

		Number Of Surveys			Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?[140]
		Returned	Not Returned	Total		
Administrators	Observed	351	141	492	105	Yes
	Expected	293	199			
Politicians	Observed	50	131	181		
	Expected	108	73			
Total		401	272	673		

---

[139] As indicated previously in the methodology chapter, other interpretations are possible. Although other interpretations are possible, the researcher used a test of association to examine the working hypothesis that administrators are more interested in making their attitudes known than the politicians are. Other interpretations might include considerations of opportunity for response or the quality of mail delivery service.

[140] Significance is reported at $p < .05$.

rate of return is statistically significant.[141] By this difference, the researcher concludes that the working hypothesis is correct that administrators respond more to survey questions about library finance issues. The survey response demonstrates that administrators are more interested in making their attitudes known to the researcher than are the politicians.

Summary Of Findings

Before remarking on the possible implications of the research findings in the next chapter, this summary will review how the evidence met the statistical tests for the working hypotheses. Table 4.8 summarizes the evidence for each working hypothesis and statistical test. According to this evidence, in considering library financial issues, administrators and politicians in Texas have opinions and their opinions are not neutral. For the topics of "Programs and Services" and "Revenues," sometimes administrators' attitudes differ from the attitudes of politicians. Yet, sometimes the attitudes of administrators and politicians do not differ with regard to "Programs and Services" and "Revenues." For the topics of "Community Context" and "Costs," administrators' attitudes differ significantly, from the attitudes of politicians. Although different in emphasis, the politicians attitudes do not openly contradict those of administrators. It is interesting to note that for all findings, regardless of the particular test or "significance," administrators' attitudes appear to be "stronger"[142] than those of the politicians for all

---

[141] Even though there was less response from politicians than administrators, such a return rate is unusually large for politicians. 28% is a very respectable response for politicians.
[142] Where administrators agreed or "strongly" agreed, politicians agreed less on average or were neutral. Where administrators disagreed, politicians disagreed less on average or were neutral.

TABLE 4.8. Summary Of Evidence

Working hypothesis	Testing for:	Statistical test:	Affiliation or Category:	Supports Hypothesis?
WH_1	opinions exist?	Frequency (mode)	administrators	Yes
	opinions are not neutral?	t-test (difference from zero)	administrators	Yes
WH_2	opinions exist?	Frequency (mode)	politicians	Yes
	opinions are not neutral?	t-test (difference from zero)	politicians	Yes
WH_3	opinions associated with group affiliation?	Pearson chi-square	Programs & Services Community Context Revenues Costs	Mostly Yes Yes Mostly Yes 1 Yes, 1 No
	difference in opinions held by groups?	t-test[143] (difference between means)	Programs & Services Community Context Revenues Costs	Mostly No[144] Yes Mostly Yes Yes[145]
WH_4	responsiveness associated with group affiliation?	Pearson chi-square	all surveys	Yes

tested library financial topics. This chapter has reviewed the research findings of these statistical tests. The concluding chapter will consider the possible implications of these findings.

---

[143] Or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U, where Mann-Whitney U results contradict and supersede parametric t-test results.
[144] Superseded by Mann-Whitney results.
[145] Superseded by Mann-Whitney results.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

What is clear throughout the literature review for this research is the library profession's general dissatisfaction with the resources made available to public libraries. Some authors have suggested that it is up to library administrators to reach out to politicians. The literature suggests that administrators should seek common ground between administrators and politicians for the sake of the libraries' financial survival. These research findings indicate that such a strategy of political partnership may be feasible.

Clearly, state legislators in Texas have their own ideas about public library finance issues. Their attitudes are not random and are measurable. The same can be said of Texas public library administrators' attitudes. The very good news for Texas public library administrators is that the overall attitudes of Texas state legislators are not usually in direct opposition to public library administrator attitudes.

However, even though Texas legislators don't absolutely disagree with Texas library administrators, legislators are not as enthusiastic about the public library finance issues presented in this research as are Texas library administrators. This observation does not mean to imply that politicians should more strongly agree with administrator viewpoints. Rather this observation simply means that politicians have a slightly different viewpoint. Indeed, if politicians had the exact same viewpoint as administrators, politicians would probably want to spend their careers running libraries rather than running for political office. Politicians, although sympathetic to the financial woes of libraries, should not be expected to be as enthusiastic about library finance issues as are

administrators. Politicians must look at broader governmental issues of which public library finance is only a part.

The task of promoting the financial interests of the library is left to the library administrator.[146] It is completely natural for library administrators to hold strong opinions about library finance issues. Knowing how similar politicians' attitudes are to their own, perhaps administrators can build on this mutual understanding to gain the cooperation of politicians for the financial welfare of the library organization. Where politicians' attitudes differ from their own, perhaps administrators can seek to understand what the priorities of the politicians are that cause those differences. While it may be possible to influence politicians by making them aware of how libraries benefit their communities and of the libraries' financial needs,[147] administrators perhaps also can figure out how they can realign their library organizations to take better advantage of current political priorities and to cope better with unavoidable political realities.

Libraries are important to library administrators. Library finances are a natural and appropriate priority of library administrators. Because library finances are such an important priority, perhaps library administrators should consider reaching out to politicians to ensure that library priorities are represented in the political allocation of resources.[148] Library administrators should be encouraged to push the advocacy

---

[146] Through personal influence, professional associations, legislative liaison offices, and interaction with city management at the highest levels.

[147] It is perhaps a testimony to administrators' successful efforts to build a mutual understanding between themselves and politicians that politicians' attitudes are as similar to administrators' attitudes as they are.

[148] While at times it may be preferable to reach out to politicians with appeals through official channels (such as appeals through liaison officers and city managers), at other times it may behoove administrators to reach out to politicians one on one (through networking efforts and the like.)

"envelope" as much as possible without appearing obnoxious or self-serving.[149] Public

library customers in Texas rely on public library administrators to work with all involved

politicians to secure the public library resources that those customers deserve.

---

[149] And preferably, without too badly offending the tradition of the politics-administration dichotomy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aronson, Jay Richard. Public Finance New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1985.

Babbie, Earl. The Practice of Social Research Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1989.

Berghammer, Darlene Villarreal. "A Cost Benefit Analysis of an Automated Circulation System for a Small Public Library." unpublished Applied Research Project. San Marcos: Southwest Texas State University, 1995.

Bookstein, Abraham. "An Economic Model of Library Service." Library Quarterly 51 (1981) 410-428.

Carrigan, Dennis P. "Public Library Private Fund-Raising: A Report Based on a Survey." Public Libraries 33 (January/February 1994) 31-36.

Casper, Cheryl A. "Pricing Policy for Library Services." Journal of the American Society for Information Science 30 (September 1979) 304-309.

Cooper, Michael D. "Charging Users For Library Service." Information Processing and Management 14 (1978) 419-427.

_____. "The Economies of Library Size: A Preliminary Inquiry." Library Trends 28 (Summer 1979) 63-76.

_____ and Nancy A. DeWath. "The Effect of User Fees on the Cost of On-Line Searching in Libraries." Journal of Library Automation 10 (December 1977) 304-319.

Dannelly, Gay N. "Justifying Collection Budgets: Indexing Materials Costs." Journal of Library Administration 19 (1993) 75-88.

DiLeonardi, Joan W. and Patrick Almond Curtis What to Do When the Numbers Are In Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1992.

Dunn, Jr., John A. and Murray S. Martin. "The Whole Cost of Libraries." Library Trends 42 (Winter 1994) 564-578.

Goddard, Haynes C. "Analysis of Social Production Functions: The Public Library." Public Finance Quarterly 1 (April 1973) 191-204.

Goudy, Frank William and Ellen Altman. "Local Public Library Funding in the 1980s." Public Libraries 33 (January/February 1994) 37-39.

Hayes, Robert M. "The Management of Library Resources: The Balance Between Capital and Staff in Providing Services." Library Research 1 (1979) 119-142.

Hicks, Donald A. "Diversifying Fiscal Support by Pricing Public Library Services: A Policy Impact Analysis." Library Quarterly 50 (October 1980) 453-474.

Holt, Glen E. "Research for Change: Creating Strategic Futures for Public Libraries." Edited by Estabrook, Applying Research to Practice: How to Use Data Collection and Research to Improve Library Management Decision Making. Paper Presented at the Allerton Park Institute, University of Illinois, October 1991.

Keene, Jan. "Distribution of Library Funds in the 21st Century." Journal of Library Administration 11 (1989) 92-109.

Lancaster, F.W. If You Want To Evaluate Your Library... Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1988.

Mansfield, Edwin. Microeconomics: Theory/Applications New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1991.

Molz, R. Kathleen. "The Financial Setting of the Public Library." Library Quarterly 48 (October 1978) 416-431.

Office for Intellectual Freedom of the American Library Association, comp. Intellectual Freedom Manual. 4th ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1992.

O'Sullivan, Elizabethann and Gary R. Rassel. Research Methods for Public Administrators White Plains, New York: Longman Publishers USA, 1995.

Ottensmann, John R. and Michael E. Gleeson. "Implementation and Testing of a Decision Support System for Public Library Materials Acquisition Budgeting." Journal of the American Society for Information Science 44 (March 1993) 83-93.

Quirk, Dantia and Patricia Whitestone. The Shrinking Library Dollar. White Plains, N.Y.: Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1982.

Raber, Douglas. "Ideological Opposition to Federal Library Legislation: The Case of the Library Services Act of 1965." Public Libraries 34 (May/June 1995) 162-169.

Ramsey, Inez L. and Jackson Eugene Ramsey. Library Planning and Budgeting. New York and Toronto: Franklin Watts, 1986.

Reed, Sally Gardner. Saving Your Library: A Guide to Getting, Using and Keeping the Power You Need. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1992.

Savas, Emmanuel S. Privatization: The Key to Better Government. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1987.

Shields, Patricia M. "Less is Less: Fiscal Issues in Human Services." Public Administration Quarterly 12 (Spring 1988) 60-91.

_____. "Freud, Efficiency and Pragmatism." Society 26 (January/February 1989) 67-72.

_____. "Pragmatism: Exploring Public Administration's Policy Imprint." Administration and Society 28 (November 1996) 390-411.

Shields, Patricia M. and Mitchell F. Rice. "Using Price As A Management Tool." New England Journal of Human Services 8 (1988) 21-27.

Sweeney, Richard T. "Leadership in the Post-Hierarchical Library." Library Trends 43 (Summer 1994) 62-94.

United States Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. National Center for Education Statistics. Finance Data in the Public Library Statistics Program: Definitions, Internal Consistency, and Comparisons to Secondary Sources. [Washington, DC]: United States Bureau of the Census, Governments Division, 1995.

Van House, Nancy A. "Research on the Economics of Libraries." Library Trends 32 (September 1984) 407-423.

Van House, Nancy A. and Thomas Childers. "Prospects for Public Library Evaluation." Public Libraries 30 (September/October 1991) 274-278.

Weingand, Darlene E. "What Do Products/Services Cost? How Do We Know?" Library Trends 43 (Winter 1995) 401-408.

Wildavsky, Aaron. The New Politics of the Budgetary Process. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 1992.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1994.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LISTS OF POPULATIONS INCLUDED IN FULL SURVEY

Surveys were sent to directors of the following public libraries in Texas:[150]

A.H. Meadows Library, *Midlothian*

Abernathy Public Library, *Abernathy*

Abilene Public Library, *Abilene*

Alexander Memorial Library, *Cotulla*

Alice Public Library, *Alice*

Allan Shivers Library, *Woodville*

Allen Memorial Public Library, *Hawkins*

Allen Public Library, *Allen*

Alma M. Carpenter Public Library, *Sour Lake*

Alpine Public Library, *Alpine*

Alvarado Public Library, *Alvarado*

Alvord Public Library, *Alvord*

Amarillo Public Library, *Amarillo*

Andrews County Library, *Andrews*

Anson Public Library, *Anson*

Aransas County Public Library, *Rockport*

Archer Public Library, *Archer City*

Arlington Public Library System, *Arlington*

Arthur Temple. Sr. Memorial Library, *Pineland*

Atlanta Public Library, *Atlanta*

Aubrey Area Library. *Aubrey*

Austin County Library System, *Wallis*

Austin Memorial Library, *Cleveland*

Austin Public Library. *Austin*

Azle Public Library, *Azle*

Bailey H. Dunlap Memorial Library, *La Feria*

Balch Springs Library, *Balch Springs*

Bandera County Library. *Bandera*

Bastrop Public Library, *Bastrop*

Bay City Public Library, *Bay City*

Baylor County Free Library, *Seymour*

Beaumont Public LibrarySystem, *Beaumont*

Bedford Public Library, *Bedford*

Bee County Public Library, *Beeville*

Bell/Whittington Public Library, *Portland*

Bellaire City Library, *Bellaire*

Bellville Public Library, *Bellville*

Belton City Library. *Belton*

Bertha Voyer Memorial Library, *Honey Grove*

Bicentennial City-County Library. *Paducah*

Blanche K. Werner Public Library, *Trinity*

Blue Mound Community Library, *Fort Worth*

Boerne Public Library, *Boerne*

Bonham Public Library, *Bonham*

Booker School/Public Library, *Booker*

Bowie Public Library, *Bowie*

Boyce Ditto Public Library, *Mineral Wells*

Boyd Public Library, *Boyd*

Brazoria County Library System, *Angleton*

Breckenridge Library, *Breckenridge*

Bridge City Public Library, *Bridge City*

Bridgeport Public Library, *Bridgeport*

Brownsville Public Library, *Brownsville*

Brownwood Public Library, *Brownwood*

Bryan/College Station Public Library System, *Bryan*

Buffalo Public Library, *Buffalo*

Bulverde Public Library. *Bulverde*

Buna Public Library. *Buna*

Burkburnett Library, *Burkburnett*

Burleson Public Library. *Burleson*

---

[150] Source of original list: downloaded from internet gopher site at: *gopher://gopher.ed.gov:10000/00/data/library/public/library94* ("Public Data File: 1994" National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC, December 1995.)

Burnet County Library System, *Burnet*
Butt-Holdsworth Memorial Library, *Kerrville*
Calhoun County Library, *Port Lavaca*
Callahan County Library, *Baird*
Cameron Public Library, *Cameron*
Canyon Public Library, *Canyon*
Caprock Public Library, *Quitaque*
Carl & Mary Welhausen Library, *Yoakum*
Carnegie City-County Library, *Vernon*
Carnegie Library of Ballinger, *Ballinger*
Carrollton Public Library, *Carrollton*
Carson County Public Library, *Panhandle*
Castroville Public Library, *Castroville*
Cedar Park Public Library, *Cedar Park*
Celina Community Library, *Celina*
Centennial Memorial Library, *Eastland*
Chambers County Library, *Anahuac*
Charles J. Rike Memorial Library, *Farmersville*
Charlotte Public Library, *Charlotte*

Chico Public Library, *Chico*
Childress Public Library, *Childress*
Cisco Public Library, *Cisco*
City-County Library, *Munday*
City-County Library, *Tahoka*
City of Presidio Library, *Presidio*
City of Wolfforth Library, *Wolfforth*
Claude Public Library, *Claude*
Cleburne Municipal Library, *Cleburne*
Clyde Public Library, *Clyde*
Cochran County Love Memorial Library, *Morton*
Cockrell Hill Public Library, *Cockrell Hill*
Coke County Library, *Robert Lee*
Coldspring Area Public Library, Inc., *Coldspring*
Coleman Public Library, *Coleman*
Collingsworth Public Library, *Wellington*
Comanche Public Library, *Comanche*
Comfort Public Library, *Comfort*
Commerce Public Library, *Commerce*
Converse Area Public Library, *Converse*
Cooke County Library, *Gainesville*
Copperas Cove Public Library, *Copperas Cove*

Corpus Christi Public Library, *Corpus Christi*
Corsicana Public Library, *Corsicana*
County-City Library, *Sweetwater*
Crane County Library, *Crane*
Crockett County Public Library, *Ozona*
Crosby County Library, *Crosbyton*
Cross Plains Public Library, *Cross Plains*
Crowley Public Library, *Crowley*
Crystal City Memorial Library, *Crystal City*
Cuero Public Library, *Cuero*
D. Bob Henson Memorial Library, *Nederland*
Daingerfield Public Library, *Daingerfield*
Dallam-Hartley County Library, *Dalhart*
Dallas Public Library, *Dallas*
Dawson County Library, *Lamesa*
Deaf Smith County Library, *Hereford*
Decatur Public Library, *Decatur*
Deer Park Public Library, *Deer Park*
DeLeon Public Library, *DeLeon*
Della Mae Baylor Public Library, *Odem*
Delta County Public Library, *Cooper*
Denison Public Library, *Denison*
Denton Public Library, *Denton*

DeSoto Public Library, *DeSoto*
Dickens County-Spur Public Library, *Spur*
Dimmit County Public Library, *Carrizo Springs*
Dittlinger Memorial Library, *New Braunfels*
Donna Public Library, *Donna*
Dr. Eugene Clark Library, *Lockhart*
Dripping Springs Community Library, *Dripping Springs*
Driscoll Public Library, *Devine*
Dublin Public Library, *Dublin*
Duncanville Public Library, *Duncanville*
Duval County/San Diego Public Library, *San Diego*
Eagle Pass Public Library, *Eagle Pass*
East Parker County Library, *Aledo*
Ector County Library, *Odessa*
Ed & Hazel Richmond Public Library, *Aransas Pass*
Ed Rachal Memorial Library, *Falfurrias*
Eden Public Library, *Eden*
Edinburg Public Library, *Edinburg*
Edmund E. & Nida Smith Jones Library, *Dayton*
Edwards County Memorial Library, *Rocksprings*
Edwards Public Library, *Henrietta*

Effie & Wilton Hebert Public Library, *Port Neches*
El Paso Public Library, *El Paso*
El Progreso Memorial Library, *Uvalde*
Electra Public Library, *Electra*
Elgin Public Library, *Elgin*
Ellis Memorial Library, *Port Aransas*
Elsa Public Library, *Elsa*
Ennis Public Library, *Ennis*
Ethel L. Whipple Memorial Library, *Los Fresnos*
Eula & David Wintermann Library, *Eagle Lake*
Euless Public Library, *Euless*
Everman Public Library, *Everman*
F.M. (Buck) Richards Memorial Library. *Brady*
Fairfield Library, *Fairfield*
Falls City Public Library, *Falls City*
Fannie Brown Booth Memorial Library, *Center*
Farmers Branch Manske Public Library, *Farmers Branch*
Fayette Public Library, *La Grange*
Ferris Public Library, *Ferris*
Flatonia Public Library, *Flatonia*
Florence Public Library, *Florence*
Flower Mound Public Library, *Flower Mound*
Floyd County Library, *Floydada*

Foard County Library, *Crowell*
Forest Hill Public Library, *Forest Hill*
Forney Public Library, *Forney*
Fort Bend County Libraries, *Richmond*
Fort Hancock/Hudspeth County Public Library. *Fort Hancock*
Fort Stockton Public Library, *Fort Stockton*
Fort Worth Public Library, *Fort Worth*
Franklin County Library. *Mt. Vernon*
Frankston Depot Library & Museum. *Frankston*
French Simpson Memorial Library, *Hallettsville*
Friendswood Public Library. *Friendswood*
Friona Public Library, *Friona*
G.B. Burton Memorial Library. *Clarendon*
Gaines County Library, *Seminole*
Gatesville Public Library. *Gatesville*
Genevieve Miller Hitchcock Public Library, *Hitchcock*
Georgetown Public Library. *Georgetown*
Gibbs Memorial Library, *Mexia*
Gilbreath Memorial Library. *Winnsboro*
Gilliam Memorial Public Library, *Wilmer*

Gladys Johnson Ritchie Public Library, *Jacksboro*
Goliad County Library, *Goliad*
Grace Grebing Public Library, *Dell City*
Grand Prairie Memorial Library, *Grand Prairie*
Grand Saline Public Library, *Grand Saline*
Grapevine Public Library, *Grapevine*
Groves Public Library. *Groves*
Groveton Public Library, *Groveton*
Gruver City Library, *Gruver*
Hale Center Public Library, Inc.. *Hale Center*
Haltom City Public Library, *Haltom City*
Hamilton Public Library, *Hamilton*
Hansford County Library, *Spearman*
Harker Heights Public Library. *Harker Heights*
Harlingen Public Library. *Harlingen*
Harrie P. Woodson Memorial Library, *Caldwell*
Harris County Public Library, *Houston*
Haskell County Library. *Haskell*
Helen Hall Library, *League City*
Hemphill County Library, *Canadian*

Henderson County Clint W. Murchison Memorial. *Athens*
Hewitt Community Library. *Hewitt*
Higgins Public Library, *Higgins*
Highland Park Library, *Dallas*
Hillsboro City Library, *Hillsboro*
Hockley County Memorial Library, *Levelland*
Hondo Public Library, *Hondo*
Hood County Library, *Granbury*
Hooks Public Library, *Hooks*
Houston Public Library, *Houston*
Howard County Library. *Big Spring*
Howe Community Library, *Howe*
Huntsville Public Library. *Huntsville*
Hurst Public Library, *Hurst*
Hutchins-Atwell Public Library. *Hutchins*
Hutchinson County Library, *Borger*
Idalou Public Library. *Idalou*
Imperial Public Library. *Imperial*
Ingleside Public Library, *Ingleside*
Ione Jones Public Library, *Jonestown*
Iraan Public Library, *Iraan*
Irion County Library, *Mertzon*
Irving Public Library, *Irving*
J.H. Wootters-Crockett Public Library. *Crockett*

Jackson County Memorial Library, *Edna*
Jacksonville Public Library, *Jacksonville*
Jasper Public Library, *Jasper*
Jeff Davis County Library, *Fort Davis*
Jefferson County Library, *Beaumont*
Jim Hogg County Public Library, *Hebbronville*
John E. Keeter Public Library, *Saginaw*
Johnson City Library, *Johnson City*
Jourdanton Community Library, *Jourdanton*
Justin Community Library, *Justin*
Karnes City Public Library, *Karnes City*
Kaufman County Library, *Kaufman*
Keller Public Library, *Keller*
Kemp Public Library, *Wichita Falls*
Kendalia Public Library, *Kendalia*
Kendrick Memorial Library, *Brownfield*
Kenedy Public Library, *Kenedy*
Kent County Library, *Jayton*
Kilgore Public Library, *Kilgore*
Killeen Public Library, *Killeen*
Killgore Memorial Library, *Dumas*

Kimble County Library, *Junction*
King County Public Library, *Guthrie*
Kinney County Public Library, *Brackettville*
Kirbyville Public Library, *Kirbyville*
Kountze Public Library, *Kountze*
Krum Public Library, *Krum*
Kurth Memorial Library, *Lufkin*
Kyle Community Library, *Kyle*
La Joya Municipal Library, *La Joya*
La Marque Public Library, *La Marque*
Laguna Vista Public Library, *Laguna Vista*
Lake Cities Library, *Lake Dallas*
Lake Travis Community Library, *Austin*
Lake Whitney Library, *Whitney*
Lalo Arcaute Public Library, *Alamo*
Lamb County Library, *Littlefield*
Lampasas Public Library, *Lampasas*
Lancaster Public Library, *Lancaster*
Laredo Public Library, *Laredo*
Leander Public Library, *Leander*
Lee Public Library, *Gladewater*
Leon County Library, *Centerville*
Leon Valley Public Library, *San Antonio*
Leonard Public Library, *Leonard*

Lewisville Public Library, *Lewisville*
Liberty Municipal Library, *Liberty*
Library of Graham, *Graham*
Live Oak County Library, *George West*
Llano County Library System, *Llano*
Longview Public Library, *Longview*
Lovett Memorial Library, *McLean*
Lovett Memorial Library, *Pampa*
Lubbock City-County Library, *Lubbock*
Lucy Hill Patterson Memorial Library, *Rockdale*
Luling Public Library, *Luling*
Lytle Public Library, *Lytle*
Madison County Library, *Madisonville*
Mae S. Bruce Library, *Santa Fe*
Maffett Memorial Library, *Groesbeck*
Mansfield Public Library, *Mansfield*
Marcs Memorial Library, *Dickinson*
Marfa Public Library, *Marfa*
Marion Community Library, *Marion*
Marlin Public Library, *Marlin*
Marshall Public Library, *Marshall*
Martin County Library, *Stanton*

Mary Lou Reddick Public Library, *Lake Worth*
Mason County/Eckert Memorial Library, *Mason*
Mathis Public Library, *Mathis*
Maud Public Library, *Maud*
McAllen Memorial Library, *McAllen*
McGinley Memorial Library, *McGregor*
McKinney Memorial Public Library, *McKinney*
Melissa Public Library, *Melissa*
Memphis Public Library, *Memphis*
Menard Public Library, *Menard*
Mercedes Memorial Library, *Mercedes*
Mesquite Public Library, *Mesquite*
Mickey Reily Public Library, *Corrigan*
Midland County Public Library, *Midland*
Mitchell County Public Library, *Colorado City*
Montgomery County Library, *Conroe*
Moore Memorial Public Library, *Texas City*
Moreau Memorial Library, *Buda*
Morgan's Point Resort Library, *Belton*
Motley County Library, *Matador*
Mount Calm Regional Library, *Mount Calm*

Mt. Pleasant Public Library, *Mt. Pleasant*
Muenster Public Library, *Muenster*
Muleshoe Area Public Library, *Muleshoe*
Murphy Memorial Library, *Livingston*
Nacogdoches Public Library, *Nacogdoches*
Nancy Carol Roberts Memorial Library, *Brenham*
Navasota Public Library, *Navasota*
Nesbitt Memorial Library, *Columbus*
New Boston Public Library, *New Boston*
New Waverly Public Library, *New Waverly*
Newark Public Library, *Newark*
Newton County Public Library, *Newton*
Nicholas P. Sims Library & Lyceum, *Waxahachie*
Nicholson Memorial Library System, *Garland*
Nocona Public Library, *Nocona*
North Richland Hills Public Library, *North Richland Hi*
Nueces Canyon Public Library, *Barksdale*
Oldham County Library, *Vega*
Olney Community Library and Arts Center, *Olney*
Orange Public Library, *Orange*

Palacios Library Inc., *Palacios*
Palestine Public Library, *Palestine*
Paris Public Library, *Paris*
Pasadena Public Library, *Pasadena*
Pearsall Public Library, *Pearsall*
Perry Memorial Library, *Perryton*
Petersburg Public Library, *Petersburg*
Pflugerville Community Library, *Pflugerville*
Pharr Memorial Library, *Pharr*
Pilot Point Community Library, *Pilot Point*
Pioneer Memorial Library, *Fredericksburg*
Pittsburg-Camp County Library, *Pittsburg*
Plano Public Library System, *Plano*
Pleasanton Public Library, *Pleasanton*
Port Arthur Public Library, *Port Arthur*
Port Isabel Public Library, *Port Isabel*
Post Public Library, *Post*
Poteet Public Library, *Poteet*
Pottsboro Area Public Library, *Pottsboro*
Quemado Public Library, *Quemado*
Quitman Public Library, *Quitman*

Rains County Public Library, *Emory*
Reagan County Library, *Big Lake*
Real County Public Library, *Leakey*
Reber Memorial Library, *Raymondville*
Red River County Public Library, *Clarksville*
Red Waller Community Library, *Malakoff*
Refugio County Public Library, *Refugio*
Rhoads Memorial Library, *Dimmitt*
Rhome Public Library, *Rhome*
Richardson Public Library, *Richardson*
Richland Hills Public Library, *Richland Hills*
Rio Hondo Public Library, *Rio Hondo*
Rita & Truett Smith Public Library, *Wylie*
River Oaks Public Library, *Fort Worth*
Roanoke Public Library, *Roanoke*
Robert J. Kleberg Public Library, *Kingsville*
Roberts County Library, *Miami*
Rockwall County Library, *Rockwall*
Rosenberg Library, *Galveston*
Rotan Public Library, *Rotan*

Round Rock Public Library, *Round Rock*
Rowlett Public Library, *Rowlett*
Rufus Young King Library, *Giddings*
Runge Public Library, *Runge*
Rusk County Library, *Henderson*
Rylander Memorial Library, *San Saba*
Sachse Public Library, *Sachse*
Salado Public Library, *Salado*
Sam Fore, Jr. Wilson County Public Library, *Floresville*
Sammy Brown Library, *Carthage*
San Antonio Public Library, *San Antonio*
San Augustine Public Library, *San Augustine*
San Benito Public Library, *San Benito*
San Marcos Public Library, *San Marcos*
Sanger Public Library, *Sanger*
Schertz Public Library, *Schertz*
Schleicher County Public Library, *Eldorado*
Schulenburg Public Library, *Schulenburg*
Scurry County Library, *Snyder*
Seagoville Public Library, *Seagoville*
Seguin-Guadalupe County Public Library, *Seguin*
Shackelford County Library, *Albany*

Shamrock Public Library, *Shamrock*

Shepherd Public Library, *Shepherd*

Sheridan Memorial Library, *Sheridan*

Sherman County Public Library, *Stratford*

Sherman Public Library, *Sherman*

Shiner Public Library, *Shiner*

Silsbee Public Library, *Silsbee*

Silverton Public Library, *Silverton*

Singletary Memorial Library, *Rusk*

Sinton Public Library, *Sinton*

Slaton City Library, *Slaton*

Smith-Welch Memorial Library, *Hearne*

Smithville Public Library, *Smithville*

Somervell County Library, *Glen Rose*

Speer Memorial Library, *Mission*

Springlake-Earth Community Library, *Earth*

Springtown Public Library, *Springtown*

Stamford Carnegie Library, *Stamford*

Starr County Public Library, *Rio Grande City*

Stella Ellis Hart Public Library, *Smiley*

Stephenville Public Library, *Stephenville*

Sterling County Public Library, *Sterling City*

Sterling Municipal Library, *Baytown*

Stonewall County Library, *Aspermont*

Sulphur Springs Public Library, *Sulphur Springs*

Sunnyvale Public Library, *Sunnyvale*

Sutton County Library, *Sonora*

Swisher County Library, *Tulia*

Taft Public Library, *Taft*

Tawakoni Area Public Library, *Quinlan*

Taylor Public Library, *Taylor*

Teague Public Library, *Teague*

Teinert Memorial Public Library, *Bartlett*

Temple Public Library, *Temple*

Terrell County Public Library, *Sanderson*

Terrell Public Library, *Terrell*

Texarkana Public Library, *Texarkana*

Texline Public Library, *Texline*

The Colony Public Library, *The Colony*

The Kennedale Library, *Kennedale*

The Rankin Public Library, *Rankin*

The Village Library, *Wimberley*

Thompson-Sawyer Public Library, *Quanah*

TLL Temple Memorial Library, *Dibol*

Tom Burnett Memorial Library, *Iowa Park*

Tom Green County Library System, *San Angelo*

Tri-County Library/Family Resource Center, *Mabank*

Troup Municipal Library, *Troup*

Tye Preston Memorial Library, *Canyon Lake*

Tyler Public Library, *Tyler*

Unger Memorial Library, *Plainview*

Universal City Public Library, *Universal City*

Upshur County Library, *Gilmer*

Upton County Public Library, *McCamey*

Val Verde County Library, *Del Rio*

Van Alstyne Public Library, *Van Alstyne*

Van Horn City-County Library, *Van Horn*

Van Zandt County Library, *Canton*

Victoria Public Library, *Victoria*

Vidor Public Library, *Vidor*

Village of Lake Tanglewood Public Library, *Amarillo*

Virgil & Josephine Gordon Memorial Library, *Sealy*

W. Walworth Harrison Public Library, *Greenville*

Waco-McLennan County Library, *Waco*

Waller County Library, *Hempstead*

Ward County Library, *Monahans*

Watauga Public Library, *Watauga*

Weatherford Public Library, *Weatherford*

Weimar Public Library, *Weimar*

Weslaco Public Library, *Weslaco*

West Public Library, *West*

Westbank Community Library, *Austin*

Wharton County Library, *Wharton*

Wheeler Public Library, *Wheeler*

White Settlement Public Library, *White Settlement*

Whitehouse Community Library, *Whitehouse*

Whitesboro Public Library, *Whitesboro*

Whitewright Public Library, *Whitewright*

Wildwood Heritage Museum and Library, *Village Mills*

William T. Cozby Public Library, *Coppell*

Williams Memorial Library, *Blanco*

Winkler County Library, *Kermit*

Winters Public Library, *Winters*

Wolfe City Public Library, *Wolfe City*
Yoakum County Library, *Denver City*

Yoakum County Library, *Plains*
Yorktown Public Library, *Yorktown*

Zapata County Public Library, *Zapata*
Zula B. Wylie Library, *Cedar Hill*

Surveys were sent to the following Texas state legislators:[151]

Rep. Al Edwards
Rep. Albert J. (Al) Price
Rep. Alec Rhodes
Rep. Allen D. Place, Jr.
Rep. Allen Ross Hightower, Jr.
Rep. Anna Mowery
Rep. Arlene Wohlgemuth
Rep. Barbara Rusling
Rep. Barry B. Telford
Rep. Beverly Woolley
Rep. Bill G. Carter
Rep. Bill Siebert
Rep. Billy Clemons
Rep. Bob Glaze
Rep. Bob Hunter
Rep. Bob Rabuck
Rep. Brian McCall
Rep. Burt Solomons
Rep. Carolyn Park
Rep. Charles (Layton) Black
Rep. Charles A. Finnell

Rep. Charles Howard
Rep. Christine Hernandez
Rep. Ciro D. Rodriguez
Rep. Clyde H. Alexander, II
Rep. Craig Eiland
Rep. Curtis Lee Seidlits, Jr.
Rep. D. R. (Tom) Uher
Rep. Dale Tillery
Rep. Dan Kubiak
Rep. David A. Swinford
Rep. David Counts
Rep. Dawnna Dukes
Rep. Debra Danburg
Rep. Delwin Jones
Rep. Diana Davila
Rep. Dianne White Delisi
Rep. Doyle Willis
Rep. Eddie De La Garza
Rep. Edmund Kuempel
Rep. Elliott Naishtat
Rep. Elvira Reyna

Rep. Frank J. Corte, Jr.
Rep. Fred Hill
Rep. Fred M. Bosse
Rep. Garnet F. Coleman
Rep. Gary Elkins
Rep. Gary Walker
Rep. George E. (Buddy) West
Rep. Gerard Torres
Rep. Gilbert Serna
Rep. Glen Maxey
Rep. Glenn Lewis
Rep. Harold V. Dutton, Jr.
Rep. Harryette Ehrhardt
Rep. Harvey Hilderbran
Rep. Helen Giddings
Rep. Henry R. Cuellar
Rep. Homer Dear
Rep. Huey McCoulskey
Rep. Hugo Berlanga
Rep. Irma Rangel
Rep. Jack Harris

---

[151] Source of original list: downloaded from internet gopher sites at: *gopher://capitol.tcl.state.tx.us:70/00/lts/sm/senmem* and *gopher://capitol.tlc.state.tx.us:70/00/tthor/hm/houmem* (State of Texas, Austin, Texas, August 1996.)

Rep. James E. (Pete) Laney
Rep. Jerry K. Johnson
Rep. Jerry Madden
Rep. Jerry Yost
Rep. Jesse W. Jones
Rep. John H. Shields
Rep. John Hirschi
Rep. John J. Carona
Rep. John R. Cook, Jr.
Rep. John T. Smithee
Rep. Judy Hawley
Rep. Karyne Jones Conley
Rep. Ken Yarbrough
Rep. Kenneth (Kim) Brimer
Rep. Kenny (Ken) Marchant
Rep. Kent Grusendorf
Rep. Kevin Bailey
Rep. Kevin Brady
Rep. Kip Averitt
Rep. Kyle Janek
Rep. L. P. (Pete) Patterson
Rep. Leo Alvarado, Jr.
Rep. Leticia Van de Putte
Rep. Mark W. Stiles
Rep. Mary Denny
Rep. Mike Jackson
Rep. Mike Krusee
Rep. Nancy H. McDonald
Rep. Nancy Moffat
Rep. Pat Haggerty
Rep. Patricia Gray
Rep. Paul Cruz Moreno
Rep. Paul J. Hilbert
Rep. Paul L. Sadler
Rep. Peggy Hamric

Rep. Jessica Farrar
Rep. Jim Horn
Rep. Jim Pitts
Rep. Jim Solis
Rep. Joe Crabb
Rep. Pete P. Gallego
Rep. Ray Allen
Rep. Renato Cuellar
Rep. Rene O. Oliveira
Rep. Richard E. Raymond
Rep. Richard F. (Ric) Williamson
Rep. Robert A. Junell
Rep. Robert E. Talton
Rep. Robert L. (Bob) Duncan
Rep. Robert M. Saunders
Rep. Robert R. (Bob) Turner
Rep. Robert R. Puente
Rep. Roberto Gutierrez
Rep. Roberto R. Alonzo
Rep. Ron Wilson
Rep. Ronald E. (Ron) Lewis
Rep. Samuel William Hudson, III
Rep. Scott Hochberg
Rep. Senfronia Thompson
Rep. Sergio Munoz
Rep. Sherri Greenberg
Rep. Steve Holzheauser
Rep. Steve Ogden
Rep. Steven D. (Steve) Wolens
Rep. Susan Combs
Rep. Sylvester Turner
Rep. Sylvia Romo
Rep. Talmadge L. Heflin
Rep. Ted Kamel
Rep. Toby Goodman

Rep. Joe Driver
Rep. Joe Nixon
Rep. Joe Pickett
Rep. John Almos Longoria
Rep. John Culberson
Rep. Todd A. Hunter
Rep. Todd Staples
Rep. Tom Craddick
Rep. Tom Ramsay
Rep. Tony Goolsby
Rep. Tracy King
Rep. Vilma Luna
Rep. Warren D. Chisum
Rep. Will Hartnett
Rep. William K. (Keith) Oakley
Rep. Yvonne Davis
Rep. Zeb D. Zbranek
Sen. Bill Ratliff
Sen. Carlos F. Truan
Sen. Chris Harris
Sen. David Cain
Sen. David Sibley
Sen. Don Henderson
Sen. Drew Nixon
Sen. Eduardo A. (Eddie) Lucio, Jr.
Sen. Florence Shapiro
Sen. Frank L. Madla, Jr.
Sen. Gonzalo Barrientos
Sen. Gregory Luna
Sen. J. E. (Buster) Brown
Sen. James W. (Jim) Turner
Sen. Jane Nelson
Sen. Jeff Wentworth
Sen. Jerry Patterson
Sen. John N. Leedom

Sen. John T. Montford
Sen. John Whitmire
Sen. Judith Zaffirini
Sen. Kenneth L. (Ken) Armbrister
Sen. Margaret Ann (Peggy) Rosson

Sen. Mario Gallegos
Sen. Michael Galloway
Sen. Mike Moncrief
Sen. Rodney G. Ellis
Sen. Royce West

Sen. Teel Bivins
Sen. Tom Haywood
Sen. William M. (Bill) Sims

SURVEY CONCERNING PUBLIC LIBRARY FINANCE ISSUES
(PILOT STUDY)

Please answer the questions below and on the back of this page, and return this completed survey to Lisa Gatliff in the enclosed self-addressed, self-stamped envelope, by August 7, 1996.

Your feedback in response to these questions will be instrumental in generating additional questions for a comprehensive statewide survey later this year. There are no right or wrong responses. For your privacy, your response will be kept strictly confidential.

1. In your opinion, what community factors enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

2. In your opinion, what community factors strain the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

3. In your opinion, what revenue factors enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

4. In your opinion, what revenue factors strain the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

5. In your opinion, what cost factors enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

6. In your opinion, what cost factors strain the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

7. In your opinion, what library-provided services and programs enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

8. In your opinion, what library-provided services and programs strain the financial status of public libraries in Texas?

APPENDIX C: PARAPHRASED SUMMARY OF PILOT STUDY RESPONSES

Administrators said:

- Up-to-date technology for information services tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (4x)

- Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services tend to enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas. (3x)

- Satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries tend to enhance the financial position of libraries. (3x)

- Strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and citizens tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (3x)

- Wealthy communities tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (3x)

- Well-educated communities tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (3x)

- A stable economic base in a community tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- Effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas (2x)

- Lower labor costs tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- Responsive tailoring of programs and services to meet community interests tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- Vocal public interest in maintaining public libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries. (2X)

- Well stocked and current fiction collections tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (5x)
- Poor local economic conditions in the community would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (3X)
- An ever widening funding gap would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)
- Lower education levels in communities would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)
- Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas. (2x)
- A rapidly growing economy tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Appropriate outreach for local support from the business community tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Broad community support, particularly for neighborhood branches, tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Citizen perceptions that the library provides basic, valuable service tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Citizen willingness to pay non-resident fees tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Community participation in groups such as the Friends and Library foundations tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Creativity in providing high quality service with increasingly limited resources tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Demonstrations to decision makers that a library is spending dollars efficiently tend to enhance the financial position of libraries.
- Developing library markets for services not offered by others tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries.
- Earmarking property taxes for libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Earmarking sales taxes for libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Effective readers' advisory staff tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Foundations that are specifically set up to enhance the financial stability of libraries tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Good economic times tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Government officials who wish to expand government services tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- High levels of literacy are in the best long term interests of public libraries in Texas.
- High property tax rates tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- High tax rates tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Increasingly inflationary pricing of books in private markets tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Information services, which provide resources to enhance the intellectual, emotional, and economic life of every citizen in a cost effective manner, tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Joint city/county support of libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Library operations that are independent of a municipal institution parent structure tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Library services that meet a specific need that has not been met in private industry tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Lower costs of living tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Programs and services that bring the community into libraries tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Properly-configured, well-supported, privately-operated library advocacy groups would enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Raising operating funds from private sources tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Raising revenues with "for fee" services unique to libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Reducing costs tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Responsiveness to business information needs within the community tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Revenue producing government agencies, such as utilities, which contribute to local government coffers, tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Risk-taking government officials tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Strong community support tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The ability of libraries to associate real benefits with hard costs tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The ability of libraries to make shared information affordable for the entire population of potential users tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The ability of libraries to share publicly purchased library resources in a frugal manner tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The ability to secure grants from both public and private sectors tends to enhance the financial status of public libraries in Texas.

- The availability of books in private markets tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The contribution of libraries to both the educational and the recreational aspects of people's lives tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The cost effectiveness of public libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The cost of books in private markets tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The perception that libraries appear to reduce costs tends to enhance the financial position of libraries.

- The powerful influence of a motivated Board or Friends group tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The support groups that promote library goals tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries.

- The use of "cost plus" fees for library services enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Using technology to provide current and accessible information tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- A lag between service demands and service capacity would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- A predominance of government officials who do not value the libraries' contribution to education would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- A predominance of government officials who see libraries as liabilities rather than as investments would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- A private sector expectation that libraries should be supported by public sector dollars would tend to strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- A reluctance to raise taxes strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Addressing special interests in the community would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Annual increases in costs for utilities, maintenance, and staff benefits would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Basic library services, for which user fees cannot be applied, strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Being dependent on one source of funding would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Broken equipment would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Community unwillingness to close library locations with low usage would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competition for a slice of the general fund pie with public safety departments, such as fire, police, and EMS, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competition for private funding among too many worthy causes strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competition for resources between books and technology would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competition for support from other organizations, in the form of foundations, bequests, or donations, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competition with private business markets would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Concentrating too many resources on one type of program or service to the exclusion of others would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Demands for small neighborhood libraries, rather than regional library sites, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Dependence on one entity for financial support would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Elected government officials regularly cut funding for public libraries in Texas, regardless of how the economy is performing.

- Elected government officials regularly cut funding for public libraries in Texas, regardless of the relative worth of libraries in comparison to other government programs.

- Escalating costs for library materials would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Expanding facilities faster than operating budgets would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Extreme caution and frugality exercised by elected government officials would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Facility expansion without corresponding expansion of funding resources would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Failing to account for ongoing costs in library budgets would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Failing to account for ongoing sinking fund/replacement costs in library budgets strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Grants which do not help with ongoing support costs after the grant period ends would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- High materials and supplies costs would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- High salaries would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- High standards of living in the community would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- High utility costs would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Inadequate funding of book collection acquisition would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Inadequate planning would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Increasing inflationary costs to provide the basic reading material would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Inefficient or ineffective library staff would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Insufficient definition of the role of public libraries in the community would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Insufficient market research regarding community needs would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Lack of cooperation between city and county governments would strain the financial position of libraries in Texas.

- Lack of economic growth would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Lack of interest in libraries on the part of policy makers would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Legal limitations on what libraries can charge for service strain the financial position of libraries in Texas.
- Libraries' inability to articulate what was bought or achieved with money allocated to libraries would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Limited funding for all public institutions strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Limited or inaccessible reference service would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Limited or slow acquisition of current, popular books would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Low property tax rates would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Low tax rates would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Maintaining overlapping service areas would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Neglecting infrastructure maintenance would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Non-public services provided with public money in public library budgets would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Over-reliance on Friends groups, as alternative revenue sources in times of governmental withdrawal of public revenues from libraries, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Over-reliance on support of community boards would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Political and citizen aversion to user fees strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Public officials do not regard libraries as essential service.
- Purchasing procedures that sacrifice quality would strain the financial position of libraries in Texas.
- Purchasing procedures that sacrifice expediency for accountability would strain the financial position of libraries in Texas.

- Rapid growth, with demand for services outpacing the ability to provide them, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Reliance on performance measurement of soft benefits, such as leisure time resources provided to the community, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Sacrificing children's programming for technology-dependent services would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Sacrificing popular fiction collection development for technology-dependent services would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Small local government budgets would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The absence of "library taxing districts" strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The absence of county funding would strain the financial position of many public libraries in Texas.
- The absence of property taxes earmarked for libraries would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The absence of sales tax revenues earmarked for libraries would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The absence of well-supported, privately operated library advocacy groups would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The addition of new facilities, without adding any funding for support staff, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The cost of leased space for library facilities would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The demand for outreach to disadvantaged communities would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The dependence of property and sales taxes on economic conditions in times of economic downturns would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The duplication of services would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The inability of libraries to gain additional funding for technology would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The inability to sustain services levels of raised expectations would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The influence of those elected officials who do not value educational institutions would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The need to build new branches in remote locations, without the benefit of a sufficient tax base in those remote, sparsely populated locations, would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The need to respond quickly to competition with other information providers, such as book stores or Internet providers, would strain the financial position of public libraries.

- The overlap of service areas would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The provision of services that the community does not want from libraries would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The requirement to provide "free" basic services strains the financial position of libraries in Texas.

- The role of the library staff as social workers would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The uncertainty of future grant funding would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Too many demands from too many competing customer groups with too few budget dollars would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Unrealistic service expectations would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

Politicians said:

- Community interest tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (3x)

- The cost of rapid growth would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. (2x)

- A willingness to spend public dollars on libraries tends to enhance public libraries in Texas.

- All basic library services that fulfill public needs tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Children's programs tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Easy of availability of tax money would enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Loaning books tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Rising costs tend to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The availability of newspapers tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The availability of periodicals tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- The volume of the community's use of libraries tends to enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Rapid growth means higher costs.

- As in all needed funding areas, a depressed economy would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Book loaning programs strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Budget priorities would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Competing budget priorities strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

- Computer access strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Non-library budget priorities would strain the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- Public libraries in Texas do not significantly waste financial resources.
- The availability of newspapers strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The availability of periodicals strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The collection of fewer tax dollars strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The cost of rapid growth in communities strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The instance of more people using libraries strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.
- The lack of available tax money strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

APPENDIX D: FULL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

OPINION SURVEY

Please take a brief moment to fill out the questionnaire below and on the back of this page. At your earliest convenience, please return this completed survey to: Lisa Gatliff, 12108 Lavinia Lane, Austin, TX 78753.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements below and on the back of this page, by placing a check mark or an X in the appropriate box to the immediate right of each statement.

There are no right or wrong responses. For your privacy, your response will be kept strictly confidential.

KEY
SA = "Strongly Agree"
A = "Agree"
N = "Neutral"
D = "Disagree"
SD = "Strongly Disagree"

In your opinion, how strongly do you agree or disagree that:

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [1]	SA	A	N	D	SD
An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [2]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [3]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [4]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [5]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas. [6]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities. [7]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities. [8]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests. [10]	SA	A	N	D	SD

[Numbers listed above in brackets did not appear in the survey instrument itself. These numbers simply indicate the position or "number" of the survey statement.]

In your opinion, how strongly do you agree or disagree that:

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections. [11]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries. [12]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community. [13]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community. [14]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries. [15]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services. [16]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community. [17]	SA	A	N	D	SD
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community. [18]	SA	A	N	D	SD
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [19]	SA	A	N	D	SD
The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.	SA	A	N	D	SD
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [21]	SA	A	N	D	SD

APPENDIX E: RESPONSE FREQUENCIES

[Statement position numbers in brackets.]	Number of responses (with **modal** frequencies in bold type)						
	SA	A	N	D	SD	*total*	*blank*
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [1]							
Total	54	131	**136**	47	4	*372*	*29*
Administrators	48	**119**	111	45	4	*327*	*24*
Politicians	6	12	**25**	2	0	*45*	*5*
An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [2]							
Total	154	**181**	42	11	1	*389*	*12*
Administrators	146	**148**	39	8	1	*342*	*9*
Politicians	8	**33**	3	3	0	*47*	*3*
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [3]							
Total	**221**	155	11	3	0	*390*	*11*
Administrators	**202**	130	9	3	0	*344*	*7*
Politicians	19	**25**	2	0	0	*46*	*4*
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [4]							
Total	144	**169**	53	23	0	*389*	*12*
Administrators	139	**142**	42	20	0	*343*	*8*
Politicians	5	**27**	11	3	0	*46*	*4*
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [5]							
Total	21	68	123	**138**	33	*383*	*18*
Administrators	20	54	106	**125**	32	*337*	*14*
Politicians	1	14	**17**	13	1	*46*	*4*
Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas. [6]							
Total	135	**158**	60	34	3	*390*	*11*
Administrators	130	**141**	44	27	1	*343*	*8*
Politicians	5	**17**	16	7	2	*47*	*3*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities. [7]							
Total	100	**186**	68	28	7	*389*	*12*
Administrators	95	**165**	53	23	6	*342*	*9*
Politicians	5	**21**	15	5	1	*47*	*3*

For all statements, 401 surveys were returned: 351 administrator surveys and 50 politician surveys. "*total* Number of responses" plus "*blank*" equals number of surveys returned.

	Number of responses (with **modal** frequencies in bold type)						
	SA	A	N	D	SD	*total*	*blank*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities. [8]							
Total	98	**206**	60	22	4	*390*	*11*
Administrators	91	**184**	46	20	3	*344*	*7*
Politicians	7	**22**	14	2	1	*46*	*4*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems. [9]							
Total	56	**170**	127	37	2	*392*	*9*
Administrators	49	**145**	113	36	2	*345*	*6*
Politicians	7	**25**	14	1	0	*47*	*3*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests. [10]							
Total	131	**216**	36	10	0	*393*	*8*
Administrators	124	**180**	32	10	0	*346*	*5*
Politicians	7	**36**	4	0	0	*47*	*3*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections. [11]							
Total	86	**161**	91	46	0	*384*	*17*
Administrators	81	**147**	68	43	0	*339*	*12*
Politicians	5	14	**23**	3	0	*45*	*5*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries. [12]							
Total	**234**	140	11	5	0	*390*	*11*
Administrators	**219**	112	9	5	0	*345*	*6*
Politicians	15	**28**	2	0	0	*45*	*5*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community. [13]							
Total	**253**	126	10	2	0	*391*	*10*
Administrators	**236**	100	8	2	0	*346*	*5*
Politicians	17	**26**	2	0	0	*45*	*5*

For all statements, 401 surveys were returned: 351 administrator surveys and 50 politician surveys. "*total* Number of responses" plus "*blank*" equals number of surveys returned.

	Number of responses (with modal frequencies in bold type)						
	SA	A	N	D	SD	*total*	*blank*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community. [14]							
Total	162	**191**	25	12	1	*391*	*10*
Administrators	156	**162**	19	8	1	*346*	*5*
Politicians	6	**29**	6	4	0	*45*	*5*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries. [15]							
Total	**224**	153	11	1	1	*390*	*11*
Administrators	**213**	122	8	1	1	*345*	*6*
Politicians	11	**31**	3	0	0	*45*	*5*
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services. [16]							
Total	102	**180**	82	21	0	*385*	*16*
Administrators	92	**160**	71	18	0	*341*	*10*
Politicians	10	**20**	11	3	0	*44*	*6*
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community. [17]							
Total	107	**215**	47	21	2	*392*	*9*
Administrators	101	**192**	36	16	2	*347*	*4*
Politicians	6	**23**	11	5	0	*45*	*5*
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community [18]							
Total	67	**193**	78	46	5	*389*	*12*
Administrators	62	**172**	67	39	5	*345*	*6*
Politicians	5	**21**	11	7	0	*44*	*6*
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [19]							
Total	**180**	**180**	21	9	2	*392*	*9*
Administrators	170	152	14	9	2	*347*	*4*
Politicians	10	**28**	7	0	0	*45*	*5*
The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [20]							
Total	85	**169**	96	38	3	*391*	*10*
Administrators	80	**145**	88	32	1	*346*	*5*
Politicians	5	**24**	8	6	2	*45*	*5*

For all statements, 401 surveys were returned: 351 administrator surveys and 50 politician surveys. "*total* Number of responses" plus "*blank*" equals number of surveys returned.

	Number of responses (with **modal** frequencies in bold type)						
	SA	A	N	D	SD	*total*	*blank*
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [21]							
Total	109	**152**	96	30	3	*390*	*11*
Administrators	107	**140**	81	17	1	*346*	*5*
Politicians	2	12	**15**	13	2	*44*	*6*

For all statements, 401 surveys were returned: 351 administrator surveys and 50 politician surveys. "*total* Number of responses" plus "*blank*" equals number of surveys returned.

APPENDIX F: COMPARISON OF MEANS TO ZERO

	total n	mean	t	significant difference?[152]
Programs & Services variables				
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	327	.5	9.5	yes
Politicians	45	.5	4.2	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.				
Administrators	345	.6	12.4	yes
Politicians	47	.8	7.8	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.				
Administrators	346	1.2	31.0	yes
Politicians	47	1.1	15.0	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.				
Administrators	339	.8	15.2	yes
Politicians	45	.5	4.0	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services.				
Administrators	341	1.0	21.3	yes
Politicians	44	.8	6.5	yes
Community Context variables				
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	344	1.5	48.1	yes
Politicians	46	1.4	16.2	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities.				
Administrators	342	.9	18.7	yes
Politicians	47	.5	3.9	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities.				
Administrators	344	1.0	21.7	yes
Politicians	46	.7	5.4	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.				
Administrators	345	1.6	47.4	yes
Politicians	45	1.3	15.8	yes

---

[152] Significance is reported where p < .05, using a two-tailed t-test, comparing the sample mean to a mean of zero.

	total n	mean	t	significant difference?
Community Context variables (continued)				
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.				
Administrators	346	1.7	55.0	yes
Politicians	45	1.3	15.9	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community.				
Administrators	346	1.3	34.9	yes
Politicians	45	.8	7.1	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries.				
Administrators	345	1.6	50.1	yes
Politicians	45	1.2	14.8	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community.				
Administrators	347	1.1	25.4	yes
Politicians	45	.7	5.2	yes
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community.				
Administrators	345	.7	14.2	yes
Politicians	44	.6	4.0	yes
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	347	1.4	34.9	yes
Politicians	45	1.1	11.6	yes
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	346	1.0	20.6	yes
Politicians	44	0	-.2	no
Revenues variables				
Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas.				
Administrators	342	1.3	30.1	yes
Politicians	47	1.0	9.5	yes
An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	343	1.1	21.9	yes
Politicians	47	.3	2.3	yes
The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas. [153]				
Administrators	346	.8	15.9	yes
Politicians	45	.5	3.5	yes

---

[153] Rapid population growth is considered to limit the amount of immediate revenues available to libraries by redirecting those revenue flows to meet immediate critical needs such as increasing utility infrastructure capacity, etc. Not exclusively a revenue factor, it is inter-related with other complex library issues as well. Indeed, the four issue categories are not exclusive, but are complexly inter-related.

	total n	mean	t	significant difference?
Costs variables				
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	343	1.2	25.2	yes
Politicians	46	.7	6.7	yes
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				
Administrators	337	-.3	-5.0	yes
Politicians	46	0	.2	no

APPENDIX G: COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

		FREQUENCIES[154]						Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?[155]
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total		
Programs & Services									
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	→	49	111	119	48	327		
	Expected	→	*45*	*119*	*115*	*48*			
Politicians	Observed	→	2	25	12	6	45	9.4	yes
	Expected	→	*6*	*17*	*16*	*6*			
Total			51	136	131	54	372		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	151	145	49	345		
	Expected	→	→	*146*	*150*	*49*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	15	25	7	47	2.6	no
	Expected	→	→	*20*	*20*	*7*			
Total				166	170	56	392		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	42	180	124	346		
	Expected	→	→	*41*	*190*	*115*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	4	36	7	47	10.5	yes
	Expected	→	→	*5*	*26*	*16*			
Total				46	216	131	393		

[154] For purposes of chi-square testing, cells were consolidated (in the direction of the arrows) to bring expected cell frequencies to a minimum of five required for the Pearson Chi-Square test of association.

[155] Significance is reported at $p < .05$.

		FREQUENCIES						Pearson	
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Chi-Square	Significant?
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.									
Administrators	Observed	→	43	68	147	81	339		
	Expected	→	41	80	142	76			
Politicians	Observed	→	3	23	14	5	45	21.7	yes
	Expected	→	5	11	19	10			
Total			46	91	161	86	384		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	89	160	92	341		
	Expected	→	→	91	159	90			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	14	20	10	44	.8	no
	Expected	→	→	12	21	12			
Total				103	180	102	385		

133

		FREQUENCIES						Pearson	
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Chi-Square	Significant?
Community Context									
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	142	202	344		
	Expected	→	→	→	149	195			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	27	19	46	5.0	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	20	26			
Total					169	221	390		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	82	165	95	342		
	Expected	→	→	91	163	88			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	21	21	5	47	11.5	yes
	Expected	→	→	12	23	12			
Total				103	186	100	389		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	69	184	91	344		
	Expected	→	→	76	182	86			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	17	22	7	46	7.5	yes
	Expected	→	→	10	24	12			
Total				86	106	98	390		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	126	219	345		
	Expected	→	→	→	138	207			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	30	15	45	15.1	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	18	27			
Total					156	234	390		

134

		FREQUENCIES						Pearson	
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Chi-Square	Significant?
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	110	236	346		
	Expected	→	→	→	*122*	*224*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	28	17	45	16.2	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	*16*	*29*			
Total					138	253	391		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	190	156	346		
	Expected	→	→	→	*203*	*143*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	39	6	45	16.5	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	*26*	*19*			
Total					229	162	391		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	132	213	345		
	Expected	→	→	→	*147*	*198*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	34	11	45	22.6	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	*19*	*26*			
Total					166	224	390		
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	54	192	101	347		
	Expected	→	→	*62*	*190*	*95*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	16	23	6	45	12.7	yes
	Expected	→	→	*8*	*25*	*12*			
Total				70	215	107	392		

		FREQUENCIES						Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total		
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community.									
Administrators	Observed	→	44	67	172	62	345		
	Expected	→	*45*	*69*	*171*	*60*			
Politicians	Observed	→	7	11	21	5	44	1.9	no
	Expected	→	*6*	*9*	*22*	*7*			
Total			51	78	193	67	389		
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	→	177	170	347		
	Expected	→	→	→	*188*	*159*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	→	35	10	45	11.5	yes
	Expected	→	→	→	*24*	*21*			
Total					212	180	392		
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	→	→	99	140	107	346		
	Expected	→	→	*114*	*135*	*97*			
Politicians	Observed	→	→	30	12	2	44	29.9	yes
	Expected	→	→	*15*	*17*	*12*			
Total				129	152	109	390		

136

FREQUENCIES

Revenues

An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?
Administrators	Observed	↑	↑	48	148	146	342		
	Expected	↑	↑	48	159	135		13.4	yes
Politicians	Observed	↑	↑	6	33	8	47		
	Expected	↑	↑	6	22	19			
Total				54	181	154	389		

Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?
Administrators	Observed	↑	↑	72	141	130	343		
	Expected	↑	↑	85	139	119		26.4	yes
Politicians	Observed	↑	↑	25	17	5	47		
	Expected	↑	↑	12	19	16			
Total				97	158	135	390		

The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total	Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?
Administrators	Observed	↑	↑	121	145	80	346		
	Expected	↑	↑	121	150	75		3.8	no
Politicians	Observed	↑	↑	16	24	5	45		
	Expected	↑	↑	16	19	10			
Total				137	169	85	391		

FREQUENCIES								Pearson Chi-Square	Significant?
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	total		
Costs									
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	←	←	62	142	139	343	15.6	yes
	Expected	←	←	67	149	127			
Politicians	Observed	←	←	14	27	5	46		
	Expected	←	←	9	20	17			
Total			76	169	144	389			
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.									
Administrators	Observed	←	157	106	74	→	337	5.8	no
	Expected	←	151	108	78	→			
Politicians	Observed	←	14	17	15	→	46		
	Expected	←	20	15	11	→			
Total		171	123	89	383				

APPENDIX H: NON-PARAMETRIC COMPARISONS
(Mann-Whitney comparison of ranks)

	n	mean rank	sum of ranks	Z	significant?[156]
Programs & Services variables					
Active, aggressive, "no-limits" reference services enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-.4	no
Administrators	327	187.23	61225.5		
Politicians	45	181.17	8152.5		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when libraries provide effective youth services programs that address modern concerns and problems.				-1.6	no
Administrators	345	193.41	66726.0		
Politicians	47	219.19	10302.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when library programs and services are tailored to respond to community interests.				-2.0	yes
Administrators	346	200.72	69449.0		
Politicians	47	169.62	7972.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when public libraries have well stocked and current fiction collections.				-2.6	yes
Administrators	339	197.56	66974.0		
Politicians	45	154.36	6946.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when they have up-to-date technology for information services.				-.9	no
Administrators	341	194.63	66369.5		
Politicians	44	180.35	7935.5		
Community Context variables					
Community interest enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-2.2	yes
Administrators	344	199.44	63253.5		
Politicians	46	166.04	10282.5		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in wealthy communities.				-3.2	yes
Administrators	342	201.39	68877.0		
Politicians	47	148.47	6978.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off in well-educated communities.				-2.5	yes
Administrators	344	200.18	68861.0		
Politicians	46	160.52	7384.0		

---

[156] Significance is reported for Mann-Whitney U z-score at $p<.05$. Significance indicates that there is a statistically significance between mean ranks of responses by group affiliation. Where Mann-Whitney U findings contradict t-test findings, the Mann-Whitney finding is considered more reliable for ordinal level measurements such as those from a typical Likert scale survey instrument like the one used here.

	n	mean rank	sum of ranks	Z	significant?
Community Context variables (continued)					
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are satisfied library customers who are willing to be advocates for libraries.				-3.7	yes
Administrators	345	202.02	69698.5		
Politicians	45	145.48	6546.5		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there are strong, articulate library commissions, Friends groups, and pro-library citizens in the community.				-3.9	yes
Administrators	346	202.75	70153.0		
Politicians	45	144.07	6483.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is a stable economic base in the community.				-4.5	yes
Administrators	346	204.34	70701.0		
Politicians	45	131.89	5935.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially better off when there is vocal public interest in maintaining support of public libraries.				-4.7	yes
Administrators	345	203.96	70367.5		
Politicians	45	130.61	5877.5		
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off when there are poor local economic conditions in the community.				-3.3	yes
Administrators	347	202.65	70318.0		
Politicians	45	149.11	6710.0		
Public libraries in Texas are financially worse off where there are lower education levels in the community.				-1.3	no
Administrators	345	197.49	68134.0		
Politicians	44	175.48	7721.0		
The community's belief in the library's importance to the cultural and educational life of the community enhances the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-3.5	yes
Administrators	347	202.94	70419.0		
Politicians	45	146.87	6609.0		
The political clout of "Big Interests," with whom libraries are not a priority, strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-6.0	yes
Administrators	346	207.05	71640.0		
Politicians	44	104.66	4605.0		

	n	mean rank	sum of ranks	Z	significant?
Revenues variables					
An ever widening funding gap strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-2.7	yes
Administrators	342	200.14	68448.5		
Politicians	47	157.59	7406.5		
Public libraries are poorly funded in Texas.				-4.9	yes
Administrators	343	205.25	70402.0		
Politicians	47	124.32	5843.0		
The cost of rapid population growth strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-1.3	no
Administrators	346	198.58	68708.0		
Politicians	45	176.18	7928.0		
Costs variables					
Demand for costly technology-dependent services strains the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-3.7	yes
Administrators	343	202.14	69334.5		
Politicians	46	141.75	6520.5		
Lower labor costs enhance the financial position of public libraries in Texas.				-2.2	yes
Administrators	337	187.70	63253.5		
Politicians	46	223.53	10282.5		

141