THE INDIRECT APPROACH: A STUDY OF SCHOLARLY USERS OF BLACK AND WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONAL RECORDS IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS MANUSCRIPT DIVISION

JACQUELINE GOGGIN

ABSTRACT: Archivists need to understand better the uses to which archival materials are put, and the role of documentation in the final product. This is especially the case for scholarly research which results in publications that can be systematically analyzed to reveal patterns of use. As one of the largest and most heavily used manuscript repositories in the country, the Library of Congress holds a wealth of information for studying the scholarly use patterns of manuscript collections. An analysis of the scholarly use patterns of thirteen collections of black and women's organizational records over a ten year period revealed that 123 users had published 168 books. Close examination of eighty-five of these books indicated that only thirty-one authors made extensive use of the archival documentation available for their research topics. The results of this study support the findings of other studies of archival use among scholars and suggest that if archivists paid more attention to the users of their collections, current archival administrative practices would need serious modification.

Only recently have archivists begun to acknowledge the deficiencies in current archival administrative practices and to argue that they should pay more attention to the users of archival materials. Generally, archivists do not know how users approach materials, what kinds of questions they are asking, or how they intend to use the materials that they consult. Archivists must begin to understand better the uses to which archival materials are put, and they must continually be aware of current research trends to meet researchers' needs. Elsie Freeman of the National Archives has contended that all aspects of archival administration must begin to focus on the users of the records rather than on the records themselves. Other archivists have pointed out that use patterns of archival materials should be systematically studied to improve collecting policies, appraisal, arrangement, description, reference, access, and outreach.

David Bearman, Richard Lytle, Mary Jo Pugh, and Nancy Sahli have advocated that greater attention be paid to users when collections are processed and finding aids are constructed; user needs, they argue, are generally ignored in arrangement and description. In addition, the Society of American Archivists' Task Forces on Goals and Priorities and on Archives and Society have mandated that archivists undertake user surveys to evaluate current archival programs and to devise ways to increase the use of archival records.[1] Finally, the 1985 SAA Annual Meeting devoted considerable attention to users and user surveys.

This paper will describe the advantages and disadvantages of conducting an indirect survey of users, or a citation study, to determine how scholars have used archival materials. Studies of non-scholarly users present more challenging problems for archivists because the results of their research usually do not lend themselves to publication. In the case of scholarly research that results in publication, however, the author's use of archival materials can be systematically analyzed. This was demonstrated in a pioneering article published in the *American Archivist* in 1981 by Clark A. Elliott, Associate Curator of the Harvard University Archives. Elliott studied patterns of documentation used by historians of science and maintained that studies of users could help to develop a body of theory to clarify appraisal decisions and increase use. He contended that

> If we know what is used and how, by knowing our collections or the universe of documentation, we also know what is not being used. Archivists can never merely react to historians' demands. Citation analysis of manuscripts . . . will help us to know better where our efforts should be placed, and will increase our opportunity to play a creative role in promoting the use of documentary sources that have not been of interest to historians in the past.[2]

Similarly, Frederic Miller, Curator of the Urban Archives at Temple University, conducted a citation analysis of more than 200 recently published articles in social history journals to examine not only the collections social historians used, but also the types of materials they used within these collections.[3] My study was more similar to Miller's, although I owe a debt to Elliott for his pathbreaking efforts.

As one of the largest and most heavily used manuscript repositories in the country, the Library of Congress holds a wealth of information for studying the patterns of use of manuscript collections. Since 1968 the Reference and Reader Service Section of the Manuscript Division has accumulated data on readers and collection usage. In fifteen years information has been collected on approximately 125,000 reader visits. On their first visit and every two years thereafter, readers are required to complete a registration card and indicate the subject or purpose of their research. Call slips, in the form of IBM computer cards, are completed by each reader to identify the title of the collection and the containers requested. Data on the number of times a collection is requested and the number of containers used are compiled annually for each of the approximately 10,000 collections in the custody of the Manuscript Division. These rich and detailed data provide information on use patterns for many different types of collections.

I analyzed the use patterns of black and women's organizational records from 1971 to 1981. The Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress has custody of twenty-five collections of black and women's organizational records, but only thirteen of these collections were available for research during the time period I chose to study. After consultation with numerous archivists and historians and a statistician, I decided to focus on these thirteen collections because of their size, the variety of types of materials they contained, and because of my reference and research experience in black and women's history. These thirteen collections range in size from the records of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which fill more than 3,500 Hollinger boxes, to the records of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, which fill eleven Hollinger boxes. Seven are records of women's organizations and six of black organizations; nine are twentieth century collections; three contain nineteenth and twentieth century materials; and one, the records of the American Colonization Society, contains materials dating from the eighteenth through the twentieth century.

During the period from 1971 to 1981, these thirteen collections were called for 12,202 times. The NAACP records were the most heavily used collection, while the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights records were the least used. To determine who used these collections and how they were used, I pulled all 12,202 call slips, which had been filed by date of use, rather than by collection title. I then arranged the call slips by user; although more than 1,000 call slips had to be omitted because the user's signature was illegible. A computer search was then undertaken to determine whether or not these users had published books. Although I presumed that the majority of these users were scholars and that a large percentage had published books, this proved not to be the case. Of the total number of users of these collections (924), the majority, more than 800, had in fact not published books. Many have undoubtedly completed dissertations, published articles, or are working on books that will be published in the future, but limitations of time prevented me from analyzing the patterns of use in articles and dissertations. However, it appears that the Manuscript Division may be serving many more non-scholarly researchers than was previously thought to be the case.

The computer search revealed 168 books published by 123 users of these thirteen collections; fifty-three books in women's history, eighty-three books in black history, and thirty-two books in other fields. Authors in the last category generally used black and women's organizational records for comparative purposes, or to supplement information gathered primarily from other sources.[4]

I read eighty-five of these 168 books and completed a detailed analysis on the patterns of use of archival materials: twenty-six in women's history; forty-two in black history; and seventeen in other fields. The books I read were chosen randomly—they were the ones that were available on the library shelves during the time when I worked on this study. Of these eighty-five books, one covered the eighteenth through the twentieth century, one was devoted to the eighteenth and nineteenth century, twelve focused on the nineteenth century, twenty-one covered the nineteenth and twentieth century, and fifty were devoted to the twentieth century. Nine books were intended to interest primarily popular, non-scholarly audiences, and eight were documentary source books. About one-fourth of the books were biographies. Scholars in black history

tended to study institutions, organizations, geographical regions, and individual communities much more than those in women's history or other fields. Similarly, scholars in black history focused to a greater extent on social history. Historians of women focused much more on studies of movements, particularly the women's rights movement. Ten of the twenty-six books in women's history that I read dealt with suffrage or the equal rights movement after 1920. This no doubt reflects the nature of the women's organizational records in this study.

That only thirty-one of the books that I read made extensive use of the archival documentation available for their particular research topics was determined by comparing the footnotes in a publication with the call slips the author filled out when conducting research at the Library of Congress. The evaluation as to what was well documented was necessarily subjective, but it was made by analyzing the role of documentation in the final product to determine whether or not the authors made use of the great variety of primary source materials available to them. In other words, I judged the authors by how well they used the collections of organizational records they cited—by the quality of use. This was a difficult and tedious process because I had to translate box numbers on call slips to record series and folder titles described in the finding aids to these collections. The lack of uniformity in footnoting practices also presented problems. I felt confident, though, to make judgements about which books were well documented because I have conducted research in all thirteen of these collections of black and women's organizational records, either by answering mail and telephone reference questions, assisting researchers in the reading room, or in my own work.

Perhaps a couple examples may help to illustrate what I mean by quality of use. In a book on the origins of the Equal Rights Amendment, historian Susan D. Becker relied much more on the personal papers of leaders of the National Women's Party, rather than on the organization's records. The general correspondence is chronologically arranged and is quite voluminous. Because Becker only sampled this correspondence, she missed several important subjects that were not documented in the personal papers of National Woman's Party leaders. Historian Ellen Du Bois, also writing on the women's movement, used the records of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, as well as the personal papers of its leaders, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.[5]

Generally, authors of books that were well documented posed challenging new questions and advanced illuminating interpretations based upon exhaustive research in a variety of types of archival sources. While archival sources were used to some extent by the majority of authors in my study, they were used primarily to supplement information available in published sources. Most authors used published secondary sources, such as books and articles, and published primary sources, such as government documents, edited collections of speeches and correspondence, newspapers, periodicals, autobiographies, and other contemporary monographs. Several authors in my study looked at black and women's organizational records at the Library of Congress and did not cite them in their books, presumably because they found nothing of value.

My analysis included all the types of materials a particular author used, whether or not the materials were culled from the thirteen collections of

organizational records, so that I would be able to determine what types of materials these authors found most valuable. The frequency with which archival materials were cited in these publications reveals that correspondence, reports, minutes, newspaper clippings, speeches, diaries and journals, memoranda, oral histories and interviews, and unpublished writings were used to a much greater extent that other types of materials. Subject files, organizational branch files, legal files, case files, membership, financial, and personnel files were used less frequently. Surprisingly, seven authors used photographs to document their interpretations. Several authors used maps and artifacts in this way. Personal papers were cited with greater frequency than were organizational records. Authors who focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth century tended to use a greater variety of archival sources because the needed documentation from a single type of source was not available in great quantity for this period. Scholars in black history tended to use a greater variety of sources than did those in women's history or other fields. Perhaps this is because the oral nature of black culture requires that scholars in black history use interdisciplinary research methods to gather information. Another reason may be that societal racism, until recently, discouraged the collection of black archival sources, at least by white repositories. While a similar argument may be made about sexism and the collection of archival sources on women, scholars in women's history whose work I studied did not use as great a variety of archival sources. Perhaps this is because the field of women's history is still not as mature as black history. Much of the research for the books in women's history that I studied was done before the availability of Andrea Hinding's *Women's History Sources*, while a similar guide, *Directory of Afro-American Resources*, by Walter Schatz, has been available since 1970. Previous studies of the ways in which historians have learned about the availability of archival sources have indicated that researchers do not use published guides. Limitations of time and the scope of this study prevented me from devising a questionnaire to determine how the authors in my study obtained information on the availability of source materials for their research topics.[6]

This study has limitations because it focuses on a small sample of scholarly users who published books in black and women's history, and I do not intend to generalize for all scholarly users; nevertheless, the results that I obtained support the findings of other studies of scholarly use of archival materials. A survey of historians conducted by Margaret Steig revealed that they used printed sources to a greater extent than manuscript materials.[7] Francis X. Blouin, Jr., surveyed articles in *Business History Review* from 1977 to 1981 and found that only about seven per cent used corporate archives to any great extent.[8] Similarly, archivists and historians gathered in 1978 to discuss scholarly use and disposition of senatorial papers, pointed out that these collections get very little use.[9] Leonard Rapport, formerly of the National Archives, found that few scholarly researchers used the National Labor Relations Board Case Files in the National Archives; most preferred to use the published reports and decisions.[10] State archives are also underutilized by scholars, who comprise only a small percentage of their users.[11] Arthur Breton, curator of the Archives of American Art, surveyed users from 1980 to 1982 and found that only 13 percent were academic researchers.[12] Although I suspect that the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress attracts a higher proportion of scholarly users

than most repositories, these scholars are not consulting archival sources to the degree that I would have expected. Career pressures to publish or perish, shrinking travel budgets and graduate student enrollments, and just plain laziness may account for the lack of extensive use of archival sources. It is simply much easier to rely on printed sources available in one's own university library.

It has been my experience that scholars, especially older, well-established, and more experienced scholars, turn to reference archivists for assistance only reluctantly. Furthermore, younger scholars are not trained to do research in graduate school. In my judgment, a primary factor accounting for the lack of use of archival sources by historians is poor training.[13] Reference archivists are — or should be — teachers, instructing scholars in the use of primary source materials and finding aids to individual collections. No doubt, as Elsie Freeman has suggested, scholars have difficulty using finding aids primarily because these tools are constructed for archivists, rather than for researchers.[14] Nevertheless, if scholars conducted research as well as they could, scholarly publications would be vastly improved.

Other factors may account for the limited use of archival sources by scholarly researchers. First, knowledge of the availability of sources may not be as readily accessible as archivists may claim. Scholars make little use of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*, for example, to learn about sources. This resource is difficult to use, and most scholars do not bother searching its numerous indexes. Announcements of recent acquisitions in scholarly journals help, but archivists might consider going beyond this simple tactic to interact with scholars at their professional meetings. Since unpublished research papers are presented at these meetings, archivists can easily find out what is currently being studied and then inform researchers about the availability of relevant archival sources. Archivists must also acknowledge that, in some cases, printed sources of information are in fact better than archival sources for certain studies. Archival sources may not provide the answers to the questions the scholar is asking. Archivists must also acknowledge that there will always be an imbalance between the use of printed and archival sources by scholarly researchers.[15]

The sheer bulk of twentieth century collections frequently prevents extensive use by scholars. In bibliographical essays on sources used, several authors included in my study indicated that the vast quantity of sources and the size of collections available for use was a deterrent to intelligent use. Barbara Joyce Ross, who wrote a biography of one of the founders of the NAACP, found the NAACP records extremely difficult to use. She noted that

> Even with the aid of the most modern research equipment, the sheer vastness of the manuscript collections associated with a study of a large scale organization like the NAACP presents a major problem . . . . One must somehow find a familiarity with the archive which will permit sweeping yet valid statements regarding, for example, Board attendance over an extended period, or participation in the annual business meetings . . .[16]

Scholars in other fields have also cited this problem; at the same time, however, they are reluctant to recommend destruction of records to make collections smaller and more usable.[17]

The level of processing may also affect use. Many of the thirteen collections of organizational records that I studied are not processed to a level that encourages easy use across all series. That historians in this study primarily used correspondence, reports, and minutes is accounted for because of the narrative quality of these types of materials. They are easier to work with — the documents speak for themselves, enabling the historian to reconstruct events or acquire discrete facts and information. Membership and financial records, and case files are more difficult to use. Historians must draw scattered bits of information and facts from numerous files, compile them, and then analyze them to reach conclusions. These records are not lacking in information value, but the information in them is undigested. These records are generally not processed to the same level as correspondence, minutes, and reports, and that may also account for their lack of use. Each new accession in records of ongoing organizations is larger and used less frequently than records created earlier. Although it could be argued that subsequent acquisitions are not used as much because many scholars are not yet studying the recent past, I suspect that the bulk of these records and their level of processing also deter use. Since most scholars rely on correspondence and other narrative materials to a far greater extent than any other types of documents, perhaps archivists should consider devoting greater attention to detailed and refined processing and description of these series; other record series that are not used as frequently could be given less processing. Of course, if record series that are not used as frequently were processed to a greater extent, they might be used more often. Archivists shape research trends not only by what they collect, but by how they describe these materials.

To ensure that the information obtained from a use study will be employed to make changes in current archival administrative practices, archivists must have support from supervisors and administrators. Some of the conclusions generated from my study have led Manuscript Division officials to reevaluate the current policy of acquiring records of ongoing organizations. They think a better alternative might be to recommend that the organizations establish their own archives. Another option might be the development of more rigorous appraisal standards. Reevaluation of arrangement and description and reference procedures has not been undertaken, and there is room for a great deal of improvement.

Use studies can provide information essential for evaluating collecting policies, appraisal, arrangement and description, reference, access, and outreach. Such studies provide information on types of users and patterns of archival use. But archivists must improve their collection of data on users before a use study can be conducted. Fortunately, the Manuscript Division at the Library of Congress collects extensive information on users, although it has traditionally been used only to report to Congress, not to improve current archival administrative practices. While most repositories collect some information on users, archivists do not systematically analyze this information. Even if repositories currently collect information only on the archival collections that are used, they also can determine what is not being used and take the next step to ascertain why this pattern has developed. Reference statistics must be improved to include information other than the number of patrons served each year and the number of collections used. Most repositories ask users to specify their requests

for archival materials at the box, folder, or item level. Although this information is used primarily for security purposes, if at all, it can and should be used to analyze which parts of collections are being consulted. The same series may be used over and over again, while other series remain neglected.

Use records generally do not include statistics on archivists' use of collections to answer telephone and mail requests. Although some repositories record aggregate figures, such as the total number of requests responded to, most do not keep or systematically analyze the information regarding what collections were consulted to answer these requests. Two exceptions of which I am aware are the Northwestern University Archives and the College of William and Mary Archives. James W. Oberly, formerly the Assistant Archivist at William and Mary, conducted a self-study on the impact of finding aids on reference service to patrons, most of whom were college staff, alumni and genealogists. He found that the archives' staff were the major users of the archives. Patrick Quinn, of Northwestern, also found this to be the case. Quinn keeps very detailed data on the users of Northwestern University archives.[18]Good reference archivists can usually tell you what collections are the most popular and the topics that have been successfully researched in the repository's holdings, but this information must be analyzed further.

Information obtained from researchers in the reference interview should be recorded and systematically reviewed for use patterns and trends. If the expected product of the research is a publication, archivists may request a copy and read it. Exit interviews with researchers are also helpful. Reference archivists should ask researchers to evaluate finding aids for accuracy, completeness, level of description, and usability. Collections with high or low research value for particular topics should be noted in finding aids and card catalogs.[19] If particular types of collections are not being used, archivists should try to find out why this is the case. If their use has been promoted and they are still not used, archivists might consider deaccessioning as a collection management tool. If expected research value is low, archivists might consider not accessioning the records.[20]

In order to make intelligent appraisal decisions, archivists must be aware of who their users are, what research projects they are pursuing, what questions they intend to ask of archival materials, and what the product of the research will be. Knowledge of who users actually are can give sharper focus to collecting policies. Developing a clearly defined collecting policy is the first step in the appraisal process. Collecting policies are determined in part by the users whom archivists are mandated to serve. Archivists cannot accurately evaluate the research value of materials they collect if they cannot predict how, and by whom, they will be used. Currently appraisal decisions are based on the value of information and the possible future uses of the records. If archivists knew more precisely how materials similar to those that they are appraising are used or not used, their appraisal decisions might be significantly affected. I am not advocating that archivists appraise records only with expected or potential researchers in mind. Archivists must collect a representative sample of records that document all aspects of society, but more attention must be paid to the way in which records already accessioned have been used.[21]

Archivists can learn a great deal from the use studies conducted by librarians. For years our library colleagues have turned to use studies to provide in-

formation for collection management. Librarians also face budgetary and space constraints and desire to use their resources to maximize the use of available research material. Generally, these studies fall into four categories: studies of a single institution and its users; studies of a particular component of a single institution (users and subject catalogs, for example); studies of users by type of library (community college libraries, for example); and studies by types of material used (government documents or books in research libraries). Librarians rely on questionnaires and interviews, for the most part, to gather information. Surprisingly, however, they are not interested in the products resulting from use. Librarians want to know whether or not patrons obtained the desired information, but not what the patrons did with it. However, there has been no coordination of use studies among librarians and many have complained that this has led to duplication of effort.[22] Archivists face the same danger if they conduct more use studies but do not widely disseminate the results and share information.

Future studies of users of archival repositories, especially scholarly users, might combine the indirect and direct approaches — both a citation study and questionnaires and interviews — to obtain more fruitful results. There are several disadvantages in only using a citation study without analyzing use data to determine what collections the researcher examined at a particular repository. A simple count of the number of citations cannot measure the quality of use, or whether or not the researcher found what he or she expected to find in the archival sources. Scholarly users may look at numerous collections and find nothing of value for their particular research topic. Questionnaires and interviews would reveal if this were the case. On the other hand, a researcher could make numerous meaningless citations to archival sources to dress-up the footnotes in a scholarly publication. The publication must be read and analyzed to determine the quality of use.

When more studies of scholarly users are conducted, it will be easier for archivists to interpret and measure the quality of use. Several people, for example, when reading the results of my study, were surprised that so many of the users of black and women's organizational records had published at all. They were also impressed by the fact that more than one-third of these users had written well documented books. In other words, their expectations were not as high as mine and thus they interpreted the results of my study differently.

Studies of users whose research does not result in publications will have to be conducted through interviews and questionnaires. The data gathered from these studies will be much more difficult to interpret and analyze because the quality of use cannot be measured. In this case, archivists, like librarians, will have to be satisfied just knowing whether or not the researcher found the needed information in the archival sources they used.

Surely the patterns of use of archival sources change over time. This is especially the case among historians, and this might be true of other scholarly researchers as well. Twenty years ago public records were virtually unused by historians. Their interest in studying society from the "bottom up" prompted them to make use of land, tax, and court records and census data to study the masses. When archivists become more sophisticated in analyzing and examining the users of their collections, future studies might consider how use changes over time. They might compare users at several different repositories, users in

various scholarly disciplines, or scholarly users and administrative users to determine whether or not there are differences in patterns of use.[23] Only when such studies have been conducted will archivists be able to accumulate the information necessary to increase use and to guide the profession to provide better service to all users of archival repositories.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Jacqueline Goggin is coeditor of the J. Franklin Jameson Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. The research for this study was conducted at the Bentley Historical Library's Research Seminar for the Study of Modern Archives during the Summer of 1984. This essay is a revised version of a paper presented at the meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Austin, Texas, October 1985.

FOOTNOTES

1. Elsie T. Freeman, "In the Eye of the Beholder: Archival Administration from the User's Point of View," *American Archivist* 47 (Spring 1984): 111-23; David Bearman, "Automated Access to Archival Information: Assessing Systems," *American Archivist* 42 (Spring 1979): 179-190; Richard H. Lytle, "Intellectual Access to Archives: Provenance and Content Indexing Methods of Subject Retrieval," *American Archivist* 43 (Spring 1980): 64-75; and part 2, *American Archivist* 43 (Summer 1980): 191-207; Mary Jo Pugh, The Illusion of Omniscence: Subject Access and the Reference Archivist," *American Archivist* 45 (Winter 1982): 33-44; and Nancy Sahli, "Finding Aids: A Multi-Media Systems Perspective," *American Archivist* 44 (Winter 1981): 15-20. Also see, *Planning for the Archival Profession: A Report of the Society of American Archivists Task Force on Goals and Priorities* Preliminary Draft, (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1984), pp. 38-51.
2. Clark A. Elliott, "Citation Patterns and Documentation for the History of Science: Some Methodological Considerations," *American Archivist* 44 (Spring 1981): 143-150.
3. Frederic Miller, "Use, Appraisal, and Research: A Case Study of Social History," (Unpublished paper in the author's possession).
4. Persons interested in a bibliography of books read for this study may obtain it by writing the author at the J. Franklin Jameson Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.
5. See Susan D. Becker, *The Origins of the Equal Rights Amendment: American Feminism between the Wars* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981); and Ellen Carol Du Bois, *Feminism and Suffrage* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).
6. Michael Stevens, "The Historian and Archival Finding Aids," *Georgia Archive* 5 (Winter 1977): 69-74; and Margaret Steig, "The Information of [sic] Needs of Historians," *College and Research Libraries* 42 (November 1981): 549-560.
7. Steig, "The Information Needs of Historians."
8. Francis X. Blovin, Jr. "An Agenda for the Appraisal of Business Records," in *Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance*, ed. Nancy Peace (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1984) p. 71.
9. *Proceedings of the Conference on Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers*, ed. Richard A. Baker (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senate Historical Office, 1978).
10. Leonard Rapport, "In the Valley of Decision: What to Do about the Multitude of Files of Quasi Cases," *American Archivist* 48 (Spring 1985): 173-189.
11. *Documenting America: Assessing the Condition of Historical Records in the United States*, ed. Lisa Weber (Albany, N.Y.: National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators, in cooperation with the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, 1983), p. 8.
12. Information on this study may be obtained from Arthur Breton, Curator, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

13. Most graduate programs in history emphasize a mastery of historiographical literature in a variety of fields. Students are trained to read and evaluate historical literature but not to conduct primary research, and most historical methods courses do not require students to complete research papers utilizing a variety of archival sources. Some scholars never learn to do primary research; others learn only after years of trial and error. Reference archivists, moreover, are frequently intimidated by scholars and hesitate to teach them how to make better use of the repository. See Walter Rundell, *In Pursuit of American History: Research and Training in the United States* (Norman, OK.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970).
14. Freeman, "Eye of the Beholder," pp. 114-118.
15. Meyer H. Fishbein, "A Viewpoint on Appraisal of National Records," *American Archivist* 33 (April 1970): 175-187.
16. Barbara Joyce Ross, *J. E. Spingarn and the Rise of the NAACP* (New York: Atheneum Press, 1972), p. ix.
17. See comments by historians William Leuchtenberg, Richard Lowitt, and Martha Swain in Baker, *Proceedings*.
18. See James W. Oberly, "The Value of Finding Aids: A Quantitative Analysis," (Unpublished paper presented at the Spring 1983 meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, New Brunswick, N.J., in possession of the author); and Goggin, interview with Patrick Quinn, August 1, 1984, Northwestern University archives, Evanston, Il.
19. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference and the Society of American Archivists have established awards for finding aids that can be promoted and used as models for the archival profession.
20. Leonard Rapport, "No Grandfather Clause: Reappraising Accessioned Records," *American Archivist* 44 (Spring 1981): 143-150; and Linda J. Henry, "Collecting Policies of Special Subject Repositories," *American Archivist* 43 (Summer 1980): 57-63.
21. Freeman, "Eye of the Beholder," pp. 121-122.
22. See for example: Margaret Brown, *The Use Made of the Subject Catalog by the Graduate Students in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Library, 1946); Pamela Fisher and Margaret Slater, *The Use Made of Technical Libraries* (London: Aslib, 1969); *The Use of Social Sciences Literature*, ed. N. Roberts (Boston: Butterworth 1977); Mary Angela Hall, *The Use and Value of Citations: A State of the Art Report* (London: Institution of Electrical Engineers, 1970); New York Library Association, College and University Libraries Section, *Use, Mis-Use, and Non-Use of Academic Libraries* (New York: New York Library Association, 1970); Pauline Thomas and H. East, *The Use of Bibliographic Records in Libraries* (London: Aslib, 1969); Herman Howe Fussler, *Patterns in the Use of Books in Large Research Libraries* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961); Kenneth W. Allen, *The Use of Community College Libraries* (Hamden, C.T.: Linnet Books, 1971); and Peter Hernon, *Use of Government Document Publications by Social Scientists* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1979).
23. Many of these suggestions are made in Chapter 6, "Research in Documentation: Needs and Opportunities," in the final report of the Joint Committee on Archives of Science and Technology. See, *Documentation of the History of Post-War Science and Technology in the United States*, ed. Clark A. Elliott (Prepared by the Joint Committee on Archives of Science and Technology, in cooperation with the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, 1983).