

brary PR Award. Prospective entrants should know that contest winners this year such as the UC Irvine Library and the National Geographic Society Library mentioned that they found this packet to be most useful in preparing their entries. The contest guidelines and rules described in this packet are intended to steer entrants toward winning an award.

An ideal public relations program includes the essential elements of healthy staff relations, a commitment to serving the public, marketing, publicity and creativity. Yet, successful public relations is involved even more in the somewhat intangible realm of having a genuinely positive attitude toward the public and in the domain of having an innovative concept of management. All libraries literally have some sort of "relations" with the public. Public relations in the context of this discussion though, means having a deliberate, systematic and planned approach to maintaining or improving the relationship between the library and specifically

identified groups.

The UC Irvine Library serves as a noteworthy example of how well academic libraries can do in this contest with the creative management of a seemingly commonplace library activity like publishing brochures, guides and newsletters. Only a small number of the estimated 5,443 academic libraries in the U.S. and Canada have entered the contest since 1980.³ As the accompanying tables indicate, however, academic libraries entering the contest perform far better than the typical contest entry in other categories. Although the contest employs no quota systems for different categories of entrants, academic libraries experience an above-average chance of winning awards in this PR award contest. ■■

³American Library Association, Library Administration and Management Association. *A Market Overview of the John Cotton Dana Library Public Relations Award Contest*. Unpublished, internal document. Chicago: ALA, 1984.



Overlapping viewpoints

By Paul Mosher

*Deputy Director of Libraries
Stanford University*

The point that Jeffrey Larson makes about the desirability of overlap among smaller instructional collections is well taken (*C&RL News*, October 1985, pp.486-87). It seems obvious to me that the smaller the collection the greater the probability, and even the desirability, of overlap—particularly in instructional components—of the collection.

But my point was not that smaller libraries should reduce the levels of duplication in their instructional collections. I would argue quite the reverse. My point was to emphasize the benefits of collaboration and resource sharing among libraries in the support of their *research*, not their *curricu-*

lar, efforts. We all realize that the research components of our universities require us to develop research collections of lesser or little used materials in many fields. These materials may not need to be duplicated as heavily if we are better aware both of the patterns of acquisition and the strengths of existing holdings of other libraries in some of these areas where we are pressed continually to expand our research holdings.

It behooves large libraries to examine this issue carefully and determine the degree to which overlap in collecting may be desirable, and hopefully to arrange patterns of collecting which tend to take advantage of the strength of other libraries' collections.

So I think Larson has misconstrued my point, without it in any way damaging the substance of the points he makes about instructional collections in smaller libraries. His conclusion that the finding of less-than-expected overlap among instructional collections should give collection developers pause about what direction they should pursue in strengthening these libraries is an excellent one and should be made. ■■