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HERBERT S. WHITE

Perceptions by Educators and Administrators of the Ranking of Library School Programs

A study was undertaken to determine professional perception of highest-quality library education programs. The survey, which was distributed to all full-time faculty members at library schools with programs accredited by the American Library Association, drew responses from 56 of 69 schools, and 259 faculty members. The questionnaire, which was also distributed to the directors of ARL libraries and drew responses from more than 50 percent, sought to determine perception rankings of excellence in four categories: quality of master's program, quality of doctoral program for the preparation of educators, quality of doctoral program for the preparation of administrators, and contribution to the profession by the faculty as a whole. Results are compared with those of earlier, smaller sample studies, and suggestions for further research to examine the common characteristics of schools generally perceived as being of high quality are advanced. It is suggested that an examination of these qualities in highly perceived schools can lead to a meaningful upgrading of present evaluative standards.

INTRODUCTION

Studies that attempt to determine rankings in the perception of the quality of academic programs have in the past aroused a considerable amount of controversy and criticism. In their studies of 1973 and 1975 Blau and Margulies undertook to rank the reputations of American professional schools. Their studies (which they called "the pecking order of the elite") included library schools along with sixteen other professional fields, and they encountered categorical opposition to ranking in any form, no matter how determined. They also received objections to the use of perceptions as a measurement, since critics pointed out that perceptions are not measures of quality.

With a specific orientation toward graduate library education, Carpenter and Carpenter encountered the same objections, plus the one that some of the individuals questioned declined to answer because they did not feel qualified to do so. The respondents claimed not to know, or they believed that nobody could know. Norton, who attempted to elicit information concerning the ranking of various degree specializations, encountered similar objections. She also met the argument that all accredited schools of library education were, because of their accreditation, assumed to be good in all areas of library education.

Criticisms of perception studies as a ranking of academic quality have considerable validity, and conclusions from such studies must be drawn with caution. Blau found that older and distinguished schools would tend to do well, in part simply because of their longevity. He found, for example, that Ivy League schools ranked high in virtually
all categories of graduate education, and surmised that this might be because these schools are assumed to be good in everything they do. While only one Ivy League institution offers graduate library education, library education is probably also susceptible to such assumptions because, as in other professional disciplines, there are well-known library schools with long and distinguished histories. It could be argued that such schools will continue to receive votes based on their past reputations, even if they no longer deserve to. Conversely, schools with relatively new or innovative programs may not immediately get the recognition that they deserve. Also, since professional perception studies involve graduates of these same programs, it may be that the larger schools, with a substantial pool of distinguished or influential alumni, will do well simply because of loyalty. While techniques could be devised to eliminate the possibility of alumni voting for their own schools, such techniques would be difficult to administer. They would also carry with them their own bias, in that schools with large alumni groups would now be penalized. Finally, any evaluation that combines schools across national borders (as this present study does in mingling American and Canadian accredited schools) inevitably raises an additional problem. In any survey distributed to educators and administrators who are predominantly American, the Canadian schools will suffer. This is not because of any inherent bias, but rather because the transborder flow of professional librarians and library educators is inhibited by the governmental policies of both nations. As a result, professionals in one country do not really know a great deal about the library education programs in another, and the generally low ranking of Canadian schools in this survey must be considered with caution. The phenomenon is not one-sided. A recently published evaluation of library education programs that queried only Canadians resulted in a ranking of programs that excluded American programs. Despite vociferous objection to perception ranking studies, they have continued and even proliferated. Attempts have been made to explain, qualify, and modify, but the use of perception ranking surveys has continued. Ladd and Lipset published their survey of faculty ratings by faculty members in the Chronicle of Higher Education, but their study of nineteen fields did not include library education. In his 1979 article, Gerhan examined some of the reasons for the continuing emphasis on perception studies. He concluded that “quality may be an intangible commodity, eluding empirical calculation, and prestige may be a chimera. Nevertheless, quality and prestige are among the most important intangibles that this whole world has created.”

It may be that, despite concern and opposition, and granting their shortcomings, perception studies are, in academia, measurements of academic excellence, since reward and recognition in this environment come through acceptance by one’s peers. This thought has been articulated by a number of educators, perhaps most directly by George H. Callcott, former vice-chancellor for academic affairs at the University of Maryland. The concept is thought-provoking. Since faculty considering a change, students selecting a school, guidance counselors advising on career options, and employers evaluating candidates all act on the basis of perceptions, it can be argued that these perceptions become the reality on which all major decisions are based. For example, it would follow that Harvard Law School is excellent not because anyone has devised a universally accepted proof but because legal professionals, from law students to Supreme Court justices, assume it is, and act on that basis. The argument can be extended to library education. Doctoral students considering job offers must and do make perception judgments about schools at which they might want to teach, and prospective students looking for “good” schools must make similar judgments.

While many of the criticisms of perception ranking studies have centered on their nonqualitative and nonscientific nature, studies that have attempted to rank educational programs by less subjective criteria have also encountered criticism. The work of Gourman, which evaluates combinations of such factors as administration, faculty instruction, faculty research
and publication, library resources, student admission policies and scholarships, budgets, and physical plant facilities, has come under criticism no less severe, and his ranking of library education programs has caused reactions of surprise, shock, and outrage that differ little from the emotional reactions to perceptions studies.

It may be that qualitative rankings that will generally be acceptable by all are beyond our grasp. It may be that administrators of schools highly rated will praise a study that salutes them as wise and astute, and that those ranked lower than expected will criticize it as biased and unscientific. There are also those who would just as soon forget the whole thing, who would prefer no studies of any kind. These individuals frequently contend that evaluation is impossible because nobody knows enough to evaluate. It is the last argument with which this writer takes issue. While the struggle to improve ranking techniques can never end, it cannot be abdicated. As professionals, we owe students and employers confronted by a bewildering array of programs and claims some indication of what we know, or at least of what we believe.

RATIONALE FOR STUDY

The reasons for undertaking this study are quite simple and direct. The studies by Blau and Margulies serve as the basis for those who now quote the results of library perception studies. The studies suffer in part because they are now seven years old, and much has happened in the intervening period in library education. The number of accredited schools has increased, the number of doctoral programs has grown, curricula have changed substantially, and the number of students and faculty has declined. None of this is reflected in these studies, and later studies of perceptions of quality in higher education have not included library education programs. The Blau studies also suffer because they report only the perceptions of library education administrators. It is quite possible that others (such as teachers or library administrators) might have different perceptions. Finally, the samples are small and, as a result, only a slight change in votes received could make a substantial difference in the rankings. For example, schools are publicized by Blau and Margulies in tenth place because they received four votes from among thirty-four respondents, a highly shaky premise for inclusion. Schools that received two or three additional votes are ranked with the "elite," while schools that received one less vote are anonymous. If perceptions are going to be quoted, then those doing the quoting should have access to more recent information, based on larger and broader survey populations.

A number of this study's respondents commented that a genuine study of quality in library education would be preferable to a study of perceptions, which the respondents considered simplistic. This writer agrees. He has already argued in other writings that genuine qualitative rankings for library education are needed and that they do not presently exist. Moreover, he has put forth the contention that the present accreditation procedures do not serve to measure or ensure quality. The present process tends to be self-adjusting, to accredit what is rather than what should be. Finally, this writer is concerned that, in the absence of quality controls, the library education profession will become the victim of its own version of Gresham's law, under which poorer educational programs will ultimately drive out the better ones. Lower quality is both cheaper and easier, and unless there is some recognition of and credit for superior programs, the easy path will prove the attractive one.

However, scientifically based quality studies are not easy to do, and if done they are not always accepted any more readily than perception studies. One of the hoped-for outcomes of this study is that, to the extent to which a small cluster of schools is consistently perceived to be of highest quality, other researchers might wish to identify factors that these programs have in common. These factors can then serve as the basis of a much-needed revision, clarification, and tightening of accreditation standards. The application of new standards can then serve to protect the quality of library education, a goal to which published rankings aspire, at least in part, through the public recognition they provide.
Conduct of the Study

Since the study sought to measure perceptions, or "gut reactions," a simple questionnaire was considered desirable. Moreover, for reasons already stated, the investigator wanted to encourage the broadest possible response from library educators, and not just from library school administrators. No valid, accurate list of faculty in residence at the sixty-nine accredited library schools exists at the time of publication. The list compiled by the Association of American Library Schools and published in the *Journal of Education for Librarianship* is in fact the previous year's roster. Moreover, there is no way of knowing what faculty members are on sabbatical or other leaves at any given time. As a result, the investigator chose the simple option of distributing questionnaire forms to the deans and directors of the accredited library schools, with the request that the questionnaires be made available to those faculty members willing to respond.

Respondents were asked to answer the following four questions:

1. Please list as many as, but not more than, ten schools in the United States and Canada (but excluding the institution with which you are presently affiliated) that, in your judgment, provide the highest-quality education for librarianship at the master's level. Please do not rank-order your responses.

2. Please list as many as, but not more than, five schools in the United States and Canada (but excluding the institution with which you are presently affiliated) that, in your judgment, provide the highest-quality preparation at the doctoral level for students prepared to enter the field of library education. Please do not rank-order your responses.

3. Please list as many as, but not more than, five schools in the United States and Canada (but excluding the institution with which you are presently affiliated) that, in your judgment, provide the highest-quality preparation at the doctoral level for students prepared to assume responsibilities as library administrators. Please do not rank-order your responses.

4. Please list as many as, but not more than, ten schools in the United States and Canada (but excluding the institution with which you are presently affiliated) whose faculties, taken as a whole, presently contribute most significantly to the advancement of the profession through research, publication, and leadership. Please do not rank-order your responses.

The restriction against allowing faculty to vote for the schools at which they were presently teaching is a fairly standard control against self-advancement, which was ultimately applied by Blau and Margulies (although they argued it made little difference). Since no school's faculty are allowed to vote for their own institutions, the injunction tends to be self-canceling. However, it avoids the garnering of "cheap" votes since, in order to be named, you must have impressed somebody else. As will be shown in the analysis, this injunction had its desired effect of "weeding." More than half of the schools received virtually no recognition of "highest quality" from any of their colleagues, although "highest quality" does not necessarily mean absence of acceptable quality. Preventing votes for schools at which the respondent had previously worked or which he or she had attended was considered and rejected, in part because it would have been impossible to monitor in part because it would have; in an attempt to eliminate a possible advantage for large schools with many alumni, created a disadvantage for these same schools.

The same four questions (without the injunction against self-selection) were distributed to the 105 directors of the libraries listed in May 1979 as members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). This group was chosen not only because it was a cohesive and identifiable group, but also because as representatives of major employers the perceptions of these administrators would have a significant impact on the actions of their and other institutions in employing the graduates of library education programs. In addition, it was considered useful to determine whether differences in perception between educators and administrators existed, and, if so, what these were. By themselves, responses from ARL administrators would have provided a different but no larger sample than the Blau studies.
It was the investigator's intent to use these responses only as a comparison against the larger educator survey.

**Response Levels**

Responses were received from 59 of the 105 ARL library administrators, or 56.2 percent. No follow-up with nonrespondents was attempted, because no record was kept of who responded and who did not. A few individuals did write to indicate why they would not participate: because they felt unqualified to judge, because they disapproved of perception studies, or because (in the case of governmental librarians) they felt it improper that they should participate. Under these circumstances, 56.2 percent is considered an acceptable level of response. Responses were received from 56 of the 69 library schools surveyed, or 81.2 percent, a response level that the investigator considered highly satisfactory given the high level of opposition encountered by earlier investigators, and the historic concerns about participating in such surveys. Because cooperation within each faculty was, of course, voluntary, the individual response level was lower, with 259 returned questionnaires. It is, as indicated earlier, impossible to determine what level of response this represents, since the size of the total population cannot be precisely determined. Surveys undertaken by and for AALS suggest that this response rate represents approximately 40 percent, adjusting for unavailability on the campus at any given time because of leaves of absence. This response level represents not only an updating and broadening, but also a fivefold increase over the population levels achieved in previous studies, in particular those by Blau and Margulies still being cited. Moreover, the actual response level, while certainly significant in any case for the drawing of conclusions, was not a significant factor in results and survey rankings. Responses were tabulated as they were received, and it was found that ranking patterns, once established with the first returns, rarely changed to any significant degree with later returns. Furthermore, the responses indicated no particular trends of regional or other preference, and respondents from smaller or non-doctoral-granting institutions did not vote differently from larger Ph.D.-offering schools. Finally, the nonresponding schools indicated no particular pattern of geography or of size of program.

**Reasons for Nonresponse**

Of the thirteen institutions from which no questionnaires were returned, six simply failed to respond, despite the fact that one follow-up letter was mailed to the dean or director. However, seven schools decided by specific vote of their faculty not to participate. One went yet further. Its dean wrote to other library schools, urging a boycott of the survey. These actions were unexpected and are surprising. Cooperation or noncooperation is an individual option and does not seem an appropriate topic for a faculty meeting. It would be particularly disturbing if a majority decision resulted in disenfranchising even a minority of one. The reasons offered by those who declined to participate form an interesting sidelight to the study. All of the letters were clearly sincere, many seriously worried, some openly hostile. They followed several patterns and, wherever possible, the investigator sought to respond and clarify. This was not always possible because some of the complaints were not directed to the investigator, but to some other body, such as the president or council of AALS. The objections fell into several groupings.

1. Perception studies were misleading, and did not represent a true measure of quality. The investigator agrees fully, and has already indicated his hope that this may serve as the springboard for more tangible studies. Some correspondents went so far as to state that real quality studies and rankings were desirable. Others contented themselves with objecting simply to this and similar studies, without suggesting an alternative.

2. The methodology was criticized as being simplistic. Since perception studies are based on the simplest possible reactions, it is difficult to object to this criticism or to consider its validity to the purposes of the study. A ranking of how people felt was sought. Nothing more or less was obtained. The injunction against rank ordering was designed to support this intuitive process. The restriction against listing more than ten
schools in response to questions 1 and 4 and more than five schools in response to questions 2 and 3 seemed to bother nobody. At least none complained about being restricted. Most respondents listed far fewer schools than they were allowed. Apparently "highest quality" did not lend itself to glib and easy answers.

3. Such studies should not be done, because, by its actions, ALA’s Committee on Accreditation (COA) has considered all sixty-nine schools to be acceptable, and therefore the presumption should be made that they offer equivalently qualitative programs. This response, also voiced to Norton, is difficult to deal with, because this investigator considers it nonsensical. Accreditation, if it works at all, establishes only minimum levels, and it is difficult to believe that anyone considers all sixty-nine accredited schools equal.

4. As with other studies, a number of educators responded that they did not consider themselves qualified to judge the merit of other library educational programs. While this answer must be accepted as an honest reaction, it nevertheless causes the investigator to wonder how library education programs are to be evaluated if other educators feel unqualified to judge them. It may be necessary that all of us in library education pay more attention to what is happening in the field, so that we do feel qualified to make evaluations and judgments. Surprisingly, academic library administrators, who might be expected to disqualify themselves because of lack of knowledge, did not invoke this reason to any greater extent.

5. The findings, no matter how carefully described and presented, will be misused by those who seek to bend them to their own purpose. It is also difficult to respond to this concern, although for an entirely different reason. All investigators, in any discipline, run the risk that their work will be used improperly by others, despite their own careful injunctions. Neither this nor any other investigator can take responsibility for such consequences.

6. The findings would be dangerous, in that they would provide ammunition for those seeking to eliminate library education programs. The investigator sought to deal with this concern in part by stating that only the top fifteen schools in response to each of the questions would be publicly released, although he would be willing to tell any school not listed specifically how it had fared. Despite the avoidance of such a public listing of the last-ranked school, some library school administrators were concerned. Specifically, they feared that campus administrators, seeing that their own programs were not included in top listings, would use this as an excuse to discontinue the program. The possibility of misuse of study findings by others has already been addressed, but this concern raises other interesting questions. This writer has already stated in other articles that, given the number of students, the number of faculty, and the decline in institutional support, we probably now have too many library schools, and that with continued fractioning into more schools (a process he considers inevitable under present COA procedures) programs will get smaller and worse. It is certainly not the intent of this study to cause the elimination of any specific school. However, if an administrator, seeing the absence of his school in any listing of perceived excellence, concludes that he or she should consider the alternatives of improving the program or shutting it down, this investigator would not necessarily consider this an unhealthy process or an unreasonable decision.

7. Through an unfortunate lack of clarity in the cover letter sent to school deans and directors, and because of a statement that promised a readiness to discuss the results of the study at the January 1981 AALS meeting, some administrators and faculty assumed erroneously that this was an official AALS study sanctioned by its board of directors. This error was clarified as quickly as possible, both by the investigator and by AALS officers. In addition, in an attempt to avoid respondent bias, the questionnaire was prepared on white bond paper without letterhead and signature identifying the source of the questionnaire, and this also caused some confusion among recipients about the source and "authenticity" of the questionnaire. The effect of having the questionnaire come from Indiana University may have had an impact on respondents,
but that impact is difficult to assess. It is possible that some would have included Indiana University because the questionnaire brought the school to mind. It is just as possible that some respondents would have excluded it because of their annoyance at the questionnaire and its promulgator. The same problem is faced whenever a professional school perception study is undertaken. In any case, the ranking for Indiana University does not differ substantially from that in the earlier Blau and Margulies study. This confusion about source and authenticity among some recipients uncovered a reaction not anticipated by the investigator. Some individuals thought that studies of this kind should not be done at all unless approved and authorized by the AALS board of directors and, further, that control should be exercised to prevent the undertaking of studies that could be “detrimental” to the profession. One hopes that the belief that investigative studies, regardless of how well or badly done, need “official permission” represents an aberrant viewpoint that is not widely shared. The implications of such control for research in our profession would be far-reaching indeed.

General Findings

In general, this investigation found close correlation between the responses of library administrators and library educators; differences tended to be in ranking a small number or cluster of schools. One group of five schools received almost half of all votes cast by library educators and more than half the votes cast by administrators, particularly with regard to questions 2 and 3. An additional twelve to fifteen schools also received support on a fairly consistent basis. The other schools, which represent considerably more than half of presently accredited schools, receive virtually no support from anyone. Fourteen institutions were not listed even once, despite more than 300 responses. While it is true that perception of the absence of highest quality in so many schools does not necessarily prove the actual absence of acceptable quality, this clustering of responses and these wide gaps in perception raise some questions.

While there are no real surprises in the rankings, at least to this investigator, there are some shifts from the rankings reported by Blau and Margulies. Some movement is taking place, with some schools rising in peer perception and others falling. Because perceptions take time to change, such shifts must be watched over a period of years. However, at least some shifts are already visible and, although the investigator prefers not to comment on them in this article, others can make the comparisons for themselves. It is also interesting that some schools are more highly perceived by administrators than by educators, some the other way around.

Finally, this study confirms a point made by Callcott, that simple size of program, while a factor, is not in itself enough to assure a high peer evaluation. Neither are faculty salaries, prestigious reputation of individual faculty “stars,” or physical resources. The schools highly rated are perceived to have a strong track record in the achievement of their graduates and in the balance of activity of their faculty members. Virtually all have doctoral programs, and the impact of the existence of a doctoral program on the quality of master’s education (which COA views with suspicion as a potential diversion of resources but which may in fact be a positive ingredient) cannot be ignored. Age of school counts for something, in that few young schools manage to make the top perception ranking, but it is also obvious that just being old isn’t enough. Finally, as Blau and Margulies noted earlier, library education, at least in perception of quality, differ substantially from other professional programs in that it is not centered on the Eastern Seaboard. If there is a geographic slant, it is toward the Midwest.

Specific Findings

There are close comparisons between the two lists (see table 1). For example, it should be noted that the first two rankings are the same in both cases. In addition, the same ten schools appear in the first ten places in both lists. There are also differences. Most significantly, the higher ranking among educators for the two two-year master’s programs (North Carolina and UCLA) should be noted, while ARL library administrators perceive these programs as of
TABLE 1

TABLE 1. PERCEPTION RANKING OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING THE HIGHEST-QUALITY EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP AT THE MASTER'S LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Educators</th>
<th>Library Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 248,* 1,782 responses (mean = 7.27)</td>
<td>N = 55,* 430 responses (mean = 7.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Illinois 150</td>
<td>1. Illinois 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UCLA 112</td>
<td>4. Chicago 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chicago 112</td>
<td>5. UCLA 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Columbia 100</td>
<td>6. Columbia 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pittsburgh 100</td>
<td>7. Indiana 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indiana 79</td>
<td>10. Rutgers 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drexel 65</td>
<td>11. Simmons 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Simmons 53</td>
<td>15. British Columbia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto 53</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas at Austin 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three hundred forty-four additional responses distributed among forty-two schools, including four programs not presently accredited by ALA COA.

Thirty-nine additional responses distributed among nineteen schools, all with programs presently accredited by ALA COA.

*For this question, as for others, the difference between N and the total number of responses received is due to respondents who answered other parts of the questionnaire but declined to supply answers to this question.

high quality but do not appear to place as much emphasis on the greater length of the degree program. By contrast, both California, Berkeley and Indiana, while significantly ranked by educators, are more highly ranked by administrators.

The clustering of responses already evident in response to question 1 is even more pronounced in response to question 2 (see table 2). The first five schools ranked received more than 50 percent of the votes of educators and more than 67 percent of the votes of administrators, and the first ten schools listed received 84 percent of the responses from educators and 91 percent from administrators. A close correlation is apparent, and it is significant that the University of Chicago, which is ranked significantly but not at the top by both response groups with regard to its master's program, is perceived first by both respondent groups in this category. The support given to these ranking correlations is significant when it is recalled from the work of Kaser that most ARL administrators, unlike educators, do not themselves possess doctorates. This difference does not appear to affect their responses. The schools that occupy the first five rankings in the educator study (allowing for ties) also occupy the first five places in the administrator evaluation. UCLA and North Carolina, whose two-year programs ranked particularly highly among educators at the master's level, compare in ranking with administrators in this evaluation. Rutgers and Case Western appear more highly ranked by educators, while Indiana is, as at the master's level, more highly ranked by administrators. However, none of these changes is really major since all three programs are recognized for perceived high quality by both groups of respondents.

A significant number of respondents among both educators and administrators declined to respond to question 3 (see table 3), either because they felt that there were no high-quality library doctoral programs preparing administrators, or because they felt that the doctorate was not relevant for posts in library administration. Some significant ranking changes appear in both groups of respondents. For example, the University of Chicago, ranked first by both groups in preparation at the doctoral level for library
educators, ranks fifth and in a tie for fourth in this evaluation. By contrast, both Columbia and Michigan move up. The high perception of the California, Berkeley administration program by administrators is not matched to the same extent by educators. By contrast, the Illinois and Rutgers programs are more highly perceived by educators than administrators. Again, as with earlier rankings, the differentiations are relatively minor. What appears of greater significance is the continued clustering.

**TABLE 2**

**QUESTION 2. PERCEPTION RANKING OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING THE HIGHEST-QUALITY EDUCATION AT THE DOCTORAL LEVEL IN PREPARATION FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION AND RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Educators</th>
<th>Library Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 248, 975 responses (mean = 4.03)</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 52, 225 responses (mean = 4.33)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chicago 145</td>
<td>1. Chicago 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Illinois 116</td>
<td>2. Columbia 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. California, Berkeley 83</td>
<td>5. California, Berkeley 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers 83</td>
<td>Indiana 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh 80</td>
<td>Pittsburgh 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve 52</td>
<td>Rutgers 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana 44</td>
<td>UCLA 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse 37</td>
<td>North Carolina 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA 36</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina 31</td>
<td>Toronto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel 26</td>
<td>Syracuse 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin–Madison 20</td>
<td>USC 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland 9</td>
<td>Wisconsin–Madison 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-two additional responses distributed among twelve schools, including three programs (largely in communication and computer science) not presently accredited by ALA COA at the master’s level.

**TABLE 3**

**QUESTION 3. PERCEPTION RANKING OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING THE HIGHEST-QUALITY EDUCATION AT THE DOCTORAL LEVEL IN PREPARATION FOR LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Educators</th>
<th>Library Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 201, 715 responses (mean = 3.56)</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 46, 170 responses (mean = 3.70)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Columbia 84</td>
<td>1. California, Berkeley 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Illinois 81</td>
<td>Columbia 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rutgers 72</td>
<td>4. Chicago 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chicago 63</td>
<td>5. Illinois 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh 63</td>
<td>Indiana 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana 45</td>
<td>Pittsburgh 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, Berkeley 36</td>
<td>8. UCLA 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA 32</td>
<td>9. Rutgers 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons 21</td>
<td>11. Simmons 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse 17</td>
<td>12. Florida State 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland 16</td>
<td>13. Maryland 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin–Madison 14</td>
<td>14. Florida State 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-four additional responses distributed among eleven schools, including one program not presently accredited by ALA COA at the master’s level.

Five additional responses distributed among five schools, all with programs presently accredited by ALA COA at the master’s level.
The ten schools that, among them, occupy the first ten places in the educator list also occupy the first ten places in the administrator list.

The consistency in response patterns noted earlier reappears for question 4 (see table 4) as well. Responses by educators and administrators compare closely, and when there are changes in rankings from one evaluation category to another, they appear in both lists. The first two rankings match exactly, and the ten schools listed in the first grouping in one ranking also appear in the other, with only the exception of Indiana, twelfth among educators and sixth in the administrator ranking. At least some of this difference can be accounted for in the possible examination of the kind of professional activity undertaken by faculty members, and in particular whether their research is of a more basic or more applied nature. This might serve as an explanation for the school in question. However, as stressed repeatedly, the similarities far outweigh the differences.

General Conclusions

As stated in the introductory sections, conclusions from this study must be approached with great caution. Studies of perception are not studies of quality, even though administrators, educators, and students may act as though they were. Meaningful comparisons of the quality of library education are lacking, as they are for other fields, and there is at least some sentiment that they should not be undertaken at all but rather that we content ourselves with the accreditation process as the only validator of acceptable quality. The results of this survey cannot be used in any sort of ranking for Canadian schools of library education. Survey responses, not divulged in great detail in this report, indicate clearly that the University of Toronto, and perhaps also the Universities of Western Ontario and of British Columbia, have perception support despite the fact that they are little known by American educators and administrators and that they could well score highly in any sort of qualitative ranking, if one could be devised.

And yet, even with these caveats, some clear patterns emerge that cannot be ignored and that warrant further investigation. While the responses to the four questions show the repeated identification of a small and select number of schools, the rankings vary, and they vary with enough consistency among educators and adminis-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 4. PERCEPTION RANKING OF THE FACULTY’S CONTRIBUTION TO PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 248, 1,460 responses (mean = 5.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Illinois 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chicago 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. UCLA 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. California, Berkeley 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Syracuse 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drexel 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Indiana 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Case Western Reserve 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Maryland 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Toronto 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred eighty-four additional responses distributed among twenty-seven schools, including three programs not presently accredited by ALA COA at the master’s level.

Twenty-two additional responses distributed among thirteen schools, all with programs presently accredited by ALA COA at the master’s level.
trators to suggest that library professionals do indeed perceive certain schools as superior and that they perceive them as better in some categories than in others. Ten schools out of sixty-nine place consistently in all of the eight lists, which measure four different qualities and use two different survey populations. These ten schools, listed alphabetically, are California at Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, and UCLA. An additional seven schools, listed alphabetically, Case Western Reserve, Drexel, Maryland, Simmons, Syracuse, Toronto, and Wisconsin–Madison, appear in the top fifteen listings with fair consistency. Only five other schools (British Columbia, Florida State, Texas at Austin, USC, and Washington) appear at all on any of the lists.

This investigator does not suggest in the slightest that the remaining schools are not of high quality in what they purpose to do, either individually or collectively, only that they are not perceived of as outstanding (or of highest quality) by the educators who comprise all faculties and by the major administrators who hire our graduates. What are the characteristics that these ten, or these seventeen, or these twenty-two schools share that others do not share? There are no quick and easy answers to this question. Size of faculty, salaries, school budget, size of alumni group, size of student body, age of school, existence of doctoral program—all of these are possible partial answers, but only that. There are schools that appear in this roster that do not meet all or most of these criteria; there are schools that meet them but are not listed. What causes these perceptions? Are they aberrations and meaningless games, as some might argue, or are they, as Calcott and others might argue, the de facto rankings of quality, based on the academic model, which suggests that peer acceptance is what we strive for and that the perception that a program has merit makes it meritorious, either by itself or because individuals now act accordingly? Or do these programs, individually or collectively, represent values and standards that we should reasonably expect from all schools that desire approbation through accreditation?

This investigator does not claim to know with any assurance. However, it is clear that the present processes designed to protect quality in library education do not work as intended, and that the process of accreditation and approval serves only to validate what has already happened. Accredited library schools have, as reported by Bidlack, increased in number and decreased in student enrollments and faculty size. They have done this at a time when the complexity of the profession has increased and the need for specialized education has grown. Even if, as some would be content to argue, library education had remained at a constant qualitative level, this would not be enough. This writer agrees completely with Thomas Galvin's lecture notes that "given a dynamic external environment, no organization can ever remain static; it is either improving or it is declining, it is either expanding or it is contracting, it is either getting better or it is getting worse." In other words, schools that are not getting better are getting worse.

This report will provide more up-to-date information for the use of students, faculty members, and employers who utilize perception data for their decisions. In addition, the identification of such a clear but small cluster group of schools generally perceived to be superior may be of use to library school deans and directors and to campus administrators interested in role models for the improvement of their programs, perhaps as an alternative to closing them. It may also be of help to those charged with the responsibility of reviewing and updating standards under which library education programs are evaluated and accredited.
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Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain Region: A Review and Analysis

Responses to a questionnaire from sixty-four four-year colleges and universities in the Rocky Mountain region reveal that sixty-two of the schools grant some of their librarians faculty status and that forty grant faculty status to all librarians. The greatest discrepancy in benefits received by teaching and library faculty arises in length of contract year and publishing responsibilities. The directors of only twelve of the forty libraries note that there is controversy over faculty status for librarians, yet the comments on questionnaires and the results themselves suggest otherwise. In addition, the respondents' uncertainty about their responsibilities and benefits indicates a lack of knowledge of what faculty status should mean to and for them.

INTRODUCTION

Since the late 1950s professional library literature has been replete with articles and studies treating the question of faculty status for librarians. This literature reflects a continuing disagreement and confusion underlying the issue of faculty status for librarians. Although the issue has been examined from a variety of perspectives and in a number of regional contexts, there have been no comprehensive studies undertaken for the colleges and universities in the Rocky Mountain region.

In an attempt to examine the issue, a two-part survey was conducted. The results of the first part of the survey, based on a questionnaire sent to all directors of four-year college and university libraries, are discussed and analyzed below. The purposes of the survey were to ascertain not only how many librarians have been voted or granted faculty status in the various institutions, but also whether or not the issue is a controversial one in the judgment of the chief administrator of those libraries. The study also sought to determine whether the benefits for and responsibilities and obligations of library faculty are the same as those governing the teaching faculty.

METHODOLOGY

The seven states surveyed in the Rocky Mountain region were New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. The list of four-year academic institutions was taken from the thirty-second edition of the American Library Directory (ALD). Law and medical libraries were excluded when the ALD suggested that they were branches of the main library because it was assumed that the policies governing them would be the same. Questionnaires
were sent to the directors of ninety-four libraries. Eighteen of the institutions surveyed were eventually excluded because they were found to be either junior colleges not identified as such by the ALD or law school libraries that were indeed part of the larger institution. From the final group of seventy-six, sixty-four responses were received, bringing the response rate to 84 percent.

The questionnaire (see appendix A) was designed to determine whether faculty status had been granted to librarians, how their rank and status were defined, and what benefits and responsibilities they enjoyed. The standards for faculty status for college and university librarians adopted by the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) in 1971 were used as the measure.\(^2\)

The questionnaire was pretested twice on library faculty at the University of New Mexico who had come from other institutions. They were asked to answer it from the perspective of their former experience. Suggestions made for clarifying the questionnaire were incorporated into the final version.

Demographic data about each of the institutions were taken from the thirty-second edition of the \*ALD\* and the seventeenth edition of \*The College Blue Book\*. Information such as membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and form of control of the institution was included. Responses to the survey were analyzed by such variables as benefits, responsibilities, and demographic factors.

**FINDINGS**

Sixty-two, or 96 percent, of the sixty-four respondents indicated that some, if not all, of the librarians had faculty status. Since only two responding libraries had no provisions whatsoever for faculty status, it was not possible to compare those schools granting and those withholding faculty status. This study, therefore, addressed the sixty-two libraries having faculty status for all or a portion of their librarians.

In fifteen, or one-fourth, of these sixty-two libraries, it was the director only who enjoyed faculty status. In forty, or nearly two-thirds, all of the librarians had faculty status, and in slightly more than one-tenth of the institutions, some other combination obtained, for example, only those who also taught or only the library director and assistant director.

The breakdown by states is shown in table 1.

As table 1 indicates, geographical location appeared to have little bearing on the granting of faculty status. Such status was enjoyed by a high percentage of librarians throughout the region. On the other hand, the type and form of control of the institution did appear to affect the granting of faculty status within libraries (see table 2).

As shown in table 2, 92 percent of the university libraries granted faculty status to all librarians whereas only 50 percent of the liberal arts colleges and 43 percent of the professional schools did the same \((p < .005)\).

Table 3, which analyzes the data by the form of control of the institution, shows that "directors only" have faculty status significantly more frequently in private than in public institutions \((p < .05)\).

**BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY STATUS**

A critical point of discussion in the controversy over faculty status has centered on the issue of benefits and whether they are the same for librarians as for teaching faculty. It was intended, when the ACRL standards were first adopted in 1971, that those institutions extending faculty status to librarians would grant them the same benefits and responsibilities enjoyed by the teaching faculty. The remainder of this study deals only with the forty schools granting faculty status to all librarians. Table 4 shows that the results, in these forty schools, have not been entirely successful.

As table 4 makes clear, major discrepancies existed between the library faculty and the teaching faculty. The sharpest difference occurred in the length of the contract year. Ninety-five percent of the librarians in the Rocky Mountain region held twelve-month contracts in contradiction to the relevant ACRL standard, which calls for academic-year appointments. Another point of divergence pertained to faculty rank. Seventy-five percent of the librarians were granted...
### TABLE 1
**Faculty Status by State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>* Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Director Only</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>All Librarians</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**
**Faculty Status by Type of Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Teachers’*</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All librarians</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The small number of teachers’ colleges precludes making direct reference to them; they are, however, included in the tables.

**TABLE 3**
**Faculty Status by Position Level and Control of Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private Church-Related</th>
<th>Private Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director only</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All librarians</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**
**Benefits and Responsibilities of Library and Teaching Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Same for Library and Teaching Faculty</th>
<th>Different for Library and Teaching Faculty</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine-month contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional committee work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional committee work</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical rank</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identical tenure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion eligibility</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical eligibility</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research leaves</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research funds</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing requirements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic governance</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academic rank, 10 percent academic status, 5 percent professional status, and 10 percent something other. This distinction also applied, though not quite as markedly, to the awarding of tenure. This, too, represented a departure from the ACRL norm, which stipulated that tenure provisions should be the same for both library and teaching faculty. A third important difference in responsibilities involved publishing requirements, a point not specifically addressed by the ACRL standards. Only 18 percent of the librarians were required to meet the same publishing standards as the teaching faculty.

At the same time, certain benefits and responsibilities were shared by a large majority. Most prominent in this category were participation in departmental and institutional committee work and access to the same grievance procedures as teaching faculty. One hundred percent of the respondents indicated that these benefits were equal. Assuming that grievance procedures closely approximate the protection of academic freedom called for in the ACRL standards, it would appear that each school has fulfilled this requirement.

In compliance with the ACRL standards, participation in professional (state and national) committee work and in academic or university governance was shared by 98 percent of the respondents. To a lesser, but still important degree, eligibility for promotion and sabbatical leave was shared.

Although sabbatical leaves were obtainable in 83 percent of the institutions responding, research leaves and research funds were available in only 80 percent and 70 percent respectively. It is thus apparent that observance of the ACRL standards on these benefits is incomplete.

OTHER BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Rank

Analyzing benefits and responsibilities in relation to location, type, and form of control of the institution disclosed significant results (tables 5-7). A statistically significant relationship \( p < .01 \) was found between the granting of academic rank and geographic location (table 5). In Arizona, 91 percent of the schools granted identical rank, and in Utah only 50 percent did. These figures contrasted sharply with those for Wyoming and Montana, where 100 percent of the schools granted identical rank. Falling between were Colorado, with 91 percent, and New Mexico, with 88 percent, granting identical rank.

Examining rank by type of institution

Although sabbatical leaves were obtainable in 83 percent of the institutions responding, research leaves and research funds were available in only 80 percent and 70 percent respectively. It is thus apparent that observance of the ACRL standards on these benefits is incomplete.

OTHER BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Rank

Analyzing benefits and responsibilities in relation to location, type, and form of control of the institution disclosed significant results (tables 5-7). A statistically significant relationship \( p < .01 \) was found between the granting of academic rank and geographic location (table 5). In Arizona, none of the schools granted identical rank, and in Utah only 50 percent did. These figures contrasted sharply with those for Wyoming and Montana, where 100 percent of the schools granted identical rank. Falling between were Colorado, with 91 percent, and New Mexico, with 88 percent, granting identical rank.

Examining rank by type of institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Rank by State</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Rank by Type of Institution</th>
<th>Teachers' Colleges</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Rank by Control of Institution</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented an interesting pattern (table 6). Within the professional schools, librarians were more likely to obtain equal rank than were librarians in either liberal arts colleges or universities.

Tenure Provisions

Analyzing tenure provisions on the basis of equality between library and teaching faculty again showed differences both regionally and by type and form of control of the institution. The most noticeable difference, when this question was examined by state (table 8), occurred between Arizona and New Mexico and the other five states. In Arizona only 50 percent and in New Mexico only 63 percent of those schools responding to this question had the same tenure provisions. In Wyoming and Montana, on the other hand, all schools responding had the same tenure provisions.

As with rank, tenure provisions were affected by the type of institution (table 9). Although 83 percent of the librarians in professional schools were granted rank identical with teaching faculty, only 50 percent of them had identical tenure provisions. In contrast, 73 percent of the universities granted identical rank, but 91 percent of them granted identical tenure.

Analysis of tenure provisions by the form of control of the institution displayed a wide variation between publicly supported institutions and private institutions (table 10).

Promotion

As with tenure, promotion was affected by geographical location (table 11). In 100
TABLE 12

PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Teachers' Colleges * %</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges * %</th>
<th>Universities * %</th>
<th>Professional Schools * %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>8 73</td>
<td>20 91</td>
<td>4 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 18</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>2 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>22 100</td>
<td>6 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13

PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Public * %</th>
<th>Private * %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28 93</td>
<td>5 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>4 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sabbatical Eligibility

The significant variation in this category (tables 14–16) occurred under type of institution. Table 15 illustrates that university librarians were eligible for sabbaticals more often than expected statistically. In professional schools and teachers' colleges librarians were eligible less often than expected (p < .05). Table 16 shows a statistically significant relationship between sabbatical eligibility and the form of control of the institution (p < .05).

Research Funds and Leaves

Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that librarians had the same access to research funds as did teaching faculty (tables 17–19). In light of this average figure, it is interesting to note that 100 percent of Wyoming's schools and only 50 percent of Utah's schools provided equal access to such funds (table 17).

A slightly higher percentage (80 percent)

TABLE 14

SABBATICAL ELIGIBILITY BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabbatical</th>
<th>New Mexico * %</th>
<th>Arizona * %</th>
<th>Colorado * %</th>
<th>Utah * %</th>
<th>Wyoming * %</th>
<th>Idaho * %</th>
<th>Montana * %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15

SABBATICAL ELIGIBILITY BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabbatical</th>
<th>Teachers' Colleges * %</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges * %</th>
<th>Universities * %</th>
<th>Professional Schools * %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>8 73</td>
<td>21 95</td>
<td>3 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 18</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>22 100</td>
<td>6 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the librarians had access to research leaves on the same basis as did teaching faculty (table 20). The greatest discrepancy between access to research leaves and funds occurred in Montana. While only 60 percent had access to funds, 100 percent of librarians had access to leaves. It is especially noteworthy that in New Mexico research funds were more likely to be accessible than research leaves! The opposite was true in every other state.

On the general questions of research funds and leaves, a somewhat higher "no response" rate was noted, indicating a possible uncertainty on the part of the directors about the actual research benefits of librarians. Access to research funds was more likely to be enjoyed by university librarians than by professional school and liberal arts college librarians (table 18). There was a significant relationship ($p < .025$) between access to research leave and type of institution (table 21).

There was discernible distinction between public and private schools in the granting of research leave and research funds (tables 19 and 22).

**ARL Members**

Seven of the libraries within the region are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Responses to the questionnaire were received from all seven. ARL membership correlated highly with the benefits and responsibilities stipulated in the previously cited ACRL Standards. Librarians in ARL libraries are universally accorded all benefits and responsibilities except equivalent rank and publication requirements. The publishing requirement must be met in the three libraries providing equivalent rank. Interestingly, the value for librarians of ARL membership, in relation to meeting the ACRL standards, is decidedly greater in the Rocky Mountain region than in the country as a whole, as is evident from the 1979 survey of all ARL libraries on

**TABLE 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabbatical</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Status / 209**

**TABLE 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Funds</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th>Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Funds</th>
<th>Teachers' Colleges</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Funds</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Leave</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th>Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Leave</th>
<th>Teachers' Colleges</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Professional Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ %</td>
<td>+ %</td>
<td>+ %</td>
<td>+ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Leave</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ %</td>
<td>+ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The status of librarians has been uncertain. Table 23 compares benefits and responsibilities of librarians in the Rocky Mountain region ARL members with those of the general membership of the association.

The Library Directors Speak

Each respondent to the questionnaire was encouraged to add comments that might shed further light on faculty status. From the many such comments, one recurrent theme emerged: equivalence between library faculty and teaching faculty is more often theoretical than real.

This finding was supported by the uncertainty characterizing the directors' responses to specific questions. Considerable ambiguity existed as to whether or not librarians actually possessed the benefits they were supposed to have under the terms of faculty status. For example, one respondent commented that while librarians were eligible for research leave, none had ever been granted. The same director commented that only one sabbatical had been granted to a librarian in thirty-one years. Confusion also attended the question of promotion. One director indicated that he did not know how people received promotion; another responded that while eligibility for promotion existed, "the possibility of promotion is almost nil." Further typifying some directors' uncertainty were such frequent responses as "don't know," "never tried," "unclear," "?" to questions pertaining to librarians' benefits. This ambiguity, it should be noted, was not specific to any single type or size of institution.

Degree requirements were also uncertain. Although 90 percent of the schools indicated that a second master's degree was not formally required for tenure and promotion, several indicated that it was difficult to be promoted without a second master's degree. One director commented that while a second master's was not required, the library would "prefer" some reference librarians have this degree.

Among the most interesting responses were those made to the questions "Must teaching faculty publish to be granted promotion and tenure?" and "Must librarians publish to be granted promotion and tenure?" Forty percent of the respondents indicated that the teaching faculty must publish, while only 18 percent indicated
TABLE 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits and Responsibilities</th>
<th>ARL Libraries, Rocky Mountain Region (7)</th>
<th>ARL Libraries, National Survey (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research leaves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic senate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


that librarians faced the same obligation. At least one director commented that the teaching faculty, although not required to publish, would probably never be promoted to the rank of full professor without publishing. He did not make the same comment about librarians. Another director indicated that while teaching faculty were evaluated for tenure on the basis of publications, librarians were evaluated not on this ground but, rather, on such other criteria as "job performance, campus and community service, professional activity, etc."

The role of librarians in academic governance may afford still another example of theoretical, rather than actual, rights and responsibilities. The survey results showed that 98 percent of library faculty members were eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent faculty body. Yet, eligibility may not itself guarantee the library faculty representation. In fact, one director commented that no librarian had ever been elected to the faculty governing body of his institution, although all were eligible. The possible exclusion of librarians from academic governance may stem in part from the absence of a tradition among them of collegial decision making. As many as 40 percent of the library faculties involved in this survey have yet to organize themselves into a collegial body.

Clearly, the inconsistent application of standards to library faculty on the one hand and to teaching faculty on the other has helped create and reinforce a continuing controversy. In the words of one director, "Every time tenure and promotion for library faculty reach the university tenure and promotion committee, someone questions it!" Thus, it is surprising that the directors in only twelve libraries acknowledged that there was controversy about the issue. Two directors who reported that there was no controversy had, in fact, recently witnessed the divestiture of faculty status from some of their librarians. It may be deduced from this that some directors may have obscured the reality of the situation.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

It is quite apparent that, while many librarians in the Rocky Mountain region have been granted faculty status by their institutions, they are in reality not enjoying certain of the benefits and responsibilities central to such status, notably, the benefit of the nine-month contract and the responsibility of publishing. The ACRL Standards published in 1972 envisioned that librarians "... be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise."

Since the Standards also proposed a three- to five-year implementation period for "college and university libraries which do not currently conform to any or all of these standards," the time is right for the directors and librarians to work toward full compliance. When the standards have been implemented and accepted by the entire university community, an equal partnership will be realized.
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APPENDIX A

We are interested in knowing the benefits for and expectations of academic librarians, whether or not they have faculty status. Please respond to the following questions and feel free to make comments on any of them. Thank you.

1. Is there controversy in your institution or library about faculty status for librarians? [ ] yes [ ] no

2. If the librarians at your institution do not currently have faculty status, is there any movement afoot to grant such status? [ ] yes [ ] no [ ] n/a

3. How many librarians are employed at your library?

4. Have any of them been granted faculty status?

   [ ] yes [ ] no

5. If yes, which? [ ] director only [ ] all [ ] none [ ] only librarians who also teach

   [ ] director and assistant director(s) only [ ] other [ ] n/a

Please answer the following questions about the majority of librarians in your institution whether or not they have faculty status.

6. Do librarians at your institution usually hold contracts of:

   [ ] nine months [ ] ten months [ ] twelve months

7. If the librarians hold nine- or ten-month contracts, is summer work paid for at rates comparable to those of teaching faculty? [ ] yes [ ] no [ ] n/a

8. If the librarians usually hold twelve-month contracts, are nine- or ten-month contracts possible for librarians? [ ] yes [ ] no [ ] n/a

9. Is the librarian’s scheduled work week: [ ] 30 hours [ ] 35 hours [ ] 37 hours [ ] 40 hours [ ] other

10. Does the normal work load of librarians include time for other professional activities such as committee work? [ ] yes [ ] no

11. Are librarians at your institution encouraged to serve on library and/or school committees? [ ] yes [ ] no

12. Are librarians at your institution encouraged to serve on professional committees at the state, regional, and/or national level? [ ] yes [ ] no

13. Are librarians at your institution granted rank identical to that of the teaching faculty? [ ] yes [ ] no

14. If not identical, is librarian status:

   [ ] academic [ ] professional [ ] other [ ] n/a

15. Are librarians at your institution covered by tenure provisions identical to those of the teaching faculty? [ ] yes [ ] no

16. If #15 is no, is there an equivalent provision made? [ ] yes [ ] no [ ] n/a

17. Are recommendations for tenure, or its equivalent, based on a peer review system? [ ] yes [ ] no

18. Are librarians at your institution eligible for promotion? [ ] yes [ ] no

19. Are recommendations for promotion based on a peer review system? [ ] yes [ ] no
20. Are librarians at your institution eligible for sabbatical leaves on the same basis as teaching faculty? □ yes □ no
21. Are librarians at your institution eligible for research leaves with or without pay? □ yes □ no
22. Do librarians at your institution have access to the same research funds accessible to faculty? □ yes □ no
23. Do librarians at your institution have access to 'grievance, appeal, and review procedures available to other faculty? □ yes □ no
24. Must teaching faculty publish to be granted promotion and tenure? □ yes □ no
25. Must librarians publish to be granted promotion and tenure, or its equivalent? □ yes □ no
26. Is the master's in library science from an ALA-accredited library school considered the beginning degree for appointment as a librarian in your institution? □ yes □ no
27. Is a second master's degree for librarians required for: □ appointment □ tenure (or its equivalent) □ promotion □ none of the above
28. How many librarians in your institution have Ph.D. degrees in any subject? □ none □ 1-3 □ 4-6 □ 7 or more
29. Has a library faculty been formally organized and/or constituted? □ yes □ no
30. Are librarians in your institution eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent faculty body? □ yes □ no
31. Are librarians in your institution unionized? □ yes □ no
32. If librarians are unionized, is the bargaining agent the: □ AAUP □ AFT □ other □ n/a
33. Are new librarians recommended by: □ a college-wide search committee □ a library search committee □ the library director □ other
34. Is the library director recommended by: □ a college-wide search committee □ a library search committee □ the library director □ other
35. Is the library director considered a: □ department head □ chairperson □ dean □ other
36. The library director is appointed for: □ 1-3 years □ 4-6 years □ indefinitely
M. KATHY COOK

Rank, Status, and Contribution of Academic Librarians as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

A questionnaire survey was conducted to determine the teaching faculties' perceptions of the academic librarians at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Each question was analyzed by academic unit and rank of the respondents. Service was perceived as the most important function of the librarians, but many teaching faculty members indicated that librarians should conduct research if they are to be awarded faculty rank and status. The higher-ranking respondents used the library materials and the services of the librarians most often. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were in favor of academic librarians at SIU-C having faculty rank and status.

As early as 1955 Patricia Knapp suggested as a topic for analysis and research, "How do librarians rate with their faculty colleagues and are they thought of by others primarily as administrators, as educators, or as bookmen?" Although many articles have dealt with the subject of academic status for librarians, as can be seen by the extensive bibliography compiled by Nancy Huling, only two were concerned with the teaching faculties' perceptions of status for academic librarians.

In the late 1950s in a study conducted by Patricia Knapp, who questioned faculty members as to whether librarians should hold faculty rank and status, the respondents at Knox, College, Galesburg, Illinois, indicated that only the head librarian was qualified and most were not in favor of faculty rank for the rest of the library staff.

The second study, conducted of English Department faculty members at the University of Kentucky by Florence Holbrook, indicated that most answering the question "Should librarians be given faculty rank" replied yes but put stipulations on the rank, such as educational qualifications and research efforts.

Between the years 1966 and 1975 faculty status for librarians increased overall from 50 percent to 75 percent. One reason for the increase was that librarians concerned with their own role in the academic community felt their goals pertaining to teaching, research, and service warranted faculty status. As a result the members of the Association of College and Research Libraries endorsed a "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," as of April 26, 1972.

Academic librarians claim to be professors whose major occupational task is teaching yet, as mentioned earlier, they have not been recognized as professors by professors. In the end the image and prestige of academic librarians will be based upon their academic preparation, service, and contributions to their colleges and universities.

M. Kathy Cook is assistant librarian, Education/Psychology Division, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
Because of the lack of data concerning the teaching faculties' perception of faculty status for academic librarians, a study was undertaken at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale (SIU-C) to determine this perception. SIU-C is a comprehensive, state-supported university with 22,000 students enrolled. Academic librarians presently have academic rank and status along with the teaching faculty.

**METHODOLOGY**

A questionnaire (see appendix A) was sent via campus mail to 50 percent, randomly selected, of the full-time teaching faculty assigned to academic units. A total of 507 faculty members received the questionnaire and 386 responded. Of these, 384 responses were usable, a 75.7 percent response. The computer program SAS (Statistical Analysis System) was used to determine percentages. It was hoped that the data collected would show the perceptions of the teaching faculty toward the academic librarians. This information would indicate whether the perceptions needed to be improved and possibly would indicate areas of needed improvement.

The total number and percentage of the full-time teaching faculty and of those responding to the questionnaire were from ten academic units, shown in table 1. Twenty-five percent of the respondents held the rank of full professor, 28 percent were associate professors, 37 percent were assistant professors, and 10 percent were instructors.

Each question was analyzed to identify differences in responses and perceptions according to rank or academic unit of the respondents. The law faculty responses were deleted, because there were too few to consider.

**RESULTS**

Three questions were asked to gain background information on the respondents. In response to the question "How often do you use the library," it was found that 6 percent of those responding used the library daily, 26 percent used the library several times a week, 31 percent used the library once a week, and 36 percent used the library once a month or less. Thirty-seven percent of the professors used the library several times a week or more, whereas 27 percent of the associate professors, 39 percent of the assistant professors, and 16 percent of the instructors did so (table 2).

In looking at the use of the library by faculty members from the various schools and colleges (table 3), 50 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Liberal Arts indicated they used the library several times a week or more, whereas 43 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Science, 42 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Communications and Fine Arts, 24 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Education, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>University Faculty</th>
<th>Respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The questionnaire was sent only to 50 percent of randomly selected full-time teaching faculty.
TABLE 2
RESPONDENTS' USE OF LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Almost Daily (Percentage)</th>
<th>Several Times a Week (Percentage)</th>
<th>Once a Week (Percentage)</th>
<th>Once a Month or Less (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
RESPONDENTS' USE OF LIBRARY BY ACADEMIC UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Almost Daily (Percentage)</th>
<th>Several Times a Week (Percentage)</th>
<th>Once a Week (Percentage)</th>
<th>Once a Month or Less (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Human Resources did so. In all other schools and colleges less than 15 percent of the responding faculty indicated that intensity of library use.

In response to the question “Have you ever requested a librarian to speak to one of your classes on the resources of the library,” 5 percent of the respondents indicated that a librarian was requested to do this every semester. Sixteen percent indicated they only occasionally made such a request of the librarian, and 74 percent said they never had made such a request. Many faculty members indicated they had never thought to make such a request. No discernible differences on this question were found when grouping the respondents by professorial rank. Fourteen percent of the faculty responding in the College of Education and 10 percent in the School of Agriculture had a librarian speak on library resources every semester. In all other schools and colleges fewer than 10 percent of the respondents made such requests each semester. Thirty-six percent of the faculty responding in the School of Engineering and Technology, 34 percent of the faculty responding in the College of Education, and 25 percent of the faculty responding in the School of Agriculture indicated they occasionally had a librarian speak on resources. In all other schools and colleges 13 percent or fewer of the responding faculty made such occasional requests (table 4).

In asking the next question, “What contact have you had with librarians other than in the library setting,” the author hoped to determine whether the teaching faculty viewed librarians as contributing members of the faculty in the university as a whole. In response to this question, 15 percent of the faculty indicated they had contact with librarians on master’s committees, Ph.D. committees, or search committees formed to fill vacant positions. Thirty-three percent of the faculty indicated they come in contact with librarians on university-wide commit-
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TABLE 4

"HAVE YOU EVER REQUESTED A LIBRARIAN TO SPEAK TO ONE OF YOUR CLASSES ON THE RESOURCES OF THE LIBRARY?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Every Semester (Percentage)</th>
<th>Occasionally (Percentage)</th>
<th>Never (Percentage)</th>
<th>Other (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Fine Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second group of questions was used to determine the teaching faculties' perceptions of the academic library and librarians at SIU-C. When asked "How important do you view the library collection as part of your teaching and research," 63 percent of the faculty indicated the library collection was indispensable, 17 percent of the faculty indicated the collection was very important, and 5 percent indicated it was either of little importance or not important. Professorial rank did not appear to make a difference in the faculty views. Seventy-five percent of those at the rank of assistant professor and higher viewed the library collection as indispensable, whereas only 36 percent of the instructors felt this way.

In response to the question "How important do you view the librarian as assisting in your teaching and research," 24 percent of the faculty indicated the librarian was indispensable, 25 percent indicated the librarian was very important, 29 percent indicated the librarian was important, and 22 percent indicated the librarian was of little or no importance. When this question was considered by academic units, few discernible differences between academic-unit responses were found. In considering the various faculty ranks, 34 percent of the professors said the librarian was indispensable to their teaching and research whereas only 21 percent of the associate and 22 percent of the assistant professors indicated this was the case. It appears that as faculty members progress to the rank of professor their view of the relative importance of the librarian to them is enhanced (table 5).

In response to the question concerning the help received from librarians in the SIU-C library, 13 percent of the faculty responding indicated the help received was indispensable, 44 percent said it was very helpful, and 33 percent indicated it was helpful. Ten percent of the responding faculty indicated librarians had been of little or no help. When this question was considered by academic units, few discernible differences between academic-unit responses were found. In considering the various faculty ranks, an increase of the feeling that librarians are indispensable was shown as the faculty approached professorial rank (table 6). Twelve percent of those indicating librarians are indispensable were instructors, 9 percent were assistant professors, 14 percent were associate professors, and 19 percent were professors. Relatively equal percentages (44 percent) of the faculty responding indicated the librarian had been very helpful.

The next question asked the faculty to indicate how much librarians contribute to the instruction of students in the university...
TABLE 5
“How Important Do You View the Librarian as Assisting in Your Teaching and Research?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indispensable (Percentage)</th>
<th>Very Important (Percentage)</th>
<th>Important (Percentage)</th>
<th>Of Little or No Importance (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6
“Has the Help You Received from Librarians in the University Library Been:__________________”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indispensable (Percentage)</th>
<th>Very Helpful (Percentage)</th>
<th>Helpful (Percentage)</th>
<th>Of Little or No Help (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

setting. Eighteen percent of the faculty indicated the librarians contributed a very substantial amount to the instruction of students, 33 percent indicated the librarians contributed a substantial amount, 31 percent indicated librarians contributed some, and 18 percent indicated librarians contributed very little or none. Only small differences were found on this question when grouping the respondents by professorial rank.

The faculty responding from the College of Communications and Fine Arts, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Education had the highest percentage indicating the librarians contributed a very substantial amount to the instruction of students. Fifty percent of the faculty in the schools and colleges other than the College of Business and Administration, School of Engineering and Technology, and College of Science indicated that the librarians contributed a substantial amount or very substantial amount to the instruction of students in the university setting (table 7).

In response to the question “Do you feel librarians should conduct research,” 17 percent of the faculty responding felt that librarians should conduct research on practical topics related to improving service. Two percent of the faculty indicated that librarians should conduct research on scholarly library topics whereas 56 percent of the respondents indicated that librarians should conduct research on both of the previously named topics. Eight percent of the respondents indicated that librarians should not conduct research and 16 percent indicated it should be up to the individual librarians whether they conduct research or not. No discernible differences were found on this question when grouping the respondents by either academic unit or professorial rank.

In response to the question “How much released time should librarians be given to conduct research,” 13 percent of the faculty responding indicated that no time should be given to librarians for research use. Twenty-one percent of the responding faculty indicated four hours per week should be allowed, and 31 percent of those responding felt librarians should be allowed eight hours per week released time. Eight percent of the faculty indicated that twelve hours per
TABLE 7

"HOW MUCH DO YOU FEEL LIBRARIANS CONTRIBUTE TO THE INSTRUCTION OF STUDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY SETTING?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Very Substantial Amount (Percentage)</th>
<th>Substantial Amount (Percentage)</th>
<th>Some (Percentage)</th>
<th>Very Little or None (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Fine Arts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

week was appropriate, and 27 percent indicated the amount of time allowed would depend on the needs of the individual project. No discernible differences were found on this question when grouping the respondents by either academic unit or professorial rank.

The respondents were asked to rank the librarians’ role in the university in terms of teaching, research, and service. Eighty-five percent indicated they perceived the major duties of librarians to be those of service to students and faculty. Eight percent indicated research was the most important function, and 5 percent indicated teaching was the most important. Two percent indicated other items were most important, such as library organization and management. Generally no discernible differences were found on this question when grouping the respondents by either academic unit or professorial rank.

Twenty-eight percent of the responding faculty viewed librarians as equal to teaching faculty, whereas 65 percent viewed librarians as professionals, rather than faculty. Only 7 percent of the respondents viewed librarians as nonprofessional or equal to clerical or secretarial help. No discernible differences on this question were found when grouping the respondents by professorial rank.

Forty-four percent of the responding faculty in the College of Education, 35 percent of the responding faculty in the School of Technical Careers, 33 percent of the responding faculty in the College of Communication and Fine Arts, and 29 percent of the responding faculty in the College of Liberal Arts indicated that the librarians were faculty equal to teaching faculty. Only 3 percent of the responding faculty of the College of Science and 10 percent of the faculty of the College of Business and Administration viewed the librarians as such (table 8).

When asked "Should librarians have faculty rank and status," 57 percent (201) of the responding faculty responded affirmatively whereas 43 percent (148) responded negatively. No discernible differences on this question were found when grouping the respondents by professorial rank. Sixty-four percent of the respondents in the School of Engineering and Technology and College of Science indicated that librarians should not have faculty rank and status. Nearly 50 percent or more of the responding faculty in all other schools and colleges indicated that librarians should have faculty rank and status (table 9).

The 57 percent (201) responding yes to the previous question were asked if they felt a limit to the rank librarians could obtain should be imposed. Of those 201 respondents, 86 percent indicated no limit should be imposed and 14 percent indicated a limit should be imposed.
TABLE 8
"DO YOU VIEW LIBRARIANS AS: ________"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Faculty Equal with Teaching Faculty (Percentage)</th>
<th>Professionals (Percentage)</th>
<th>Non-professionals (Percentage)</th>
<th>Clerical and Secretarial (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Fine Arts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
"SHOULD LIBRARIANS HAVE FACULTY RANK AND STATUS?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Yes (Percentage)</th>
<th>No (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Fine Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Careers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 148 faculty members indicating that librarians should not have faculty rank and status, 58 percent indicated it was due to insufficient teaching; 40 percent indicated it was due to insufficient research and publications; 13 percent indicated it was due to insufficient service; and 27 percent indicated it was due to insufficient education. Thirty-seven percent also listed a variety of other reasons why librarians should not have faculty rank and status. The numbers total more than 100 percent because respondents could check multiple reasons for denying librarians faculty rank and status.

CONCLUSION

Sixty-three percent of the respondents used the library once a week or more, which corresponded exactly with the percentage of faculty indicating they viewed the library collection an indispensable part of their teaching and research. Seventy-five percent of the respondents in every academic rank indicated the library collection was either very important or indispensable. Several faculty members who recorded a lesser amount of usage indicated it depended on their teaching and research needs at any time. The other 25 percent may need to be educated as to the procedures in requesting new materials in their research areas. Attendance at orientation workshops held for new faculty members to inform them of the materials and services
provided in the university library should be encouraged. All faculty members should be made aware of the computerized literature-searching service offered in the university library.

Another area in public relations that could be initiated by the librarians is to volunteer to teach classes on the resources of the library. Although many classes are currently brought to the library each semester for one-to-three hours of instruction, more faculty should be made aware of this service. A bibliographic instruction course on how to use the library is currently offered for one credit hour. These classes represent direct teaching by librarians. Unfortunately, the students are the ones who suffer if they are not made aware of the library resources and of the course offered on its use.

The teaching faculty are also confused as to how much instruction of students is done on a one-to-one basis in the library. Many faculty members indicated they had no way of knowing how much individual instruction was given on how to use the library resources when librarians assisted students in finding information. In addition, faculty members should be made aware of the instructional materials librarians prepare for the students. Users' guides and subject bibliographies are prepared much the same way and with similar intent as teachers prepare instructional materials. Both are indirect forms of teaching, which are difficult to measure.

On the whole, the teaching faculty thought that librarians should conduct research on topics of their own choosing and that released time should be granted for this. Several faculty members indicated that in order to have faculty rank, research was a necessary duty. Many faculty members thought librarians should resolve this issue themselves.

Of the three responsibilities of a faculty member—teaching, research, and service to students and faculty—an overwhelming majority of faculty indicated they thought service was the most important responsibility of the librarians.

Concerning the granting of faculty status to librarians, several teaching faculty felt that the librarians' role was coequal but different: "Because the library is not a degree granting department, faculty rank and status should not be awarded"; "They should be considered administrators and have the sole purpose to serve students and teaching faculty"; "The only legitimate faculty rank for librarians would be those with crossappointment in an academic department."

One respondent indicated that in view of the publish-or-perish emphasis, research is the most significant factor and service the least for qualifying for promotion in faculty ranks. If a librarian was heavily engaged in research (as required by the university), the library services that should be rendered would go lacking. Therefore, he indicated that librarians should not be classified in faculty ranks, but should be in professional ranks.

Overall the perceptions indicated that librarians are contributing members of the university, they help in teaching, they should be conducting research and they should be given faculty rank and status for their efforts.

A replication of this study should be conducted on many campuses to help in planning local activities. In addition, comparative studies would lead to a broader knowledge of faculty attitudes toward librarians as members of the faculty. Studies of university administrations' perceptions of librarians qualifying for faculty rank and status could be conducted as well.
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### APPENDIX A

**FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS AND FACULTY RANK AND STATUS FOR LIBRARIANS**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please check the appropriate response.

**BACKGROUND:**

1. In which school or college are you a faculty member?
   - School of Agriculture
   - College of Business and Administration
   - College of Communications and Fine Arts
   - College of Education
   - School of Engineering and Technology
   - College of Liberal Arts

2. What faculty rank do you hold?
   - Full professor
   - Associate professor
   - Assistant professor
   - Instructor

3. How often do you use the library?
   - Almost daily
   - Once a week
   - Several times a week
   - Once a semester
   - Other (Please specify)

4. Have you ever requested a librarian to speak to one of your classes on the resources of the library?
   - Every semester
   - Occasionally
   - Other (Please specify)

5. The contact you have had with librarians other than in the library setting has been on:
   - Master’s committees
   - Ph. D. committees
   - Search committees
   - University-wide committees
   - Other (Please specify)

**PERCEPTIONS:**

1. How important do you view the library collection as part of your teaching and research?
   - Indispensable
   - Of little importance
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

2. How important do you view the librarian as assisting in your teaching and research?
   - Indispensable
   - Of little importance
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

3. Has the help you received from librarians in Morris Library been:
   - Indispensable
   - Of little help
   - Very helpful
   - Not helpful
   - Helpful

4. How much do you feel librarians contribute to the instruction of students in the university setting?
   - Very substantial amount
   - Very little
   - Substantial amount
   - None
   - Some
5. Do you feel librarians should conduct research? (Check one)
   a. ___ On practical topics related to improving service
   b. ___ On scholarly library topics
   c. ___ Both a and b
   d. ___ Librarians should not conduct research
   e. ___ Other (Please specify)

6. How much released time should librarians be given to conduct research (based on a forty-hour work week)?
   ___ 0 percent  ___ 10 percent  ___ 20 percent  ___ 30 percent  ___ Other (Please specify)

7. How do you perceive the librarian's role in the university in terms of teaching, research, and service to students and faculty? Rank the following in order of importance for librarians, 1, 2, 3, 4 (1 is high).
   Teaching _____ Research _____ Service to students and faculty _____ Other

8. Do you view librarians as:
   Faculty equal with teaching faculty _____ Nonprofessionals
   Professionals _____ Clerical and secretarial

9. Should librarians have faculty rank and status?
   a. Yes (If yes answer only 9a)
   b. No (If no answer only 9b)
   9a. Should there be a limit to the rank librarians may obtain?
      Yes _____ No

9b. (Check appropriate responses.)
      It is due to insufficient contributions to teaching.
      It is due to insufficient research and publications.
      It is due to insufficient service.
      It is due to insufficient education. (Would it matter if the professional library staff had Ph.D.'s in addition to master's degrees?) Yes _____ No
      All of the above
      Other (Please specify)

COMMENTS:
JOHN N. OLSGAARD AND JANE KINCH OLSGAARD

Post-MLS Educational Requirements for Academic Librarians

In a survey of job listings contained in two library periodicals, the educational requirements for college and university librarians were evaluated for the period 1970 through 1979. It was discovered that the requirements for nondirector personnel and university director personnel rose until 1976 and have since declined. It was also determined that there exist educational differences between director and nondirector positions and between college and university positions. The results of this survey are presented, and tests were performed to determine the statistical significance of the data.

By some estimates, upwards of 75 percent of academic librarians have obtained some type of faculty rank or faculty status. As a corresponding problem, academic librarians have had to make some difficult decisions concerning the educational requirements their institutions will set with respect to employment and tenure. Although in 1975 the ACRL Board of Directors set the basic educational requirement of academic librarians as the MLS, rarely does a job listing come out in which one cannot find educational requirements for employment being set at levels above this guideline.

Historically there have been several debates as to whether it would be appropriate for librarians also to have graduate degrees in other academic disciplines, most notable among these being the 1973 study by W. A. Moffett and the 1976 study by Rush G. Miller. More recently, the Minimum Qualifications for Librarians Task Force of ALA recommended that research be commissioned to analyze the educational credentials necessary for librarianship.

This paper will not enter the debate as to the desirability of additional graduate study beyond the MLS, but rather will seek to document the trends in educational requirements for academic librarians as shown through the actual job listings for positions during the decade of the 1970s. In addition, this study will consider the differences in educational requirements for director and nondirector positions, and the educational differences between college and university positions.

Method

Job listings in the library periodicals Library Journal (LJ), volumes 95–104, and College & Research Libraries News (C&RL News), volumes 31–40, were surveyed for the years 1970 through 1979. All job listings for college and university libraries constituted source data. The most basic data breakdown included whether the position was in a college or university setting and whether it was a director or nondirector position. The number of entries analyzed in the ten-year period for both periodicals totaled 5,269. The following rules were implemented to standardize entries:

1. Duplicate job listings for the same position within each journal were purged from the sample; interjournal duplication was not deleted.

2. The categories of educational requirement were: no additional education beyond the MLS (no additional); second master's,
both preferred and required (2d master's); and doctorate, both preferred and required (Ph.D.).

3. Listings that stated “additional graduate education” were entered as second master's.

4. The data entry for a college or for a university was taken directly from the institutional name.

5. In the context of this study the job title “director” implies the chief administrative officer of an academic library. Job listings for administrative officers of departments or parts of a larger library unit were not entered as directors.

6. There were no distinctions made among disciplines within each category. For instance, the requirement for a second master's degree in the natural sciences was given the same data value as the requirement for a second master's degree in the humanities.

**Basic Configuration of Educational Requirements**

When this study was initiated, it was assumed that the educational requirements for academic librarians would show greater levels from year to year, with the last year surveyed showing the most stringent requirements. However, the data yielded some surprising information (see tables 1 and 2). In the two higher educational categories, the percentages generally increased from 1970 through 1976, peaking in 1974-76, and then generally declined for the remaining years. The results for nondirector listings in colleges and universities and for university director positions reflect this overall decline since 1976. For instance, the percentage of jobs for university nondirector positions that at least preferred a second master's degree fell from approximately 35 percent in the 1974-76 time period to 32.5 percent in the last three years of the decade. The only exception to this pattern was in the area of college director positions, which showed a continued increase in educational requirements throughout the surveyed period. The data would also indicate, although the actual percentage will vary a good deal from year to year, that openings for nondirector positions have requested more than the MLS degree approximately 25 percent of the time, and that the job listings for director positions have asked for more than the MLS degree approximately 45 percent during the 1970s. Further elaboration of the data is given in appendix A.

In order to demonstrate the compatibility between the two periodicals a Pearson r test was conducted on the mean percentages of LJ on C&RL News for each type and are listed in the last column of appendix A. This test shows that the groups with the largest sample sizes, that is, the nondirector positions, tend to demonstrate the highest degree of correlation; whereas the director

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration of Educational Requirements, Nondirectors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In mean percentage, adjusted for rounding error.
TABLE 2

Configuration of Educational Requirements, Directors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970 to 1973</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>1974 to 1976</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>1977 to 1979</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Mean (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d master’s</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In mean percentage, adjusted for rounding error.

TABLE 3

Chronological Intercategory Shift Test of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>115,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>47,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>14,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>27,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 9.

TABLE 4

Variation Between Director and Nondirector Jobs Test of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>979,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>69,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 2.

Comparision of Director and Nondirector Positions

As one could expect, the results in tables 1 and 2 also demonstrate a large difference between the educational requirements for director positions and for nondirector positions. This difference is most apparent when considering the comparison between university directors and university nondirectors; the overall mean average of jobs requesting no additional education beyond the MLS for director positions is 47.5 percent, whereas the same average for nondirector university positions is 71.1 percent. The results of the chi-square test, given in table 4, confirm the dramatic difference between these two types of positions. Director positions on both the college and university levels show a statistically significant higher level of educational requirements over nondirector positions.

Although there have not been any previous general surveys of job listings for academic librarians, there have been several papers devoted specifically to the requirements for directors. Hence it was appropriate to compare the data derived from this study, by using the overall mean of the
combined valued of the Ph.D. category, with these previous studies (see table 5). The research by Jerry L. Parsons and William L. Cohn reviewed the obtained educational levels of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) directors. The study by Paul Metz also surveyed actual educational obtainment, but employed a nationwide sample of library directors. The work of Herbert S. White and Karen Momenee surveyed job listings for directors during the period June 1976 through December 1976.

The results indicate a close relation between the data from the Parsons, Cohn, and Metz studies and the data from this study. There is a high degree of difference between this study and the White and Momenee study; however, the period surveyed by White and Momenee not only represented a small sample, but also happened to be taken during a year in which the educational requirements in all categories were unusually high.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Having or at Least Preferring Ph.D. by Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohn</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Momenee</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td>36.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>32.936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 2.

H₀ : P₁ / P₀ ≥ P₁ / P₀₁ = 5.991.

**CONCLUSION**

The purpose of this study was to examine the trends in educational requirements for academic librarians. By way of the tabular data presented, it was determined that the post-MLS requirements for both non-director categories and for university director positions rose steadily until 1976, and have declined since then. It was also determined that this rise and decline was statistically significant and not due to chance. It was further found that the post-MLS educational requirements for director positions are significantly higher than the requirements for nondirector positions, and that these post-MLS requirements for director positions are generally compatible with previous research in this area. Last, it was determined that the educational requirements for university positions as a class are more stringent than for college positions, and that these differences are also statistically significant.

This study does not attempt to determine the causation of the patterns that have been established. However, if it is true, as many academic librarians believe, that the educational requirements for employment and tenure are becoming increasingly tougher, then it is incumbent upon the profession to delineate adequately the growth and makeup of these requirements. This study represents merely the first step in a process of research on a topic that will inevitably affect every academic librarian.
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**APPENDIX A**

**COMPARISON OF TYPES OF POSITIONS BY YEAR, USING MEANS OF COLLAPSED CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2d</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>71.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondirector</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>52.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Opportunities for Academic Librarians in the 1970s: An Analysis of the Past Decade

This study analyzed academic library position vacancies advertised in Library Journal during the period 1970–79 in the categories of position type, position level, and geographical location. The past decade was characterized by fluctuating levels of advertised job opportunities. Those opportunities presently are entering a period of marked decline, indicating diminished employment prospects for academic librarians in the future.

A frequent lament in academic librarianship today centers on the perceived decrease in the availability of job openings in the field. Factors such as increased numbers of individuals entering the field of librarianship, austere library budgets, declining student enrollments, reduced job mobility, and vagaries of the national economy seemingly have operated to constrict the job market, resulting in fewer openings and decreased employment opportunities for academic librarians at all levels.

However, the basic validity of this premise remains untested. How pervasive is this predicament? Are academic librarians' pessimistic perceptions of this situation accurate? Have employment opportunities actually declined over the past decade? What is the current state of the job market? Answers to these questions are of vital interest to academic librarians and are the focus of this study.

The Historical Perspective

In 1967, the American Library Association stated that the shortage of librarians had reached "crisis proportions." To combat the shortage, ALA announced the implementation of steps to: (1) increase recruiting for graduate library science programs; (2) push lobbying for increased aid for library science programs; and (3) encourage job redesign. This program worked so well that by 1970, in combination with a slowdown in the nation's economy, an oversupply of librarians existed and the job market became tight.1

Scattered reports surfaced during the 1970s about librarians experiencing problems in securing employment. In its 1970 annual report on placement and salaries for new library science graduates, Library Journal noted that "for the first time in the [nineteen-year] history of this series, we can observe a marked reduction in the number of openings available to the beginning librarian," thereby signalling that the disparity between supply and demand, which had characterized librarianship for two decades, had narrowed significantly.2 An ALA survey conducted the following year confirmed that declining employment prospects were in the offing as libraries reported budget cuts, hiring freezes, and even reductions in hiring.3

By the end of the decade, librarianship was being rated as one of the ten worst professions for potential employment. This situation was compounded by a general de-
cline in higher education nationwide. Pessimistic employment projections were accompanied by frustration generated by employers who increasingly demanded experience yet were reluctant to offer chances to acquire the necessary experience.¹

**METHODOLOGY**

Determining a workable test sample and procedure for this project presented a number of problems. It was decided that a decade-long perspective would best be gained by analyzing position openings advertised in library-related periodicals. This perspective probably would provide a representative overview of the situation.

Nationally circulated library publications such as *American Libraries*, *College & Research Library News*, and *Library Journal* regularly list position openings. *Library Journal (LJ)* was eventually chosen for three major reasons. First, it had been in existence since 1876 and was well established as an advertising medium by 1970. Second, its wide circulation made it appealing to potential advertisers. And third, *LJ*’s greater frequency of publication (twenty-two times per year as opposed to eleven for *American Libraries* and eleven for *College & Research Library News*) encouraged larger numbers of position advertisements. A random check revealed that *LJ* included more academic library advertisements overall. Consideration was initially given to utilizing all three periodicals. However, an attempt to compile statistics from advertisements appearing in all three proved to be an unmanageable and unnecessary task, and it was abandoned.

Two methods of data collection were employed on a trial basis to ascertain which best suited the total project. Photocopying each page of advertisements, clipping them apart, and then comparing to eliminate duplication was the first option.² While this method guaranteed near-perfect accuracy, it was time-consuming, costly, and wasteful. The second option, which ultimately was adopted, involved sight perusal of advertisements. This procedure involved some backtracking, cross-checking, and occasional photocopying of advertisements to ensure that each position was counted only once. These steps were crucial to the study’s validity and were adhered to scrupulously. A check of this method revealed that it was not only simpler and faster, but equally as accurate as the clipping method tested.

Assigning each advertised position vacancy an appropriate designation of type and level was relatively simple since advertisements normally stated this information in exact terms. The geographical determination of listings was axiomatic, and required no interpretation. Where multiple duties were listed, the first library position/function given was used to determine the position designation. Only library vacancies in the United States were included. Canadian, overseas, and library science teaching positions were excluded. Only full-time positions if the contract period ran at least nine months.

**FINDINGS**

A total of 2,531 academic library job openings were advertised in *LJ* during the decade 1970–79. Of that number, 1,237 (or 49 percent) were classified as public service positions, 897 (or 35 percent) as technical service, and 397 (or 16 percent) as administrative (table 1). Administrative classifications pertained only to library directors or assistant directors. Administrative classification within other positions will be described in a later section on position levels.

It was evident from yearly totals that a cyclical pattern of position availability plagued academic librarians throughout the decade (figure 1). The strong level of job openings that launched the decade gave way to two years (1971 and 1972) of declining prospects, which bottomed out in the latter year. A substantial upswing in advertisements occurred in 1973, followed by a modest gain in 1974, a plateau in 1975, and another significant increase to the decade’s high point in 1976. A sharp decline took place during the years 1977–79, a drop that shows no signs of abating as the 1980s get under way.

The falling level of advertised positions, and the decreased opportunities for professional employment inherent in that decline, was exacerbated by the fact that the total number of academic librarians increased over the last decade. Their numbers grew...
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives/special collections</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch/departmental</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government publications</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials/periodicals</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (all)</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from about 20,000 in 1970 to an estimated 26,500 in 1980, a 32 percent increase, which contributed to the constricted job market. This point is especially noteworthy since the number of positions advertised in 1970 (263) exceeded by one-third the number advertised in 1979 (200).

Most position types advertised followed the overall cyclical pattern already described, particularly those in the public service category. Technical service positions displayed some resistance to the extremes of the general pattern, although this category actually fared worse than the other two since the number of technical service positions advertised in 1970 (123) was never equaled during the ensuing decade. Advertisements for reference (561) and cataloging (544) positions far exceeded those in any other category. Taken in the aggregate, they accounted for 44 percent of all positions advertised.

Analysis of position levels indicated in the advertisements provided insight into the job market for academic librarians over the past ten years. It should be acknowledged that advertisements in a national publication such as *LJ* possibly might include fewer beginning or assistant positions. These would likely be filled utilizing less expensive approaches, such as mailings to graduate library science schools or telephone job lines. No attempt was made to categorize positions pegged with a beginning-level designation since that descriptor was infrequent. All non-head-level positions were tabulated in the assistant category, even though qualifications for those positions varied.

Little consistency was maintained in position levels for the public and technical service advertisements. The ratio of head to assistant positions fluctuated broadly throughout the decade (table 2). The number of head and assistant positions operated independently of any extraneous variables such as the total number of positions advertised in a given year. The years 1971 and 1976 illustrate this point well. In 1971, total positions advertised (172) approached the decade low (167), reached the following year. Also during 1971, the percentage of head positions advertised reached a decade low, and the percentage of assistant positions a decade high (22:78). Five years later, in 1976, these respective percentages rose to similar levels (30:70) after several years of fluctuation, even though 1976 boasted the decade's high of 356 positions advertised.

For the administrative category, the head
to assistant ratio averaged 60:40, nearly a reversal of that found for the public and technical service categories, 33:67. The larger percentage of head positions is due partly to the fact that not all academic libraries fund an assistant director position. The larger percentage of head positions in this category does not indicate any significant opportunity for upward mobility because of lateral job moves or because of the small segment (16 percent) of all positions advertised that the administrative category comprises (table 3).

The final area of investigation involved the geographical distribution of positions advertised. In order to provide a basis for
geographical comparisons and analysis, the regional breakdowns made by the ALA Committee on Accreditation of graduate library schools programs were utilized.

For the total number of positions advertised over the sample period, the regional distribution paralleled the distribution of academic librarians employed in each region in 1970 (table 4). While it seems reasonable that a variable like the number of academic librarians employed in a region would influence the number of positions advertised, this ten-year perspective indicates a stronger relationship than might be expected. Except for some variance in the northeastern and midwestern regions, the number of positions advertised either closely approached or equaled the regional distribution of all academic librarians. This fact, as well as future regional population shifts that would further affect position availability, are important considerations for those seeking employment in a given state or region.

CONCLUSIONS

After a decade of fluctuation in the marketplace, job opportunities for academic librarians are falling to critically low levels, perhaps permanently. Few new positions will be created. Nearly all position vacancies will be replacement positions. The 1980s will likely be characterized by limited upward mobility, as advancement will be feasible not through growth and expansion but rather through retirements or deaths. Individuals striving to advance from assistant to head positions, or those attempting to break into academic librarianship, will increasingly be thwarted in their attempts by declining job opportunities and reduced mobility at all levels.

Admittedly, this is a grim prospect. Nevertheless, it is essential for today's
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academic librarian, or for those contemplating entry into the field, to be cognizant of these serious problems and chart their futures accordingly.
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Publishing in Library Science Journals: A Test of the Olsgaard Profile*

As a test of the universality of the Olsgaard profile of authorship characteristics in academic library journals, the gender, geographic location, and occupation of authors contributing to five journals of interest to special librarians were analyzed. The resulting data provide the basis for the construction of a profile of authorship characteristics in special library journals. This profile is compared to that produced by Olsgaard and Olsgaard, whose methodology this study replicates. This study shows that while female authors are consistently underrepresented in the literature of library science, they are published in greater proportion in special library periodicals than in the academic library periodicals sampled by the Olsgaards. This study essentially confirms the Olsgaards' findings with regard to geographic distribution and occupation of authors in library periodicals.

In their recent article "Authorship in Five Library Periodicals," John N. and Jane Kinch Olsgaard reported the results of a bibliometric study that examined selected characteristics of authors published in library science journals. The characteristics under study were journal authors' sex, occupation, and geographic location. The Olsgaards sought evidence of publication bias by comparing authorship characteristics with the characteristics of the library science community as a whole.

The Olsgaards found that in the five journals studied, female authors were not represented in proportion to their numbers in the library profession. Thirty-four percent of the authors in the journals studied were women, while 84 percent of all librarians are women. With regard to occupation, the Olsgaards found that the journals studied contained a "substantial number of articles by practicing librarians." They also found that library science faculty members were represented in numbers greater than their proportion of the library population. In comparing the geographic distribution of authors in five library journals to the distribution of the United States population as a whole, the Olsgaards found that a disproportionately large number of authors were from the Northeast and Midwest, while the Southeast and Southwest were underrepresented.

Problem and Hypothesis

The Olsgaards selected the five library periodicals in their study based upon the following criteria:
1. minimum ten-year publication history;
2. recognition as a "nationally known journal of library science";
3. article format;

*This paper was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC04-76-DP-00789.

Martha C. Adamson is librarian, physical sciences and engineering, Technical Library, Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. Gloria J. Zamora is subject specialist, Technical Library, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
4. influence on the library profession;
5. "common trends in publishing."

The journals selected were:

This article does not question the selection of these five journals for the Olsgaard study. Each journal quite clearly meets the criteria they stated. In the opinion of these authors, however, each journal also meets another, unstated criterion. Each is a journal that is of greater interest to librarians in institutions of higher learning or to library science faculty and students. We were concerned that rather than portraying the authorship patterns of library periodicals in general, the Olsgaards' study might be biased toward the authorship characteristics of academic librarianship.

To test the general applicability of the Olsgaards' authorship profile, a study was conducted using the Olsgaards' methodology. The research population selected was journals believed to be of interest to special librarians. Do authorship characteristics in special library periodicals differ from those found in the Olsgaard study? The intent in gathering additional data was to modify and enhance the evolving profile of authorship characteristics in library periodicals.

**METHODOLOGY**

With the Olsgaard criteria in mind, the following journals were selected for study:
- *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association (MLA)*, V.57-66, 1969-78;
- *Online Review (Online)*, V.1-3, 1977-79;

*Online Review* does not meet one of the prescribed qualifications because it does not have a ten-year publishing history. It was included in the study genre because it represents a new field in library periodicals, and an area of interest that is of growing influence in the special libraries community.

All articles for the years shown above were studied. As in the Olsgaard study, book reviews and letters to the editor were not included. The Olsgaard methodology was followed with respect to multiple authorship and occupation.*

Ambiguous or incomplete information in any data entry was assigned to an "indeterminate" category and was disregarded in statistical operations, which utilized the following formula:

\[ X = \frac{a}{N - d} \]

where
- \( X \) = percentage of specific data entries;
- \( a \) = number of unambiguous data entries in a particular category;
- \( N \) = total number of entries in a journal;
- \( d \) = number of entries for which data cannot be determined.

**LIMITATIONS**

Analyzing authorship characteristics based only on the information provided by the typical library science journal is inherently risky. Most author information is sketchy and incomplete. In this regard, *Online Review* merits praise for the completeness of its author information, which includes the author's current preferred mailing address. The *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* has much room for improvement.

The regional designations adopted by the Olsgaards and continued in this study are those of the ALA Committee on the Accreditation of Graduate Library School Programs. These regional designations are, in the opinion of the authors, not always in agreement with common usage. For example, the ALA Committee on Accreditation considers Mississippi to be part of the Southwest region. Missouri, which was missing from the Olsgaards' regional listing, was added to the Midwest group. The committee's regional categories are as follows:

Northeast: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Mas-

*Each author was counted as one complete data entry, and each occupation was counted as one complete data entry.
Southeast: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.
Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.
Southwest: Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.

Because this study focused on special library journals, it was necessary to modify the Olsgaards' occupational categories to describe more accurately the contributors to these journals. The occupational sets for the two studies are compared as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olsgaard Study</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic librarian</td>
<td>Special librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public librarian</td>
<td>Library science faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other librarian</td>
<td>Academic librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science faculty</td>
<td>Other librarian/Library science student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science student</td>
<td>Other faculty/Graduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty</td>
<td>Information supplier/Broker/Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlibrarian/Nonacademic</td>
<td>Nonlibrary/Government/Private sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader is cautioned not to make extensive occupational comparisons between the two studies. Because occupational categories in this study have been redefined, correlations drawn between the studies would be spurious. In this study, librarians and information specialists who work in libraries and information centers serving industry, business, research institutes, and government are defined as special librarians. Also counted as special librarians are academic librarians clearly identified as working in a separate subject collection in an academic library. For example, an author identified as "Reference Librarian, Engineering Library, Anywhere University," is counted as a special librarian, while an author identified as "Science Bibliographer, University of Anywhere Library" is counted as an academic librarian. Similarly, a "Technical Information Specialist, Technical Information Center, ABC Corp." appears as a special librarian, while "Technical Information Specialist, ABC Corp." is considered to be a private-sector occupation.

RESULTS

Female authors were not represented in proportion to their numbers in the special library community in any of the five journals studied. Female authors were published 9.3 percent more frequently in special library journals than in academic ones; however, females are 9.7 percent more prevalent in special librarianship than in academic librarianship (table 1). In the special library journals studied, 56.3 percent of the authors were male, while 43.7 percent were female. In two journals, *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* and *Online Review*, female authors were actually in the majority, representing 56.9 percent and 59.3 percent of the authors, respectively. The *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* trailed in female authorship, with 23.5 percent (table 2).

The geographic distribution of authors in this study resembles quite closely that of the Olsgaards' study (table 3). Again, as in the Olsgaard study, the northeastern portion of the country is represented by a substantially larger percentage of articles than its percentage of the population, while the southeastern and southwestern regions are underrepresented. In special library journals, the midwestern region falls slightly below its expected publication rate, and the west slightly exceeds expectations. Just the opposite is shown in the Olsgaard study (figure 1).

| TABLE 1 |
| COMPARATIVE AUTHOR GENDER RATIOS |
|----------------|------------|
| Authors in Olsgaard study | 65.6 | 34.4 |
| Academic librarians* | 33.8 | 66.2 |
| Authors in special library journals | 56.3 | 43.7 |
| Special librarians* | 24.1 | 75.9 |
| National average of all librarians* | 16.0 | 84.0 |

TABLE 2

GENDER OF AUTHORS IN FIVE SPECIAL LIBRARY PERIODICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Percentage Male</th>
<th>Percentage Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIS</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted average 56.3 43.7

In seeking an explanation for the greater productivity of librarians in the northeastern region of the country, the authors investigated the possibility that this region might contain proportionally more library schools and consequently an atmosphere that stimulated scholarly pursuits both by academic librarians and their special librarian colleagues. Basing their distribution percentages on the fifty-seven ALA-accredited graduate library school programs located in the United States as of December 1978, the authors found that library schools were regionally distributed as shown in table 4.

Since library schools are nearly evenly distributed in relation to the population of librarians, the authors concluded that no positive correlation could be made between the distribution of library schools and the productivity of librarians in terms of authorship.

It is no surprise to find special librarian
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Population of librarians as a whole*


Fig. 1
Comparative Geographic Distribution Ratios
authors heavily represented in this study. They constitute 41.6 percent of the authors in the five journals analyzed (table 5). It is more interesting to discover that almost all authors listing two occupations (4.3 percent of all data entries) are special librarians (102 of 119). Most teach either in the institution with which their library is associated—most often a law or medical school—or in a library school. This dual occupation category includes 8.7 percent of the special library authors.

Library science faculty members contributed 20.1 percent of the articles in the Olsgaard study, as compared to a contribution of only 10.3 percent of the articles in special library journals. This statistic lends support to the authors’ belief that the Olsgaards sampled journals of interest to the academic library community.

While no exact comparisons are possible because of redefinition of occupational categories, “practicing librarians” appear to be published to about the same extent in special library journals as in those surveyed by the Olsgaards. This statement is based on a comparison of the “academic,” “public,” and “other” librarian categories in the Olsgaard study (47.2 percent of the population studied) with the “academic” and “special” librarian categories in this study (47.4 percent of the total population analyzed, see table 6).*

As might be expected, the three “traditional” special library journals studied, Law

*The “other librarian” category in this study is not included because it also contains library science students.
TABLE 6

COMPARATIVE OCCUPATIONAL RATIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olsgaard Study</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic librarians</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public librarians</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other librarians</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science faculty</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science students</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlibrarian/Nonacademic</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Library Study

| Special librarians      | 41.6%    |          |          |          |
| Academic librarians     | 5.8%     |          |          |          |
| Library science faculty | 10.3%    |          |          |          |
| Other librarians/Library science students | 3.3% |          |          |          |
| Other faculty/Graduate students | 19.1% |          |          |          |
| Information suppliers/Brokers/Associations | 4.7% |          |          |          |
| Nonlibrary/Government/Private sector | 15.3% |          |          |          |

TABLE 7

PRACTICING LIBRARIANS IN FIVE SPECIAL LIBRARY PERIODICALS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIS</td>
<td>At least 8.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>At least 64.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>At least 71.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>At least 35.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>At least 57.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Journal, Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, and Special Libraries, exhibit higher percentages of authorship by "practicing librarians" than do their cross-disciplinary counterparts (table 7).*

CONCLUSIONS

The authors set out to test the Olsgaard's profile of authorship in library periodicals against another sample population to assure its validity and applicability to the whole library community. While this study revealed some small differences from the Olsgaard model, it is perhaps more remarkable in its similarities, including the disturbing underrepresentation of female authors in all journals studied (see figure 2).

It is beyond the scope of this study to analyze the causes of this apparent imbalance; however, the authors believe that it is a matter for concern, discussion, and further research, not only by librarians but also by psychologists and sociologists. Among the questions that might be raised in relation to this apparent imbalance are:

1. Do female authors submit fewer articles for publication?
2. Are female librarians less career-oriented and consequently less willing to undertake extracurricular research?
3. Are male librarians more likely to be found at higher organizational levels, which encourage the expression of opinions in public forums?

By merging the statistics generated by this study with those of its predecessor, a refined profile of authorship in library periodicals emerges. The typical author writing in a library science journal is still a male from the northeastern United States who is actively employed as a librarian, but the disparity between male and female authorship is somewhat less than that indicated by the Olsgaard study. The refined profile is summarized in figures 2 and 3 and table 8.

*"Practicing librarians" includes the academic and special librarian categories.
Surveys like the two discussed here are just the beginning of much needed work on the bibliometrics of library science. Still unexplored are the publishing characteristics of school and public librarians and of important subject specialties within the library profession. Also yet to be investigated are more complex bibliometric patterns, such as how ideas travel among library professionals.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Combined Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library science faculty</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing librarians</td>
<td>At least 47.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Job Stress and Burnout: Occupational Hazards for Services Staff

Occupational hazards of stress are noted in individuals designated with responsibilities for service delivery in academic libraries. Staff members who perform duties requiring direct service to the library user are expressing concern about negative characteristics of job stress and the nonproductive results of burnout. Three components contributing to negative characteristics are highlighted as sources of frustration for services staff. The components are the individual ability to handle a stressful occupation, traditional organization structure, and fragmented professional support. Solutions are discussed in terms of productive individual coping strategies, enhanced organizational design, and cohesive professional support.

A recent meeting of reference librarians representing large academic libraries provided a forum to exchange ideas and laments. Repeatedly voiced during the discussion was a level of frustration directed at the job demands of the reference environment in libraries serving a large student and faculty complement. Although the nature of the exchange permitted only superficial analysis of the real problems, the recurring theme was the concern for stress and burnout brought about by an increasing demand for services. The meeting brought attention to the dilemma of service professionals, specifically library reference staffs, trying to preserve quality service and staff stability while dealing with the occupational hazards of job stress and burnout. Burnout itself has many negative implications, often resulting in loss of highly qualified staff to other lines of work or nonproductive coping strategies such as loss of initiative, energy, or maximizing aptitude.

Job stress involves three major issues. The first is the ability of the individual to handle a stressful occupation. The individual's ability to cope with the frustration of job stress immediately raises other questions. Does recruitment literature adequately emphasize the stressful nature of the work? Do individuals seeking public service positions demonstrate the necessary energy, decision-making ability, intellectual curiosity, and communication skills necessary to meet the vigorous performance requirements?

Once the recruitment and hiring of the individual is completed, a relationship between the individual and the organization evolves that directly influences the stressful nature of the job. A second issue related to job stress is the pattern of influences between the individual and the organization, because the organization plays a significant role in preparing an appropriate environment for service delivery. Increasingly it is argued that libraries are shifting priorities from an emphasis on material orientation to a client orientation. As a result of the shift, libraries are moving away from material-oriented concepts of quantifying bibli-
graphic units and instead are placing greater value on assessments of service quality. The academic library is becoming increasingly accountable for delivering information and document services, thereby placing greater demands on the staff members responsible for direct services, who then must assure the success of the emerging library priority. However, the library does not articulate its client orientation through its structure, which creates organizational ambiguities and an inappropriate environment for service delivery. In spite of this shift in emphasis, many academic libraries will continue to use a structure that reinforces a materials orientation, where priorities are placed on preservation, acquisition, and storage of materials.

A third issue suggests that the professional support provided for direct services is fragmented and multidirectional. Activities sponsored by national associations tend to reinforce the material orientation described earlier. This can be observed in cohesive association support for traditional technical operation areas when compared with the numerous multidirectional groups representing direct-service interests. A lack of synthesis in professional support reflects the ambiguity of organizational priorities at a time when strong professional support is essential.

In elaborating on these three issues, the following discussion will cover the individual's ability to cope with job stress and the role of the organization structure in providing a supportive environment for direct services. A final comment will address concerns about professional association support.

**INDIVIDUAL ABILITIES AND COPING STRATEGIES**

The ability of the individual to handle a stressful occupation has received little attention in the literature of librarianship. Librarians rarely note that many service jobs have inherently high risk and stressful conditions. A review of library literature disclosed few references on the topic of job stress, and these tended to concentrate on physical working conditions rather than individual coping strategies. In contrast, management and administration literature contained numerous references to the general problem of job stress and individual coping strategies.

Stressful job situations are characterized by the individual's perception of unwanted outcomes, the amount of evaluation, the evaluator's capability to judge performance, time separation between performance and occurrence of outcomes, task difficulty, and uncertainty of success. The aspects that can be identified as contributing to the stressful nature of direct-service responsibilities also might include some specific elements such as unrealistic deadlines, the problem of expectations not matching the reality of the job, the political atmosphere of the organization, and a lack of feedback as duties are performed.

The management literature frequently discussed topics concerned with the personality package of the individual as an important part of job stress. The characteristics of a stressful job situation as outlined above must be weighed against the personality of the individual who holds the position. Any situation can produce stress and the individual must have an ability to cope with frustration. Personality factors or stressors are an important determinant of individual coping ability. Stressors are variables such as lack of meaning in the job, frustrated ambition, obsessive concern for work, level of anxiety, level of emotionality, and tolerance for ambiguity. Every individual brings to the job a package of stressors, and the distribution or degree of intensity of each determines the ability to cope with stressful conditions.

Although personality stressors and characteristics of stressful occupations are infrequently discussed in the library literature, a professional recognition of job stress problems is evident in the number of middle-manager training programs offered for librarians at state and national meetings. The training programs usually concentrate on time-management techniques and job enrichment processes. These techniques can help the individual overcome some conditions of job stress. Certainly efforts at job enrichment training help the individual determine the work-related elements of tasks and procedures flow that might assure greater satisfaction. The opportunity to analyze cooperation between work units and job de-
sign can contribute to individual satisfaction. Time-management techniques can relieve some strain by providing the individual with tools that can be applied immediately to daily work situations.

However, permanent solutions to stress may not result from the application of individual approaches or strategies. After an initial effort to apply individual strategies, many librarians may sense a lack of success, which can contribute more rapidly to the most counterproductive condition, referred to as burnout. At this point, a staff member either leaves or finds methods to become a survivor only, a deadweight in the organization. In fact, the very techniques that provide the individual with a level of objectivity on a management predicament may contribute to increased frustration, which in turn is complicated by the unbending and traditional design of the organization structure.

Newman and Beehr, writing in support of this prediction, observe that there are many strategies suggested for handling individual job stress, but unfortunately no evaluation of effectiveness for these strategies has been demonstrated. They point to the need to recognize the fact that multiple causation and multiple effects require the use of combinations of personal strategies and organizational strategies. 8

A study of job stress directed to a specific line of work (trade salesperson) found that individual nonproductive anxiety and stress were reduced when a certain type of organization structure was in use. In this particular case, a “flat” organization structure (i.e., few hierarchical levels) was found to be conducive to higher productivity and greater job satisfaction than other types, described as medium or tall structures. 9 This should not be construed as a recommendation for flat structures; instead it should be recognized as an effort to marry the type of job activity with an appropriate supporting organizational structure to achieve maximum benefit for both the individual and the institution.

The specific example above can be conceptualized as positively combining the dimensions of individual tension, influence, and satisfaction with the moderating effects of institutional structure, organizational member characteristics, and the external environment of the organization. 10 In these terms, the dimension of individual tension is moderated by the decision-unit structure of the institution; the dimension of personal influence is moderated by the characteristics that the individual provides as an organization member; and the dimension of satisfaction is moderated by the external environment of the organization. The academic library has an institution of higher learning as its external environment, as well as relationships with professionals in state, regional, and national settings. As a point of further emphasis, the dimension of individual tension, according to the conceptual model, is influenced by the organization structure or the decision-unit structure.

In examining the problems of individual tension and role stress in organizations using complex technology, a group of researchers noted the complicated web of interdependencies and observed that factors that reduce stress for one employee may increase it for another. 11 They concluded:

We can no longer ignore the fact that individuals do not perform tasks in isolation. We must extend our analyses to others in the organization and the context in which they and the subjects of our inquiries operate. 12

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

The issue of the individual’s ability to cope is so closely related to characteristics of the organization structure that a confusion of the two issues easily develops. Sources of stress can be associated with different functional activities and with the level of ambiguity within the organization.

It is possible that the structure of the organization contributes to conditions of stress and burnout found among many staff members responsible for direct services. Inappropriate organization structure in libraries may result from a shift in library priorities to a client orientation and calls for a process of organizational review. A review of work units within the library might well take advantage of a classification of user functions as mentioned by F. W. Lancaster. He brings a fresh viewpoint to the structure of service delivery responsibilities by indicating six categories of user functions:

1. Document Services—providing documents for
which user has current bibliographic descriptions (citations)
II. Citation Services—providing citations to documents, including verification and subject bibliographies
III. Answer Services—providing specific information to answer user's questions
IV. Work-Space Services—providing space equipped for user to work within library
V. Instruction and Consultation Services
VI. Adjunct Services

By looking at the organization structure through the user-function categories, direct-service departments can review the placement of service responsibilities and determine obstacles to service delivery. Traditionally, responsibilities were assigned to organizational units based on concepts of like procedures or similarity of processes, putting like tasks together with a strong emphasis on differentiation, repression, and stability. A preferred placing of responsibilities for the direct services must respect the flow of work and all the related activities necessary for the successful completion of the requested service. In this manner, departments would be responsible for related activities whether they are "like" or "unlike" as tasks. Emphasis here is on integration, wriggle room, change, and flow of work.

Applying the user-function categories as an approach to organizational review offers an opportunity to examine the library structure from the client-oriented viewpoint. In the past two decades, many academic libraries have determined the work-flow design by the demands of the material-oriented functions. When this is the case, feedback mechanisms do not communicate smoothly to staff responsible for direct-service functions; units and departments responsible for service delivery are at the end of the flow, with few communication vehicles along the way. Evidence of nonsupportive organizational structure is most notable when the achievement of even minor service goals requires the involvement of several departments and is accompanied by a complicated tangle of paperwork and employee resistance.

Organizational structures that conflict with changing goals force a type of administration called crisis management. Many librarians responsible for managing service departments may feel the stress and frustration of dealing with problems on a crisis basis. Regardless of the individual's management training, the organization forces the individual to use this uncomfortable type of management because work flow and feedback mechanisms fail to support the service goals. When the line function of the organization serves a material orientation rather than a client orientation, management by crisis may result; "in spite of ever more sophisticated tools for management, an uncommonly large number of organizations continue to be run in primitive manner." The efforts to treat the symptoms of stress may not be remedied by individual training in stress management, time management, and job enrichment techniques. Although the current attempts to concentrate on the individual approach for coping strategies are useful, dependence on individual solutions to stress problems for services staff may not be satisfactory in the long run. Studying the organization structure in relation to the user-function categories is essential and will offer a productive method for diagnosing the real occupational hazards of direct-services staff.

A review of organization structures in academic libraries can provide more meaningful support if results of such review projects are shared among the institutions through the avenues opened by professional associations. Professional associations can offer an important link in the review process by augmenting desirable outcomes during this period of shifting priorities.

PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT

Academic libraries have completed several decades of placing the highest priority on collection building, preservation, and storage as primary activities supporting a materials orientation. Evidence of this emphasis is readily observed in professional-association support. For example, the annual statistical report issued by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) provides compilations that reinforce the materials orientation. In the ARL Statistics, the data gathered (i.e., collection size, materials budget, volumes processed, etc.) represent quantities that serve the needs of the traditional activities.
In assessing direct-service support from the ARL Statistics, the interlibrary loan data may have become the one exception to the comments concerning the bias toward a materials orientation. This item was originally included, no doubt, as a measure of collection building within the institution. However, the uses of interlibrary loan have changed as institutions adapt to more resource-sharing techniques, and now the figures presented can be considered reflections of service commitments. As relationships with networks evolve and cooperative agreements in a variety of geographical configurations are made, interlibrary loan data have become more of a measure of service strength and less that of collection strength.

While the library organization responded to the pressures of a material orientation, measures of internal efficiency in technical services became a frequent topic of examination in the professional literature. The attempts to quantify library goals through analysis of technical operations have limitations, however, partly due to the carelessly defined sources of data and lack of standards for cost measurements. Efficiency studies reported in the literature were not transportable because of these limitations and could not be generalized to other applications. To compound our problem, typical technical operations studies made no attempt to assess the effect of the internal operation on the public-services or user-function operations. The impact of efficiency on direct-service effectiveness was ignored or excluded by the narrow definitions of technical operations. The quantifier found the client orientation less attractive, perhaps because of the more elusive qualitative environment or the low priority of services as an organizational goal. The derivation of useful direct-service assessments has eluded the skills of the "hypereconomist," to borrow a term.

The need for good assessment devices of a statistical nature should be addressed through the cohesive support of professional library associations. Units or divisions that address the issues of user functions are numerous and fragmented in the American Library Association. An example of the lack of cohesiveness is apparent when the various committees dealing with direct-service interests are observed in the Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA), the Reference and Adult Services Division (RASD), and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), to name a few. This should be compared with the fact that a division that represents the interests of technical-service concerns has been in existence for some time.

Recently, RASD submitted a revision in its bylaws designed to address an aspect of this need. The revision to the bylaws as proposed (Article II, Section 1) states that the objectives of the division should include a group responsible for the synthesis of activities in all units of the American Library Association where direct service to the library user is involved. The emphasis on synthesis where concerns for the user functions are involved is an important step to a cohesive approach in dealing with direct-service needs. The type of library is recommended as a criterion for consideration in the RASD-proposed change. Following the example of RASD, colleges and universities might find it useful to establish an activity as part of their association, and enhance the role of ACRL in supporting the functions responsible for service delivery.

SUMMARY

Professional librarians responsible for the direct-service functions are frequently faced with the occupational hazards of job stress and burnout, which are nonproductive outcomes of organizational shifts in priorities. Training the individual to develop personal strategies to cope with stress by improving management skills will provide a temporary reprieve from certain aspects of job frustration, but a review of organizational design can offer more permanent solutions to a problem that taxes both the individual and the institution.

Library organizations and professional associations can create environments that will help or hinder effectiveness, facilitate or inhibit service activities. Libraries in the next decade must recognize the shift from a materials orientation to a client orientation and design the organization structure to serve the work flow of library services. Associations and other professional groups
must address the direct-service functions as a cohesive activity deserving more than fragmented attention. Only then will non-productive, stressful conditions contributing to services-staff frustration and burnout be changed to productive conditions in an organization environment supporting direct-service responsibilities and objectives.
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The continuing energy crisis has created a secondary crisis in the assimilation of related technical information. The sheer volume of new technological information on energy being published in journals, through seminars, conferences, and academic activity around the world makes it impossible for any individual and most libraries to keep fully up to date in this critical field.
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Letters

To the Editor:

The affiliation statement on the article, “The National Program to Microfilm Land-Grant Agricultural Documents,” College & Research Libraries, November, 1980, failed to include the information that I was “formerly assistant reference librarian, New Mexico State University Library, Las Cruces” and project contact for that library—not the entire Southwestern Land-Grant College Microreproduction Project.—Sarah A. Garrett, Records Management Supervisor, Gulf Oil Exploration & Production Co., Casper, Wyoming.

To the Editor:

Over the past few years I have wondered why books reviewed in C&RL were frequently sent to reviewers with absolutely no expertise in the subject of the book reviewed. Latest horror is a review of the Library Trends issue on “Library Consulting,” in the September 1980 C&RL. An informed reviewer of this issue would be either a librarian deeply involved in consulting or one who uses consultants frequently. Instead, this review was assigned to Davie Laird, a nice lad totally unqualified on both scores, who seems to have found the Arizona desert a great generator of bile. He first grumps that this issue of Library Trends is not unified like a book. This has been true of periodicals ever since I was a boy. Then he declaims (with the other fragment of his mind) “perhaps the main problem . . . is that the various authors obviously had quite different audiences in mind as they wrote.” How in the name of the Chicago Office and all the other deities could a group of articles discussing consultation on buildings, collection development, computerization, labor relations, management, and staff development possibly have the same audience in mind? The articles, however, are all addressed to the same kind of need, discussing circumstances that call for use of consultants, how to select them, what you can expect from them, how to prepare for their arrival, how to work with them on the spot, and how to evaluate their results. How unified can you get in nine diverse articles?

With Davie’s opinion of the various articles I will not quarrel since he is entitled even to his ignorant opinions. However, I must rescue one from his unevaluated list of “other topics,” Robert M. Hayes’ article on consulting in computer applications, which in my opinion is brilliant, the best of the lot, on a field where consultancy is in very bad shape indeed. Those of us who do consulting know that consultants are often very badly chosen and very badly used. This issue of Library Trends provides a centralized source, for anyone who even thinks that he might need a consultant, of information that should help minimize the mistakes often made in choosing one.—Ellsworth Mason, Head, Special Collections Department, University of Colorado, Boulder.

To the Editor:

Dr. Mason’s diatribe is a bit more passionately hostile than I expected. I suppose I should address him as Little Ellie Mason, then the next time we meet in the schoolyard we can draw a line in the dirt and shout “I dare you . . .” at each other.

I will stick with my review as worded: a journal issue unified around one theme must be reviewed as if it were a book, not a journal issue. Also, if the “target reader” of this issue was (is) librarians who have little experience with consultants, it seems eminently appropriate that such a person provide the review. I have had limited experience as a consultant and have used consultants sparingly. Unfortunately the consulting issue of Library Trends did not speak to me clearly. The literature of this discipline can stand some additions.—W. David Laird, Librarian, University of Arizona, Tucson.
To the Editor:

The September, 1980 C&RL includes a review of the ALA World Encyclopedia of Library and Information Services which refers to my article on censorship and intellectual freedom—among others—as "factual and well written." Naturally, I appreciate that, but I do not accept your reviewer's characterization of me as "definitely outside his field and beyond the range of his expertise" in having written a statement (to which he finds "serious objection," p.453) concerning the relationship of the Pauline Epistles and the modern "basic Christian attitude in favor of concealment and prudishness in regard to sexual matters, of veneration for asceticism and chastity." This is not the forum to dispute Mr. Peterson at length on the credibility of my statement—but I do resent his downgrading of my expertise in this field.

After a lifetime of research and study I spent several years in writing The Fear of the Word: Censorship and Sex, a 362-page volume published by Scarecrow Press in 1974. It included three chapters (27 pages) with nearly 200 footnotes and citations bearing on the point of view I expressed in the statement your reviewer quoted invidiously from my encyclopedia article. I wonder if the reviewer has read these chapters: how otherwise can he judge my expertise?

As for the statement itself, in a time when the religious leader of a vast number of Christians, the current Pope, calls on husbands not to look with lust upon their own wives, it hardly seems worthwhile to belabor my point any further. My entire article was factual.—Eli M. Oboler, University Librarian, Idaho State University, Pocatello.

Editor's note: The reviewer, Kenneth G. Peterson, elected not to reply.

To the Editor:

Harold Shill has written on a topic ("Open Stacks and Library Performance", C&RL, May 1980) with ramifications that reach far into the future of libraries and other information depositories. While many studies have been done, we know little about how scholars, and other users of information, utilize their information sources. Planning the libraries of the future would be greatly helped by a clearer understanding of what happens, and why, when a closed stack collection is opened. Mr Shill has told us some of what occurred at his library, he has speculated as to why, but the conclusions he has drawn are not supported by the evidence he has presented.

Mr. Shill states in his abstract that "Direct shelf access . . . contributed to an increase in library use and a decrease in circulation." The figures for nonreserve circulation excluding building loans show a decrease for the two years before the stacks were opened. The rate of decrease accelerated during the first year of direct access and then dropped sharply during the last two years of the study. Building use increased the year before the stacks were opened and continued to increase thereafter. No evidence shows that direct access "contributed" to these established trends.

Enrollment increased by 37.89 percent through the period of the study. Mr. Shill says " . . . allowances for this change have been made in the analysis." He doesn't tell us what the allowances were or how they were made. The evidence presented leaves the reader with no alternative but to question why Mr. Shill does not consider that the enrollment increase is at least partly responsible for the increase in building use. His curious disclaimer that "This upsurge in building use cannot be attributed to the increase in enrollment . . . given a simultaneous decrease in circulation figures" is incomprehensible. Nothing in the study correlates these three elements.

Two extrapolations from Mr. Shill's data lead me to a different conclusion. The ratio of enrolled students to library use was 1:28.4 in 1973 and 1:23.9 in 1978—a reduction of more than fifteen percent. The 37.89 percent increase in enrollment compares with an increase in building use of only 15.97 percent. It seems to me that these data show a net decrease in library use.

Words and terminology should not mislead the reader. In the abstract we read that ". . . book availability . . . improved significantly . . . " while in the text we see, twice, the word "mild" describing the improvement in book availability. The two words are not synonymous. Which is cor-
rect, Mr. Shill? He refers to "... significantly increased library use in 1976 ... a year in which enrollment ... declined." He doesn't give us the comparable enrollment figures. Library use data show that the increase in 1976 from 1975 was 4.04 percent, while the increase in 1975 from 1974 was 3.26 percent. Does an increase in rate of less than one percent warrant the word "significantly"?

When presenting data it is important to put all figures in the same form, and all tables should cover the same time periods. Enrollment figures are given for only the first and last years of the study. Table 3 gives percentage figures and the other tables use whole numbers. The reader is thus deprived of the data to make his own comparisons and analyses.

Mr. Shill concludes that the study shows that "... stacks can be opened ... with significant benefits for individual patrons..." The only benefit that can be adduced from the evidence presented is the improvement in book availability. However, even here, the results are inconclusive because the data covers only three years of the study.

Questions are raised because of the omission of information. For example, what was the effect of direct access on the statistics of two significant indicators of collection use—the size and the use of the reserve book collection, and the number of books picked up by staff for reshelving? Exclusion of this data increases the possibility of inadequate and inappropriate interpretation of the figures that are given.—Ronald P. Naylor, librarian at large, Waxahachie, Texas.

To the Editor:

In order to distinguish the legitimate criticism in Ronald Naylor's letter from several misinterpretations of my findings, I am compelled to review the preparation of my article and the analysis of my data.

The data in "Open Stacks and Library Performance" are longitudinal and were extracted after the study period from operational records maintained consistently over time. Library use patterns, like analyses in other areas of social science inquiry, are susceptible to ex post facto statistical analysis. Obviously, this approach permits only the use of pre-existing data, a limitation less frequently affecting sample surveys and experimental studies. Data on books collected in the stacks had not been maintained during the study period and, therefore, could not be used in the present study. Data from a 1975 book delivery study were excluded because the coding categories used that year were incompatible with those in the other three studies. In short, I have worked within the real limitations of operational data collected years before this study was conceived. This is stated clearly in my introductory paragraphs.

Naylor seems to imply that I am somehow at fault for failing to amass every conceivable datum concerning the opening of the stacks at West Virginia University's Main Library. In so assuming, he applies criteria appropriate for evaluating a pre-planned study to judge a retrospective analysis. In real-life situations, administrators seldom structure their decisions for the convenience of scholarly analysis. In this case, WVU's library administration did not decide in 1972 or earlier that the stacks would be opened February 1976. This is a limitation inherent in historical analyses of organizational behavior. Rather than consider beyond the scope of statistical analysis past decisions for which the entire spectrum of relevant data is unavailable, however, we must carefully assemble available data, perform necessary statistical operations, and present conclusions within the data parameters. I have approached the open access question from this perspective.

The article itself examines the impact upon three indicators of library performance—circulation, book availability and library use—of a decision to open the stacks in one academic library building. Earlier studies assumed that open access would increase circulation and reduce book availability, while the question of building use was not addressed previously. Each of these possible relationships was stated as a hypothesis to be confirmed or rejected on the basis of available data.

The hypothesis that circulation would increase after the stacks were opened was rejected on the basis of Table 1 data. Naylor acknowledges that circulation declined throughout the study period, correctly not-
ing that the decline was sharpest in the first year of direct access. His focus on rates of decline is spurious, however, since the hypothesis being tested is that circulation would increase if the stacks were opened. The continued decline in circulation clearly supports my conclusion. Additional computation shows that 46% of the 1973-78 circulation decline occurred in 1976, the first year of open stacks. This finding further strengthens my argument. The overwhelming evidence that circulation did not increase when the stacks were opened cannot be facilely dismissed by lumping circulation and building use together as "established trends." Given the weight of evidence supporting my conclusion, the verb "contributed" seems to appropriately describe this inverse correlation.

The finding that book availability did not decline after the stacks were opened is as important as the circulation finding, since anticipated shelf disorder is the strongest managerial argument against direct access. The continued improvement in book delivery two years after the stacks were opened is hardly "inconclusive," since a sharp decline in across-the-desk delivery success would be expected as patrons located a greater percentage of correctly-shelved books without staff assistance. This finding may also indicate a high level of patron search failure, though neither my original article nor Naylor's letter addresses that issue. Table 3 data were presented as percentages rather than raw numbers to facilitate interpretation; since the number of across-the-desk requests declined sharply (as expected) after the stacks were opened, the direction of this trend ("mild" is the correct and intended adjective) would not be readily apparent from the raw figures. Data in other tables could easily be converted to percentages and, therefore, be made consistent, by readers wishing to perform statistical tests upon them.

The one important and valid criticism in Naylor's letter is his assertion that enrollment has not been adequately controlled as a variable affecting library use, a point raised previously by P. Robert Paustian ("Letters," Nov. 1980). Given the data supplied, both men are correct, and I acknowledge the point. A re-check of major reference sources revealed some startling disparities in reported enrollment figures. The enrollment data in my article, which were evidently drawn from the World Almanac, were obsolete. Accurate enrollment figures, as supplied by our Office of Institutional Research, are 17,649 for spring 1973 and 20,025 for spring 1978. Using Naylor's ratio upon enrollment and building use figures for the six years examined, I find per capita visitation rates of 24.44, 23.71, and 23.43 in the three years before the stacks were opened. The rates in the first three years of open access were 24.22, 24.85 and 24.98, respectively. Though these data are compatible with my conclusion, they were not included in the article. This is a matter of oversight, however; there is nothing conspiratorial here.

It is disturbing that Naylor could not deliver this appropriate criticism without misrepresenting other findings and indulging in innuendo. Several phrases ("curious disclaimer," "Which is correct, Mr. Shill?" "Words and terminology should not mislead the reader," the smug injection of irony in the last sentence) are slick examples of verbal overkill which contribute nothing to scholarly dialogue.—Harold B. Shill, Head Librarian, Evansdale Library, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

To the Editor:

I find it ironic that an issue devoted in part to the importance of library research (May 1980) contains an article as frivolous as Turner's "Femininity and the Librarian—Another Test." The author admits that his findings are not generalizable. Even were they, I doubt that society's perception of the library profession would be changed by its awareness of test results concerning the sex-role orientation of librarians.

I fervently hope that in the "ongoing
search for knowledge about the personality and characteristics of the library science student and the librarian” (p.241), not another study of this type is undertaken.—Charlotta Hensley, Head, Serials Department, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Editor’s note: The author, Robert L. Turner, elected not to reply.

To the Editor:

Thomas Gaughan’s article on “Resume Essentials for the Academic Librarian” (C&RL, March 1980) could more accurately have been titled as “Resume Minima.” What Gaughan describes are the minimum elements which allow a resume to pass a preliminary checklist screening by a typical personnel librarian. However, there is a great difference between passing this initial screening and being seriously considered for the job.

To get the job, one must convince the employer that one can succeed in performing to a high degree the responsibilities attendant to the position available. Nothing gives assurance of future success like a record of previous success, but nowhere in the items ranked by Gaughan and his colleagues can one find mention of an applicant’s achievements, accomplishments or promise for the future. Offices “held” and degrees awarded do not necessarily relate directly to success on the job. Listing duties and responsibilities gives virtually no clue as to how well those responsibilities were acquitted. Experience is passive—anyone can acquire some by reporting to work—but real achievements on the job reveal a successful worker.

The persons cited as references will speak to a candidate’s achievements, it is true, but in today’s tight job market, the successful job seekers must do all they can to advance their searches for desired positions. This means that resumes must be tailored to the job being sought, giving the employer the best possible grounds to believe that the applicant will succeed on the job. Thus the resume should list accomplishments in past and present positions, as well as publications, degrees and professional activity.

Guidelines for the construction of such resumes and accompanying cover letters may be found in such books as Richard Lathrop’s Who’s Hiring Who. [Berkeley, Calif.: Ten Speed Press, 1977.] Any librarian seeking work in today’s market should read this book first, and then begin the task of convincing prospective employers that the applicant can succeed in the position available, as well as meet minimum resume requirements.—Steve Marquardt, Assistant Director for Resources and Technical Services, Ohio University, Athens.

Editor’s note: The author, Thomas Gaughan, elected not to reply.

To the Editor:
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BOOK REVIEWS


A policy of "comparable worth" may be defined as one that compensates employees equally, not only for jobs that are equal or substantially equal as mandated in the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but also for jobs that can be shown to be of comparable value to an employer. It suggests that it is possible to compare dissimilar jobs by isolating and evaluating components such as level of skill required, responsibility carried, and so on. Supporters of comparable worth assume that implementation of such a policy would be an important step toward reducing job discrimination, particularly against women.

Comparable Worth: Issues and Alternatives presents a strong argument against the concept of comparable worth, which rests on two basic premises. First, that comparable worth has not been defined in operational terms and it appears that it will be difficult to accomplish this in the near future; and second, that comparable worth does not take into account market factors that are the basis for wage setting and efficient op-
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Operation of the free market in the United States. The study was funded by a grant from the Business Roundtable and, not surprisingly, consistently supports existing compensation practices and warns against the chaos that contributors are certain will result from any movement toward putting into practice a policy of comparable worth. Contributed papers address the value of job evaluation, stating that its purpose is only partly to analyze jobs and compensate workers fairly and therefore it cannot be used as the basis for determining the worth of jobs (Schwab); point out that other countries are not dealing with this issue (Bellace); assert that there are always quantifiable reasons for differences in pay between men as a group and women as a group (Robert); insist that as more women move up into managerial ranks, the problem of apparently inequitable wages for women as a group will disappear (Milkovich); and, finally, state that any attempt to implement a policy of comparable worth will result in "regulatory quagmire" (Williams and McDowell).

Of special interest is the conclusion by George Hildebrand that if "in a full burst of passion for what its proponents would call social justice, the wage differentials between 'male' and 'female' jobs are slashed so that female jobs are increased even as much as 50 percent relative to comparable male occupations," there would be an inevitable increase in unemployment and welfare costs. This is because such a policy would have the greatest effect on "low productivity" workers, that is, women, by raising the price of such workers to the point that employers would not be able to afford them and would therefore "disemploy" them. Hildebrand concludes:

"... economic theory tells us that if comparable work is put into effect (1) unemployment rates for females will rise, (2) unemployment of females also will rise, (3) the major victims will be the poorest female workers, (4) welfare dependency will grow, (5) female youngsters will be large losers of job opportunities, and (6) there will be some withdrawal of discouraged women workers from the labor force, precisely because official policy, in the purposed service of a peculiar concept of social justice, will have destroyed their jobs for them, despite their own efforts to be productive and self-supporting citizens."
There are undoubtedly many ways to support arguments on either side of this controversy. The most disturbing aspect of this book, however, is its primary assumption that there is currently no problem that time and the good motives of employers won't solve. Such a condescending, even paternalistic, view of a situation in which women's salaries on the whole remain at 57 percent of men's salaries, and in which the largest proportion of both women and men will always remain in the service, clerical, or maintenance categories of employment, is appalling.

The implications of this view for librarians are clear. Despite what librarians perceive as a profession in which individual jobs are complex and demanding in terms of required skills and levels of responsibility, the typical characterization of librarianship as a woman's profession continues to have a negative effect on the salaries that librarians can expect to earn over the course of their careers. The debate over comparable worth is just beginning, and it will be important for librarians interested in fair and equitable compensation practices in their own profession as well as in the labor market as a whole to be aware of both sides of the issue. Comparable Worth presents only one side.—Tina Kass, Research Libraries Group, Stanford, California.


This publication of sample personnel policies is intended, according to the author, to provide assistance to those who are faced with the "formidable task of writing a personnel policy in the absence of good examples." Unfortunately, the approach and the content of this book are unlikely to encourage either "good" policies or even the development of written policies. It fails to do an adequate job of explaining why written personnel policies are necessary to effective library administration, nor does it include any evaluation of the sample policies.

The book has two major focuses: the first, a summary of survey results from a questionnaire on personnel policies, and the second, the reprinting of sample personnel policies. The survey questionnaire was developed to query public and academic libraries on the extent of their written policies and to identify the specific areas of personnel in which policies existed. Questionnaires were mailed to over 1,300 public and 1,000 academic libraries with 510 usable questionnaires returned from the former and 416 from the latter. The section of the book entitled "Survey" is an analysis of the information obtained from these questionnaires. An immediate problem in understanding the survey results is with the broad question: "Does the library have a written personnel policy which defines librarians' rights and their conditions of employment? . . ." The implication, then, is that the survey is directed toward policies for only one group of employees—librarians—even though following survey questions are addressed to policies affecting "library employees." For instance, the question on performance evaluation is: "Are library employees given performance evaluations?" Does this question refer to all library employees or only to the librarians referred to in the broad survey question? This is not simply nit-picking since most libraries have different policies for professional and support staff. Therefore it is important to know when reading the survey results and later the sample policies whether the information applies to all staff or only to librarians.

The bulk of the book, though, is devoted not to the survey results or general information on personnel policies, but to the sample personnel policies reprinted from public and academic libraries. The policies are presented in two formats. The first set of policies consists of the complete personnel policies of four libraries—one academic and three public. The second group of policies—organized by personnel topics such as selection of staff, working conditions, employee benefits, and so forth—includes selections from numerous libraries. The author justifies the inclusion of the four comprehensive policies by commenting that they "provide reasonably thorough coverage of issues associated with the particular type and size of library" though none of this relevant information is provided to the reader. Indeed, no information on the libraries that
contributed policies—such as size and type of library, number of professional and support staff, union status, governance, or faculty status—is included. Since a clear understanding of personnel policies requires an understanding of the context within which they are developed and applied, this lack of information minimizes the usefulness of the sample policies.

In addition, the author provides no explanation of the criteria used to select the sample policies of 26 public and 20 academic libraries from among the 325 libraries that forwarded policies. In the acknowledgments section of the book, the author does indicate that she tried to achieve representation from geographic locations and size and type of library in presenting the policies but, other than this general statement, she provides no criteria for selecting the sample policies. Again it would be helpful to the reader to know what qualitative judgments the author made when reviewing so many personnel policies from such a wide range of libraries.

A major fault of this book is that the author provides no critical evaluation of the sample policies' content, writing style, or clarity. Nor has she identified those personnel issues, such as sexual harassment, privacy, and personal freedom, that are not covered in the policy information and survey results. What is also absent from this book is any information on the process of developing policies: who has the responsibility for identifying needed policies and writing policies, what opportunities should be provided for staff to review and contribute to policies, what are mechanisms for review and updating of policies, and how is policy information disseminated. Certainly major considerations in implementing personnel policies are staff attitudes, the acquisition of complete information on which to base policy decisions, and effective means for communicating policies to staff. These issues are ignored even though they are far more difficult for administrators than the actual writing of policies.

This book does not provide constructive assistance to someone faced with developing personnel policies. It fails to raise questions or issues related to policy development, nor does it provide helpful guidelines in the actual development, implementation, and updating of personnel policies. It simply provides in one volume a wide range of existing personnel policies—good, bad, and indifferent. One would hope that personnel administration—and specifically personnel policies—would deserve a more serious treatment than this volume provides.—Sheila Creath, University of Connecticut, Storrs.


Justin Winsor, the first president of ALA, was an important and interesting man, and many of his writings on librarianship and historiography are well worth reading. Most of this volume (p. 59–174) is devoted to reprints of twenty-one of his addresses, articles, and reports, including his report as chairman of the Boston Public Library Examining Committee (1867), his tenth report as superintendent of the Boston Public Library (1877), and the first of his twenty reports as librarian of Harvard University (1878). Twelve of the documents are reprinted from early volumes of Library Journal and one is from Atlantic Monthly, and although such texts may be readily accessible, it is convenient to have them brought together here. Each is reprinted in full, which is clearly desirable in most cases, but the three reports inevitably contain details, statistics, and tabulations that will be skipped by most readers. Deletions here might have made room for illuminating paragraphs from some of Winsor's many other reports.

The reprints are preceded by forty-four pages in which the editors outline Winsor's career and consider his ideas. This contribution is brief yet somewhat repetitious, informative but undistinguished.

Suspicions regarding the proofreading are aroused by the first line of the foreword, which states that Winsor died "unexpectantly" in 1897. Some of the subsequent slips—e.g., "Boyleston" (twice) for Boylston, "enert" for inert, and "credible" for creditable—might be passed over as venial; but a verdict of guilty is justified when (p. 41)
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Winsor's quotation from Macaulay is mangled and nonsense is printed.

When the editors criticize Winsor's literary style, asserting that it suffered because he "had no taste or feel for music," they may invite comparisons that they can ill afford. Their own style is remarkably graceless and inept. Winsor did not repeatedly use what Fowler calls "the illiterate such." He would not have affronted his readers with "Yet building the institutional structures of the library profession would prove more successful than maintaining the vital piety of the new dogma." He would not have written that he "was pushed to the stature of a folk-hero," that he "vacillated some," or that he "prepared exhaustive and critical surveys of historical erudition on early Americana." Winsor may have failed to appreciate music, but his writings deserve competent editors.—Edwin E. Williams, Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.


Much has been written about the fiscal crisis plaguing libraries; indeed, journals are filled with articles reciting a litany of shrinking budgets and rising costs. Frequently the suggestion is made that technological innovations and the organized sharing of resources can thwart those demons that make the task of managing a library a living nightmare. Surprisingly enough, however, the role that organized supporters—donors, volunteers, and friends—can play in helping libraries address the problems of the 1980s has received little attention. Thus, D. W. Krummel's Organizing the Library's Support: Donors, Volunteers, Friends is welcome in that it suggests that librarians must "pass the hat" as well as purchase the computer terminal if they are to weather the eighties.

The essays that Krummel has edited and compiled in this volume were originally given as papers at a conference devoted to the work auxiliary groups give to libraries—whether through the donation of books, time, money, or plain enthusiasm. The essays in the first part of this collection, "The Library Context," are very useful. Edward G. Holley, for example, has written an amusing anecdotal account of his experience as director of the University of Houston Libraries. Holley, while entertaining, has a clear message to deliver: librarians must come down from their ivory towers and be willing to take both the time and effort necessary “to interpret the library to those who have the resources to help.” The librarian must be diplomat and administrator, strategist and workhorse, if he or she is to organize successful support for his/her library.

Unfortunately, the second part of the collection, "Special Topics," is disappointing. The essays by Cynthia Weddel, Thomas G. Sanberg, and Jeanne Bohlen, although interesting in themselves, seem far removed from the library world. Their remarks seem applicable to any nonprofit organization, and I found myself wondering if the library was in fact different from a museum.
church, or school when viewed from the perspective of organizing support. The second part of this collection also has a disturbingly diffuse quality. The essays deal with all kinds of libraries—from large academic to small-town public—and discuss a variety of topics, ranging from how to deal with problem personalities in a friends' group, to choosing print styles for library publications. In this case, comprehensiveness is a liability rather than an asset. The reader is left with a wealth of information on a variety of subjects and a longing for some more in-depth treatment of the overall problem of organizing support for libraries.

Fortunately, Paul Mosher's essay, "Friends Groups and Academic Libraries," satisfies this craving. In describing the Stanford Library Associates, Mosher paints a picture that should inspire the envy and admiration of any library director. An imaginative program, the work of a full-time library development officer, and the support of the library staff have combined to make for a remarkably successful friends group. Yet, as Mosher sagely notes, this friends group has never been seen as an end in itself, but as a source and resource "for a range of short- and long-term developmental activities, having as their goal the larger financial benefit of the library." Mosher's essay crystallizes the seminal thread in this book: carefully cultivated, a friends group can indeed be a valuable resource that can help libraries provide better service and better collections, even in the straitened environment of the eighties.—Leslie Parker Hume, Research Libraries Group, Stanford, California.


From time to time experts from other disciplines have applied their paradigms to libraries. The impact of their efforts has usually been negligible on thinking and practice within the profession. This book, written by an economist and intended for scholars of local government as well as library and public administrators, may prove to be an exception.

Getz' outsider view of libraries as publicly financed institutions, and the resulting payoff of such support in terms of value to society and the efficiency of operations, is provocative and illuminating. Drawing upon data from thirty-one major libraries, the author has attempted to analyze "the strategic decisions that shape the provision of public library service in the United States" according to economic and public administration theories. The conclusions—based on macroeconomic data about the optimum mix of hours of operation, number of facilities, staff size, number of materials, and the impact of technological innovation in terms of cost reduction—are not definitive but certainly raise tough questions that public officials are likely to ask and library administrators should prepare to answer.

Getz views libraries with scholarly dispensation, but some of his statements are sure to raise hackles among librarian readers. He considers the public library as an industry and the "bundling" of labor, buildings, and materials a "production process" to be optimized into a cost-efficient mix of services. Forty-seven of the fifty-nine branches of the New York Public Library are characterized as having benefits less than their annual cost of operation. He discusses the widely accepted public administration concepts of equity and redistribution of benefits—both are positive if benefits are larger for low-income families. He concludes that public libraries do "not tend to redistribute well-being from higher to lower income groups" because low-income groups do not use libraries much.

He favors charging fees whenever the library incurs an additional use. Furthermore, it's appropriate to charge in excess of cost. In fact, the author thinks fees reflecting the value of the service are perfectly O.K. The problem is setting the basis for the fee.

Academic librarians should not ignore this disturbing book. Many of the ideas presented and issues raised are pertinent for all libraries.—Ellen Altman, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Studies in Creative Partnership: Federal Aid to Public Libraries during the New Deal. Edited by Daniel F. Ring.
Studies in Creative Partnership examines the uses to which federal aid generated by the period of the Great Depression was put in the public libraries of seven major American cities: Baltimore, Cleveland, Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and San Francisco. The federal agencies responsible for the sudden infusion of hundreds of newly employed workers into these civic libraries were all created from President Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation: the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA); the Civil Works Administration (CWA); and the most well known of the agencies, the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Established in 1935, the WPA provided funds for library personnel to maintain and repair buildings, bind and mend books, serve in clerical and other paraprofessional posts, and provide support for large-scale bibliographical projects, such as union catalogs, which would probably not have been undertaken without additional help.

Unlike Edward B. Stanford’s monograph, Library Extension under the W . P . A . , which analyzed the national distribution of funds and examined their use at the state level, this anthology concentrates its attention at the grass-roots level of government. Its contributors have scrutinized local records to determine what the various projects were and to evaluate their utility and long-term success. As might be expected, the results were uneven. Chicago, for example, forged ahead with the production of major catalogs and bibliographies, while San Francisco, under a rather lackluster librarian, hired workers to perform as clerks, bookbinders, and typists. Libraries also showed variety in the ways in which WPA workers were integrated with the permanent staff; employee unrest characterized Baltimore’s Enoch Pratt Free Library, while the New York Public Library’s use of additional personnel appears to have gone smoothly. No doubt because of the paucity of records, this anthology heavily stresses the institutional response to the WPA program; little presumably remains attesting to reactions of the federally paid employees to their new work environment. As Fay Blake poignantly observes, “For San Francisco Public Library the Works Project Administration provided a steady, if unspectacular, source of assistance and support. For the people whose livelihood the Agency ensured it meant more.”

This anthology is helpful in broadening our knowledge of early programs of federal assistance in the seven libraries selected for study, but the relationship of these forms of grants activity to the larger issues soon to occupy the nation’s public libraries in their search for federal aid is largely untouched. This lack of connection somewhat limits the book as a source for an understanding of the role of public libraries on the public policy agenda.—R. Kathleen Molz, Columbia University, New York City.


Closing the Catalog is more than a frank and comprehensive evaluation of the pros and cons of closing a catalog. This record of two Library and Information Technology Association (LITA) institutes offers an engaging philosophical discussion of the purposes of a library catalog and the future of bibliographic access. In addition to very practical treatises on closing the catalog at the New York Public Library, the New York State Library, the University of Toronto, and LC, this volume contains articles on such topics as the process of planning for the bibliographic future; the impact of closing on library organization and on reference services; past and present research that could affect library catalog design; and opening the catalog, i.e., making the catalog more relevant, sensitive, and timely for the library user. Although some would argue that the topic of this work makes it automatically out of date, the content of the presentations would belie any such claim.

If there is one message that this work emphasizes, it is that the adoption of AACR2 by itself is insufficient reason for closing a catalog. Despite dire consequenc es—loss of continuity, indefinite creation
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of two catalogs, premature use of technology and professionals, and a "new era of dependence on LC"—Paul Fasana, who gave the keynote address, elects to close the catalog because of AACR2 and LC's response to AACR2. Seymour Lubetzky contends that "a scarred catalog is vastly preferable to a dismembered one." Joseph A. Rosenthal discusses the process of planning itself, and its benefits and drawbacks. In planning for the bibliographic future, he argues persuasively that staff should be widely involved, but at the same time he indicates that it is important to be speedy and forceful, and to include statistical verification when presenting a case. Frederick Kilgour notes, "to be sure, implementation of AACR2 will not produce economic catastrophe but, on the other hand, it will not improve the economics of libraries." Edward Shaw views the closing of the catalog as a symbol of the end of one epoch and the beginning of another. Peter Paulson points out that opportunities to exploit new technology are the soundest reason for closing a catalog. Allen Hogden and Valentine DeBruin provide detailed case histories of closings at the New York Public Library and the University of Toronto. Susan L. Miller gives a thorough description of the Library Control System (LCS), which, with its enhancements, is becoming Ohio State University's online catalog. Michael Gorman speaks of the card catalog as the "Bibliographic Maginot Line," and maintains that mechanization and standardization are the only future course for cataloging. Carole Weiss believes the most significant reason for closing is the "desirability of taking advantage of new computer technology to provide better information retrieval." She and Pauline Atherton both summarize F. W. Lancaster's findings on catalog use studies. Atherton provides an excellent comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of card catalogs, COM, and online catalogs, plus an extensive bibliography of catalog use studies. Hugh Atkinson presents his theories on the effects the death of the catalog will have on library organization. He foresees smaller units that will participate in technical service and public service functions simultaneously. Lucia Rather, after describing the history of LC's decision on closing, offers three scenarios: (1) if a library needs to close its catalog and has plans for a viable alternative, the catalog should be closed preferably at the time AACR2 is adopted; (2) if a library feels the need to close and has no ready alternative, the catalog should be closed with the adoption of AACR2 and a temporary new card catalog begun; (3) if a library has no other need to close its existing card catalog (space is not a problem, filing staff is adequate, etc.), the card catalog should not be closed simply to accommodate new rules. She notes that "the most important step to be taken is to begin to plan for change." John G. Lorenz' presentation follows Rather's and describes ARL's program to study the costs of closing. (The King Research Program has since been finished and its conclusions published.)

Two articles by Sanford Berman and Maurice Freedman are perhaps the most interesting because they both challenge the assumptions of the previous presentations and argue for more creative cataloging that meets local needs. Their concern is
that libraries will run, as Freedman puts it, "lemming-like to follow the de facto national library's practices or support their bibliographic utility's practices..." Like most of the authors, they argue strongly for rigorous authority control as an essential element of good cataloging.

In his closing remarks S. Michael Maliconico is equally critical of the rush to close. He also questions the benefits libraries will derive from AACR2 when machine searching is capable of rendering moot many of the questions of choice and form of entry. Perhaps AACR2's most lasting benefit will be as a catalyst to change.

This work is a provocative one, well worth its cost. This brief review necessarily telescopes much of the commentary by these cataloging experts, and this reviewer strongly urges that libraries purchase this title and librarians read it.—Frederick C. Lynden, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.


The Making of a Code gathers papers presented at the International Conference on AACR2 held March 11–14, 1979, in Tallahassee, Florida. Objectives of the conference were: (1) to provide librarians with an opportunity for dialogue with the individuals directly responsible for the revision of AACR; (2) to provide an opportunity for individuals to discuss the various rule changes and thus gain a better insight into the theory behind the rules; (3) to provide an opportunity for individuals to exchange ideas about the code to increase their understanding of the impact of the code on library operations and user expectations; and (4) to explore avenues for implementation. The majority of the papers, particularly in part 2, "Description," part 3, "Access Points," and part 4, "Looking beyond the Rules," do not provide new insights into the interpretation of use of the code or even the background of the code development for the most part. A notable exception is "Examining the 'Main' in Main Entry Headings" by Elizabeth L. Tate, who addresses the fundamental concept of the role of the main entry in cataloging, tracing the development of the main entry (as reflected in an author-unit-entry) over the past 130 years. Tate investigates three questions: (1) Is the author-unit-entry more efficient than the title-unit-entry as far as the user is concerned or vice versa? (2) Is either method demonstrably more or less costly? (3) Is either type of cataloging more or less suitable for international exchange of cataloging data? Although she can answer only the last question with any degree of certainty (the title-unit-entry appears to be more amenable to effective international exchange of bibliographic data in her opinion), she touches on questions of catalog use studies, work-flow analyses, and other studies as part of her examination of the still unsettled controversy.

It is in part 1, "Generalities," however, that the most interesting presentations appear. In "The Fundamentals of Bibliographic Cataloging and AACR2," Seymour Lubetzky points out that the attempts of the authors of AACR2 to reconcile widely divergent opinions and objectives has resulted in a "compromise unsusceptible to a coherent ideology based on the requirements of a sound catalog designed to serve the users of the library." Despite praise for the craftsmanship of the new code, Lubetzky identifies three decisions made during its development that have compromised the integrity of AACR: first, a compromise on the issue of main entry that blurs the primary objective of the catalog as first set forward by Panizzi; second, the abandonment of the principle of corporate authorship; and third, the resulting inadequacy of the treatment of serials in AACR2. Lubetzky reminds us of Panizzi's critics, who looked at a catalog primarily as a finding list rather than as a device that could also in its structure reflect the relationships of works and editions to one another, thus providing the catalog user with more information than simply that needed for identification of a specific item. The collocating function of a catalog that in-
eludes syndetic devices was a guiding principle in the development of AACR1. According to Lubetzky, this view has been lost in the new code, which reflects a view of the catalog as a finding list.

The importance of Lubetzky's comments is underscored by S. Michael Malinconico in "AACR2 and Automation." Malinconico points out that although automation can make it easier for libraries to accommodate changes in bibliographical principles, such principles exist independently from any technology and must be developed in isolation from computers, despite the intention of drafters of the new code "to take developments in library automation into account." Malinconico notes that the concept of the main entry, despite its demise in AACR2, reappears in the frequently forwarded suggestion that automated systems can compensate for the absence of the main entry and collocation function by linking various versions of a work. However, the ability of most systems to accomplish this or to support any of the extensive modifications necessary to implement the new code well is not evident at this time. He argues that the time to implement a new cataloging code would have been at a point when this kind of support was available.

Malinconico also lists some accommodations to automation that are evident in the new code, although his opinion of at least two of these is that the code has found solutions to relatively trivial problems. For example, the filing provisions in AACR2 occasionally result in forms of access that—while easily processed by machine—look peculiar to the people reading them. He points out that in the experience of the New York Public Library, reliance on manual filing forms when necessary has caused no major problems. In addition, use of rigid punctuation rules to help machine sorting will not be as effective as the consistent use of explicit content designators that already exist in the MARC format.

The Making of a Code will be an important text on the development of the second edition of AACR for future students of cataloging history. For the present, it raises questions and doubts about the code that continue to be troublesome and controversial.

In The Handbook for AACR2, Margaret Maxwell presents a useful explication of the new code by providing clear explanations of specific rules, numerous full catalog entry format examples illustrating code prescriptions, transcriptions of title pages from which the examples are derived, and references to treatment of specific topics in earlier codes when possible and appropriate. The Handbook also includes helpful appendices such as descriptions of anonymous classics; AACR2 forms of headings for U.S. presidents, British sovereigns, etc.; and indexes to rules, examples, and topics covered in the book. Library of Congress practice is reflected as much as possible in the text and examples.

Most valuable to nonspecialist catalogers will be the chapters on special materials that provide examples of cataloging of motion pictures, video records, graphic materials, three-dimensional artifacts and realia—items that many catalogers encounter only occasionally and that present problems because of their rarity in many collections. Although the Handbook will not take the place of the example files most catalogers compile to illustrate unusual problems they solve in their work, it does provide a very useful basic collection that, together with the explanations, will be valuable for training purposes in both libraries and library schools, and for general consultation in catalog departments.—Tina Kass, Research Libraries Group, Stanford, California.


Roper and Boorkman are the principal authors of this work, writing nine of the fourteen chapters; the remaining chapters were contributed by librarians from various health sciences libraries around the country. Intended primarily for use as a library school text, this book should be equally useful to practicing librarians and library users.

The first chapter covers the organization and management of a reference collection. It offers no cut-and-dried blueprint, but rather a discussion of alternatives and the factors to be considered when making deci-
sions about particular situations. The remaining thirteen chapters are the real meat of the book, however, and deal primarily with specialized sources of information in the health sciences.

Unlike the heavily subject-oriented approach followed by authors like Lunin and Morton, this volume is divided into two general sections—bibliographic sources and information sources. Each chapter within a section deals with a particular type of bibliographic or information resource, providing both a discussion of the general characteristics of the type and examples of the most important sources, with a brief description of the major features of each. The titles cited do not provide an exhaustive listing, but rather are the authors’ choice of core titles for each type. Suggested additional readings are also included for each chapter.

The section on bibliographic sources begins with two chapters discussing general sources of bibliographic information on monographs and periodical titles, followed by discussions of the major abstracting and indexing services and the computerized databases that are currently available. The final two chapters of this section cover sources of information for government documents, technical reports, conferences, reviews, and translations.

The section on information sources contains chapters on terminology, handbooks and manuals, drug information, audiovisuals, medical and health statistics, directories and biographical sources, and history sources. The chapters dealing with conferences, audiovisuals, and statistics may be particularly useful, as these topics are not often addressed in this manner.

This book will not be of particular value to the person seeking a specific source in a particular subject area. It will, however, be a tremendous help to the individual who is trying to determine how and where to find such information as statistical data, biographical data, or information about audiovisuals in the health sciences. These individuals are probably in training to become reference librarians in a health sciences library, but they could just as easily be library patrons or reference librarians in any general academic or research library.—Eliz-
abeth Sawyers, Health Sciences Library, Ohio State University, Columbus.


The title of this book may lead the reader to expect a treatise on reference work in the humanities. This work actually presents a variety of reference questions and case studies organized by subject. The subjects covered are philosophy, religion and mythology, literature, music, fine arts, and theater arts; there is also a chapter on interdisciplinary problems. Each subject area has a set of exercises, divided into three sections: questions, search problems, and case studies. The exercises are designed to familiarize readers with the disciplines that make up the humanities; to introduce the reader to the difficulties and complexities of the reference interview; and to provide search problems for every subject area using appropriate examples. Unfortunately, the author does not provide solutions to search problems. The appendix gives some examples of possible solutions in a few subject areas, but it seems that a book of this type should have solutions, or at least some suggestions on finding answers to the questions posed. This is also true for the case studies; no examples of possible solutions are given. Even if the main function of this work is to serve as a workbook in a classroom situation, suggested solutions appended at the end of the book would have enhanced its usefulness.

The approach employed in this book helps the reader to understand how to translate the language of the library user into the terminology of potential retrieval systems in a given library situation. Often too much emphasis has been placed by the library science curriculum and by practicing reference librarians on the nature and reference qualities of specific reference titles, and too little emphasis on understanding how these qualities come into play in the process of reference work. In this respect the author is successful in identifying a number of questions that help to distinguish the difference between these two processes. In the absence of other titles in the area of reference service in the humanities, this work is a good beginning. The questions selected in the exercises are phrased in a variety of ways, having varying degrees of clarity and ambiguity and differing levels of depth, which may help the reader to understand the kinds of questions he/she will encounter. A major weakness is the lack of a bibliography or notes suggesting further reading. This is a serious flaw in the book. One cannot help but compare this work with Reference Books in the Social Sciences and Humanities by R. E. Stevens (Stipes, 1977). The latter work is broader in scope and provides extensive information on several hundred specific reference books in the social sciences and humanities. (Stevens' title referred to here is out of print. Available is Reference Books in the Social Sciences by R. Stevens and D. Davis [Stipes, 1977].) Had these features been present in SantaVicca's book, they would have considerably increased its value.—George V. Hodowanec, Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources. ERIC Basics; a Sound/Microfiche Instructional Package. Syracuse, N.Y., 1979. 53-frame color microfiche, 12-minute audiocassette. $10. (Available from: Information Resources Publs., 130 Huntington Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210.)

This unusual pairing of media formats, a cassette and microfiche, is attractively boxed and easy to use. Its aim is to teach the uninitiated how to use the two ERIC indexes, Resources in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), in order to access the ERIC document collection and periodical literature in the field of education. It succeeds admirably. The narrators assume nothing yet are not insulting. A woman gives clear instructions on how to load and follow the fiche, and these instructions are repeated at appropriate points. A man presents the content, and again is concise and clear. Visually, the fiche frames are simple yet effective; the use of color and the repetition of cover shots of the three sources discussed (RIE, CIJE, and the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors) reinforce the information that
is being heard. A fiche alone could never begin to address the specific details given on the cassette, but a cassette alone would lack the visual impact. In short, the combination works well for this presentation.

To demonstrate the use of the ERIC Thesaurus in combination with RIE and CIJE, the user follows the steps in a sample search on the College Entrance Examination. The notations for each descriptor (date the term was added and the number of times it has been used) as well as the abbreviations for related terms (UF for “use for” and NT for “narrower term,” for example) are all defined as part of the explanation of the descriptor page. The differences in coverage of the two indexes and the arrangement of each are detailed, and there are sample entries from the document sections showing the abstract, identifiers, and availability of the item. The author index and institution indexes are also shown. A clear distinction is made between ERIC documents available on fiche in over 700 libraries, and journal articles that must first be accessed by journal title in the library’s card catalog. The program runs twelve minutes with the last two to three minutes being devoted to a review of the presentation. Recommended for the beginning education major, anyone approaching ERIC for the first time, and individuals who wish to review the ERIC tools, this program would be a worthwhile addition to any library instruction collection.—Jean W. Farrington, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.


This collection of papers, presented at the Twenty-Third Midwest Academic Librarians’ Conference (Ball State University, May 1978), attempts to analyze the symbiotic relationship between the faculty development and library instruction movements. Although the literatures of both movements are expanding rapidly and consume the time and energies of many an institutional committee, there has been little dialogue and cross-fertilization between the two. The changing student population, growing financial pressures, exponentially increasing sources of information, and the appropriate use of technology in higher education are joint concerns. But, as Ray Suput writes in the foreword, the specific focuses of faculty development and library instruction are mismatched—the former is faculty-oriented and the latter is student-oriented. The authors (representing librarians, faculty, and library and institutional administrators) address opportunities and strategies for enhancing interaction between the two movements.

Participants Jesse McCartney and Paul Lacey draw upon the work of faculty-development proponent Jerry Gaff as they detail three approaches to development: personal, instructional, and organizational. Dwight Burlingame suggests that library schools must be agents of change in equipping librarians with essential research and teaching skills that allow them to assume a more credible and substantial role in faculty development. The ability of library instruction to strengthen the bond between research and teaching is discussed by Patricia Senn Breivik. She advocates participation by librarians in the research planning process and in the construction of “real life” learning experiences for students. William Stephenson characterizes faculty as “disciplinary chauvinists”—a description that may explain the success of discipline—and course-specific bibliographic instruction. Evan Farber describes just such a successful approach in his review of Earlham College’s library program.

Panel discussants Sharon Rogers and George Gardiner decry the status differential between faculty and librarians implied by several of the speakers and outline strategies to neutralize the differential. Finally, John Barber makes a plea for social insight, while Marilyn Ward contends that librarians should help change faculty self-perceptions from subject specialists to teachers.

The conference’s emphasis is definitely on Gaff’s notion of faculty instructional development. Too little attention is given to the librarian’s (and library administrator’s) function in organizational development.
There is surely a role for librarians in more fully integrating the library into the institution’s faculty development goals, particularly to ensure equal consideration with other contenders for a piece of the faculty development action (e.g., computer literacy programs). Library involvement in departmental review and institutional accreditation proceedings might also be considered.

Symbiosis implies a close association of two organisms that is not necessarily mutually beneficial. The conference participants have illustrated the opportunities for librarians to enhance the faculty development movement, but the “growth opportunities” are generally one-sided. The question of faculty participation in the library/librarian development process is unanswered.

This volume, the eleventh in Pierian’s Library Orientation series, does provide some interesting think pieces and useful examples for librarian involvement. In comparison to its predecessors in the series, however, it lacks some of the earlier enthusiasm and conviction—perhaps a sign that the honeymoon period for library instruction has ended.—Wendy Pradt Lougee, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.


It is an ironic fact of librarianship that major movements take an inordinately long time to appear in the monographic literature or as textbooks. Bibliographic instruction is a case in point: interest, activity, and innovation continue to gain momentum while BI journal literature, conference announcements, and continuing education blurbs swamp one’s desk. Yet to date there has been only one attempt to codify the full range of principles and practices, the Bibliographic Instruction Handbook published by ACRL in 1979 (reviewed in College & Research Libraries 41:82 [Jan. 1980]). The present volume, despite its nearly identical title, is very different in intent and arrangement and should be welcomed by everyone in the field of academic library instruction, whether veteran or novice.

Whereas the ACRL publication, a spiral-bound committee effort of the Bibliographic Instruction Section, consists of a series of useful checklists, charts, model statements, and assorted papers on setting up a BI program, the Renford-Hendrickson volume provides a much more complete picture of library use instruction.

Renford and Hendrickson have organized their work according to the principal modes of BI with chapters on planning, orientation, the printed word, course-related instruction, library skills workbooks, credit courses, computer-assisted instruction, and AV materials and equipment generally. Each chapter addresses the appropriate situation for the teaching method under consideration, with a thoughtful review of the advantages and disadvantages inherent in that approach. Then follows a discussion of how one would go about designing and carrying out that form of BI, giving solid advice, full-page examples, and warnings of pitfalls. Chapters conclude with footnotes and suggested readings, all of which are relevant and up to date. A list of additional sources (including clearinghouses and organizations), a brief glossary, and a subject index appear as back matter.

Throughout their book, Renford and Hendrickson provide the sort of practical insights that only seasoned BI librarians can offer. Especially astute are their observations on the politics of BI; and on the critical importance of flexibility, of communicating through channels, of involving as many staff and faculty as possible, and of keeping the program visible. The degree of detail varies, however, from chapter to chapter. For instance, much is said about how to structure a printed self-guided tour but there is very little discussion of how to put together an audio or AV tour that would accomplish the same end. Evaluation is admittedly a difficult problem; for just that reason more space might have been given to it. Despite occasional cursory treatments, virtually every surface aspect of BI is covered with sufficient emphasis so that readers can extrapolate ideas to their own situations.

The reviewer has only one serious reservation about this long-needed book: that is, that the concepts and content of effective instruction are scarcely mentioned. No-
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where do Renford and Hendrickson discuss what topics or titles can best be covered in any particular form of instruction and why. For example, in the section on the presentation aspects of the single lecture, they suggest ways of organizing material so that students are interested and engaged by it, but they never touch on pure BI theory: why certain concepts are appropriate to certain levels of users, how concepts should be sequenced, and how to present a versatile search strategy that can be transferred by the student to other disciplines and institutions. This omission is regrettable, but to cover these areas the text would need to be twice as long. Perhaps we should be grateful that the book has appeared at all—and not a moment too soon for most of us.

Bibliographic Instruction: A Handbook is most highly recommended, in fact should be required, anywhere academic BI is seriously undertaken. Together with the ACRL volume (which, by the way, is currently being revised by a committee chaired by Beverly Renford), it provides an excellent what-to-consider manual for the practitioner.—Mary W. George, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.


A distinguishing feature of The Library and Information Manager’s Guide to Online Services is the depth of documentation cited for every major topic covered. The citations reflect the relative maturity of online services at the start of the 1980s. Anyone new to the field today faces information overflow, when a decade earlier the newcomer had only a few personal accounts to read. In a thorough manner, this Guide succeeds in focusing attention on key managerial issues and in presenting both valuable factual data and various viewpoints on controversial topics.

The Guide consists of ten individually authored chapters. Two chapters by Ryan E. Hoover—“Overview of Online Information Retrieval” and “The Mechanics of Online Searching”—are excellent introductions for any uninitiated searcher. Databases, their producers, and vendors of services are concisely reviewed in two chapters by Kathleen Sheton and Alice Bahr. Management concerns and questions of service policies are summarized by Donald T. Hawkins, while specific areas are further explored in three subsequent chapters. John C. Blair’s paper focuses on measurement and evaluation of various aspects of online services and their management; promotion is covered with helpful hints and illustrative examples in a chapter by Alice Bahr; and Kristyn Kuroki discusses the range of available training modes for searchers. A chapter by Mary Berger and Barbara Quint is devoted to the growth and role of online user groups, a topic not as yet extensively documented in the literature. The final chapter, by Ryan Hoover, presents a view of the future in which a greater reliance on electronic storage and retrieval of information will permit the information specialist to provide information on demand, without the need for physical library buildings and collections.

The reference use of the Guide is enhanced by a glossary of more than eighty online phrases, a short selected bibliography, numerous citations footnoted at the end of each chapter, and a detailed index.

The Guide is the twelfth title in the publisher’s Professional Librarian series, which emphasizes practical information about technological developments, supported by operational examples. It is an easily usable package of practical information to aid those interested in online services. Topics discussed are of universal interest to any type of library. However, as noted in the text, academic libraries have not met yet the full potential to use such services, and thus this Guide may be of particular interest to their users and staff.—Danuta A. Nitecki, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.


It is no exaggeration to say that the ARIST volumes have received more praise than any other information science publica-
tion. The series has become a legend in its own time and is must reading for the information scientist and must browsing for the librarian who would be keen.

It may be a slight exaggeration to say that ARIST represents the best thing NSF and ASIS ever did for us. Unfortunately, it is probably not exaggerating to say that ARIST volumes may be the only bargains on the publisher's overpriced list. The treatment of ARIST in the library and information science secondary literature continues to be a bargain-basement case of too little, usually too late. Future reviews should deal with separate chapters (which vary annually according to plan), and our indexing services should especially expedite their coverage.

Per usual, there are a cross-referenced dictionary index, a series cumulative keyword index, and chapter bibliographies with about 1,400 citations. These features, of generally high quality, constitute about half the pages and are the cornerstones of ARIST's usefulness. There are a few chinks in the old cornerstones. There is no explicit citation or treatment of AACR2. Nor are all of the appropriate papers from ACRL's first national conference cited. There is only one passing mention of the White House Conference.

"Copyright and Information Technology" by Keplinger (U.S. Copyright Office) is a well-written annotation of a nine-page bibliography that does not go far enough! The elusive mystery paper that clears up the legal way to do photocopies for closed reserves is still absent. Missing also is any discussion of Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry (Johns Hopkins Pr., 1979) and of the copyright surveys in the ALA Yearbook and Bowker Annual.

What of Donald Johnson's Copyright Handbook (Bowker, 1979) and Leon Seltzer's Exemptions and Fair Use in Copyright (Harvard Univ. Pr., 1978)? Some omissions may reflect either the author's value judgments or the quality of the bibliography furnished him, but one is puzzled by the absence of the Copyright Office's own General Guide to the Copyright Act of 1976 (U.S. Copyright Office, 1977) and its Concordance (U.S. Copyright Office, 1979) and of the widely distributed second study by John C. Stedman from the Sept. 1978 AAUP Bulletin.

Cawkell's erudite review of "Information Technology" leans heavily on English examples—as it must since they are leaders in some key areas. The paper's high quality and technical scope may have put off the editor who allowed such puzzles as: "Non-verbal information is originated by a person writing or typing" (p.44), and the whole last paragraph, which seems to have lost something in translation.

"Artificial Intelligence Applications in Information Systems" by Smith covers the last ten years of this seemingly esoteric field. She provides a scholarly, useful summary of work that may well be the underpinning of information science and library service during the rest of the century.

The acid test of ARIST for many librarians will be Veneziano's 1978-79 summary of library automation concerning cataloging, acquisitions, and circulation. After chopping a 300-item bibliography down by more than half, the author has put together a gingerly map of the North American libraries' dependence on computers. That she did so from the vantage point of Northwestern University, one of the few research libraries...
with maximum reliance on in-house, online computer processing, gives credibility to her astute questions and predictions.

Do "Information Analysis Centers" lose their flavor after eighteen good and bad years? The question is thoughtfully and thoroughly answered, perhaps once and for all, by Carroll and Maskewitz. Librarians will profit from the sections on effectiveness and evaluation, marketing, and comparisons to libraries.

Terratn's "Computers in Publishing" repeats his 1975 tour de force, which slants toward scientific and technical publishing, especially chemistry. Absent is notice of the word-processing journal Typeworld (ISSN 0149-4851) and of the American Newspaper Publishers Association's journal, Pressstime (ISSN 0194-3243).

The awkward title "The Impacts of Computer-Mediated Organizational and Interpersonal Communication" belies a rewarding overview of a literature that librarians should know because of studies on organizational work life, employment, organizational structure, and personal communication.

In their definitive review of "Computer Assisted Legal Research," Larson and Williams cover the five U.S. systems and provide insights and conclusions that have parallel implications for the database searching and user instruction worries of libraries. In sharp contrast to the legal literature is the review of the fuzzy literature dealing with information work in less developed countries. Keren and Harmon's conclusion: things are tough all over. Their considered admonition to the UN, UNESCO, and the less developed countries seems also to apply to the library-information science tension that is as old as the ARIST series itself: "the danger of increasing the gap . . . is a real one." (p.310).—Larry X. Besant, Ohio State University Libraries, Columbus.


The editorial statement of purpose for this volume is to summarize the state of the art in online library automation systems. Eight papers discuss the status of and developments in the use of various systems: three papers are about online bibliographic retrieval systems and services, three papers describe user education and training in the use of these systems, and two papers discuss computerized periodical control and order systems. Six papers are in English, one in German, and one in French.

Of the three papers on bibliographic retrieval, the one entitled "Cross Data Base Searching," using the SDC Search Service ORBIT retrieval system as an example, is very outdated in the fast-moving online world. It was written by two former SDC employees in 1978; considerable advances have been made in that system since that time. While the data are still accurate, they do not represent all that the system offers on the subject today. One paper, in German, describes the status of German, French, and U.S. online retrieval systems in the Federal Republic of Germany. The third paper is on the European Space Agency's Information Retrieval Service using the RECON retrieval system. It is timely and accurate and a good summary of the most heavily used European online service.

The three papers about user education and training for bibliographic retrieval systems describe French developments and methods through 1979 (in French), U.S. experience with Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI), and European experience in online-user education. All three are appropriate to the topic of the volume. The final two papers describe the Pekos online periodicals control system at the ETH-Bibliothek in Zurich and the Swets & Zeitlinger subscription service system.

The mix of papers is a bit uneven; there is no coverage of online cataloging and circulation systems. A better distribution would have been to include a paper on each of these kinds of systems at the expense of two papers on online bibliographic retrieval services. Aside from the overemphasis on bibliographic retrieval systems and the outdated paper on the SDC ORBIT system, this volume is acceptable as far as it goes. The available journal and review literature provides far better coverage of this topic than this single volume, which fails as a comprehensive overview of online library systems.—Ryan E. Hoover, SDC Search Service, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.
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This paper describes the integration of a reclassification and conversion program staffed by CETA workers into the technical services work flow of a research library. It includes a brief overview of CETA with a bibliography of suggested readings, a review of the use of CETA in libraries, and two proposal narratives with sample job descriptions. Simplified work plans present the reclassification of a Dewey collection to Library of Congress (LC) and the conversion of LC record cards into machine-readable format. Suggestions are offered for other libraries contemplating the use of CETA.


This study determines the periods of peak demand on library services in the Radford University Library, establishes staffing profiles to meet these demands, and projects changes in staffing levels that may in the future modify the library's service capabilities. It is divided into three parts, the first of which applies a data analysis of library use statistics to staffing needs, critically examining current staffing patterns and making recommendations. The second section projects current levels into steady state, using both the current state staffing formula and the State University of New York (SUNY) public services staffing formula, and offers conclusions and recommendations based on the findings detailed in the first two sections. Attached are the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) enrollment projections, Radford College enrollment projections, an appendix from the state budget manual, and the Library Advisory Committee report summary.


Emphasizing the importance of the development and maintenance of a system of signs to make the library patron aware that a reliable pattern of information exists within the library, this report includes a selection of statements excerpted from Sign Systems for Libraries, a collection of papers on visual guidance systems in various types of libraries edited by Dorothy Pollet and Peter C. Haskell (Bowker, 1979), and an outline, explanation, and list of recommendations for a proposed signage system for the Idaho State University Library.


This final report of the Committee on the Future of the Card Catalog at the University of Virginia considers the evaluative reports of three task forces on the effects of AACR2 and recommends that the university library set as a top priority goal the design, development, and implementation of an online catalog by 1983. The committee further recommends that the library not close its catalog in 1981 but wait until the online catalog is in place. After 1981 the open catalog should include full two-way links between the old and the new headings. The library should move to become a member of the Research Libraries Group as soon as possible to ease the transition, and task forces to help cope with AACR2 should be appointed without delay. This report summarizes alternative courses of action open to the committee and the discussion leading to these recommendations.


This resource notebook, one of three developed within the framework of management review and analysis self-study procedures, focuses on improvement of library organization. The introduction provides background and a review of analytical methods. The first section provides examples of data-gathering tools and approaches to gathering information. The second group of documents illustrates methods of describing and analyzing library organizational structures and relationships, and the final section contains examples of recommendations for change and improvement that have been made by libraries. A selected bibliography is included.

This resource notebook, the second of three developed within the framework of management review and analysis self-study procedures, focuses on library planning. An introduction provides background and a conceptual overview of library-planning processes. The first section of documents provides examples of data-gathering tools and approaches to gathering information. The second group of documents illustrates methods of describing and analyzing planning needs, and the final section contains examples of recommendations for new approaches to planning that have been made by libraries. A selected bibliography is included.


This resource notebook, the third of three developed within the framework of management review and analysis self-study procedures, focuses on library staff development. The introduction provides background and a brief conceptual overview of staff development. The first section of documents provides examples of data-gathering tools and approaches to gathering information. The second group of documents illustrates methods of describing and analyzing examples of recommendations for new approaches to staff development that have been made by libraries. A selected bibliography is included.


A survey of 40 reporting academic libraries in Indiana developed this directory of library user instruction programs, which provides an index profile of library resources and types of programs within the state. Entries are alphabetical in outline form and provide a library contact person, capsule information about the library instruction program, and lists of topics for which print and audiovisual materials are available. Libraries that issue lists of their instructional programs are indicated and published information about instruc-
tional programs is included if the library supplied the information. The index presents resources by broad subject and format. The directory includes the survey report and questionnaire.


Use studies were conducted in the main libraries and science branches at the Davis and Santa Cruz campuses of the University of California to gather data for use in the detailed planning for establishing regional compact shelving facilities for infrequently circulated library material. Analysis of preliminary data on the three areas examined—unrecorded use, browsing, and immediacy of need—suggest that (1) collection usage may be six times greater than indicated by circulation statistics; (2) unrecorded use is not synonymous with at-the-shelf discovery; (3) differences exist in recorded and unrecorded use rates between broad categories of materials; (4) techniques are available for recording use of materials consulted in the library and reshelved by library staff; (5) some library users are aware of differences in the immediacy of their needs; and (6) further investigation of browsing and/or immediacy of needs is unwarranted at this time. This report provides an executive summary as well as a detailed description of the methodology and findings in each study area. Appendices include reports on a questionnaire response rate experiment and a regression analysis of the relationship between circulated and unrecorded use, a glossary, and a list of twenty-seven references.


As a means of studying the present public catalogs and possible catalog format alternatives at the Iowa State University library, a six-week queuing study was conducted. Objectives of the study were: (1) to determine the correlation between other library statistics (e.g., door counts and circulation records) and use of the public catalogs; (2) to calculate the ratio between use of the card catalog and the separate serials catalog; (3) to compare the library staff's use of the catalog with use by the public; and (4) to obtain information about use of the card catalog and the serials catalog in each of several autonomous library service points. The catalogs were observed in 234 ten-minute periods. Numerical data gathered from observations are presented in the form of scatter diagrams and histograms comparing card catalog use, circulation counts, and exit counts. The results indicate little correlation between numbers of card catalog users and other staff-gathered user statistics. It was also found that card catalog users arrive randomly, and neither their numbers nor their arrival patterns can be predicted through use of other library statistics.


A committee was appointed in March 1978 to investigate feasible alternatives to the existing card catalog at Northwestern University Library; this interim report reviews the committee's activities and recommendations, identifies tasks still to be completed, and describes the status of a proposed online successor to the card catalog. Ten concerns related to the online catalog are discussed: (1) the need for a public services liaison, (2) the question of closing or freezing the card catalog, (3) alternative formats for the continuation catalog, (4) inclusiveness of the online catalog, (5) conversion of cross-references, (6) maintenance of the database, (7) index enhancements, (8) backup for the online catalog, (9) staff and user training, and (10) evaluation. Some additional concerns are briefly reviewed, as well as the current status of the project.


An analysis of twelve music libraries presents documentation for the development of guidelines for music collections at institutions offering graduate music programs. The profiles examine library administration and organization, collection de-
development, collection organization, and services at the selected institutions. They include statistical information and twenty-four tables summarizing survey information gathered from a detailed report submitted by each library and a personal visit by the author.

Part-Time Students: Their Use of a Polytechnic Library. LLRS Publications. By Alan Pritchard and Philip Payne. Library and Learning Resources Service, City of London Polytechnic (England), 1980. 43p. ED 191 489. MF—$0.83; PC not available from EDRS.

Part-time students at City of London Polytechnic were surveyed regarding their use of the library. This report explains the methodology, presents survey results, and summarizes conclusions of the study. Analysis is based on a response rate of approximately 26 percent of the questionnaires that were distributed to a sample of students. In addition to characterizing users, the results measure use of the library according to academic department, type and grade of course, day and location of class, and length of traveling time. Responses also identify additional services desired by part-time students, reasons for not using the library, and the extent of the use of other libraries. Contained in the appendices are a copy of the questionnaire and relevant correspondence.


Results of a four-month library self-evaluation program conducted by staff members at Carnegie-Mellon University Libraries are reported in this document. The study was conducted using the Academic Library Development Program (ALDP), a self-improvement strategy for libraries to evaluate and develop their performance. The study team consisting of four task groups addressed these issues: (1) services and collections, (2) management systems, (3) human resources, and (4) technology and facilities. A summary of the recommendations from each task force prefaces the report. An overview of the university and of the library, environmental analysis, assessment of library needs, and statement of university and library goals provide a framework for the study. Documented in each task force report are: scope of study, user surveys and other methods of data collection, procedures for evaluation, findings, and specific recommendations. Supporting materials contained in appendices include statistical data, surveys, interviews, organizational charts, and pertinent correspondence.


This discussion of the use of computer output microform (COM) as a feasible alternative to the library card catalog includes a brief history of library catalogs and of microform technology since World War II. It is argued that COM catalogs are to be preferred to card catalogs, online catalogs accessed by terminals, and paper printouts. Advantages and disadvantages of film or fiche formats for a library catalog are explored in relation to retrieval performance, cost, and ease of use, and such features as updating procedures, readability, and possible patron reluctance to use COM are discussed in greater depth. It is concluded that COM appears to be the most viable answer to new demands placed on the library catalog.

Answering the Challenge of Teletext, Viewdata Systems and Other Fast Growing Communications, Such as Home Comput-

A Style Manual for Citing Microform and Nonprint Media
Eugene B. Fleischer
This manual provides, for the first time, a style for citations of all the nonprint media. It is designed to be a companion to such works as Campbell's Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers; The MLA Style Sheet for Reports and Theses; and Turabian's A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations. It includes models and rules for citations of the full range of nonprint media—micropublications and nonprint periodicals, charts, filmstrips, globes, kits, maps, microscope slides, models, motion pictures, realia, sound recordings, and video recordings. Brief and complete forms are furnished with many examples arranged for convenient reference. 74 pages Paper LC 78-9375 ISBN 0-8389-8268-5 (1978) $5.00
Order Department American Library Association 50 East Huron Street Chicago, Illinois 60611

Newspapers are facing challenges from the new media of teletext, viewdata systems, and home computers. Teletext, which provides formatted pages of text broadcast for viewing on a television screen, provides news immediately, simply, conveniently, and inexpensively. However, it does not provide the browse-and-scan options of newspapers. Of greater potential impact is the development of viewdata systems that use the television, telephone, and computer so that online searching can be done from the home. The system can also be modified to use a home computer rather than a television screen. Changes in how people spend their leisure time and their disposable income, combined with the stagnation of newspaper readership and the increasingly important role of information in society, suggest that newspapers should look into new options. If newspapers would utilize their information collection, analysis, storage, and dissemination capabilities, the production of a newspaper could be one part of their business. Information-marketing possibilities for both the business and the home in the future include using electronic news records to develop online databases, selling information in both electronic and clipping forms, and providing research services.


Elgin Community College, one of fifteen members of the Northern Illinois Learning Resources Cooperative (NILRC), served as host institution for a project to design, develop, test, and install computer programs in a community college resource center environment. The service functions identified for systems development included circulation, serial holdings, equipment scheduling, materials preview and rental control, and media production. The development for the project took place within an IBM technical environment (Model 370/125 computer) and is designed for ease of transfer to other medium-size or larger IBM computer systems. Special technical features include modular programming, COBOL coding, online documentation and programming, database management system design (DL/I), CICS teleprocessing with command level coding, and the extensive use of tables in the system design. The project report includes results of the activities, problems encountered, and extensive appendices.


Use of the ERIC database is explained in the 1980 edition of the guide. Presented first are the major components of the ERIC document collection and journal index, including the thesaurus, indexes, and source materials. A step-by-step procedure for searching Resources in Education (document index) and Current Index to Journals in Education by subject using the 1980 revision of the thesaurus is described, and a brief explanation of searching by author, institution, or type of publication is provided. The guide also includes general information about computerized ERIC searches, an annotated bibliography of ERIC materials (indexes and thesauri) and guides to ERIC, and a directory of the sixteen ERIC clearinghouses.


In the policymaking process, one of the important steps is the consideration of the consequences deriving from the alternative choices. For the case of information policy, the present research has begun the development of a methodology for doing so. The methodology chosen was modeling. Information policy modeling serves the dual purposes of further clarification of the phenomenon under study, along with the provision of an avenue for quantitative analysis through computer simulation. Following an examination of three policy model configurations—maximization, optimization, and adaptive—the adaptive or cybernetic representation was chosen as the most appropriate way to represent the information policymaking process. In addition to the intended role of modeling in this research setting, another perhaps more important function emerged. It was the use of modeling as a tool for better understanding of information policy itself. A list of references is attached.
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Developed in anticipation of the adoption of AACR2 by the library community, two plans reported by the General Libraries address the impact on the catalog and staff training. No conflict is anticipated in the absorption of AACR2, and the focus of the first report is on the mechanics of integrating AACR2 headings with headings already in the catalog. This report provides sections on methods and principles, procedures, special problems, special recommendations, a timetable, costs, a bibliography, and appendixes on corporate entries and serial identification. The second report examines staff to be trained and the structure of training; staff to do the training and preparation of training aids; user orientation and training; training methods for instruction of the staff; a training timetable; and utilization of external resources. An appendix provides a 1980-81 schedule of regional institutes sponsored in cooperation with the Library of Congress.


This survey of online search service centers in Canada was conducted to provide data on these centers and, more specifically, on the characteristics of the human search intermediary, and to provide an accurate overall picture of online searching in Canada. The survey questionnaires were mailed to approximately 765 Canadian customers of seven commercial online vendors and yielded a response rate of 49.7 percent. Questions on the survey were divided into two parts: data on the search service center itself, and data...
on search intermediaries. Findings were analyzed for each question using frequency distributions, and cross-tabulations were performed on some groups of questions. The survey instrument and sixty tables and figures that illustrate findings are included in the report.


This survey of faculty salaries and related information on library educators includes data gathered from sixty-seven library education programs holding American Library Association accreditation as of January 1, 1980, as well as from twenty-seven unaccredited programs. Deans and directors of library schools provided salary figure, academic rank, appointment period, tenure status, sex, highest degree earned (including the discipline represented by the degree), ethnic origin, age category, year of initial full-time appointment, and the year of appointment to present rank for all full-time faculty members. No school or individual is identified with specific data.


This review of the literature on undergraduate libraries, the historical context from which they arose, and their status at the end of the 1970s points out that a long tradition of lack of concern for undergraduate bibliographical needs was broken dramatically in 1949 by the construction of Lamont Library, the Harvard undergraduate facility. Although designed to solve problems unique to Harvard, Lamont was an exemplary construction that soon captured the imagination of the academic library world. It became the model for a rash of new libraries aimed at satisfying "unique" undergraduate needs. These libraries proliferated during the 1950s and 1960s, a period of accelerated growth in academe. By the 1970s, however, the general financial retrenchment of American colleges and universities had virtually halted new construction. Further, the thesis that presumed the needs of undergraduates to be somehow "different," as well as the advisability of facilities effectively segregating them from the rest of the academic community, came under attack in the professional literature. Few undergraduate libraries were built during this period and several were closed or converted to other uses. A bibliography of twenty-four references is included.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS


Bromberg, Murray, and Liebb, Julius. You Can Succeed in Reading & Writing: 30 Steps to Mastering English. Woodbury, N.Y.: Barron's


Jackson, Gregg B., and Meyer, Francine H. Evaluations of Firms and Professionals Who
"For workers in the field, whether librarians, scholars, teachers, writers or illustrators, the Hodges-Steinfurst revision and enlargement is an absolute necessity. The ‘outlines’ add up to a remarkably concise summary of the history of children’s literature: invaluable.”—CLIFTON FADIMAN

The History of Children’s Literature
A Syllabus with Selected Bibliographies, 2nd edition
Elva S. Smith; revised and enlarged by Margaret Hodges and Susan Steinfurst

This landwork work presents by chapters in outline form the principal developments in the history of children’s literature and names the authors and titles that characterize these developments. Each outline is followed by an annotated list of secondary sources that explore the specific aspects of the period. Thus, this work serves as a handy guide to the field of children’s literature and the critical writings about it.

The second edition extends the outlines and reevaluates the critical writings to include those published since the previous edition and felt to possess continuing usefulness. Each chapter is prefaced by a headnote that summarizes the salient features of the period. Hodges and Steinfurst then improve Smith’s concept of a guide to research in children’s literature by increasing the detail in the outlines. In this way, the usefulness of the work for suggesting topics for investigation is enhanced.
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The Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries has published SPEC Kit #70, Basic Preservation Procedures (January 1981). The kit contains twenty-six documents (116 pages) including policy statements, guidelines and procedural instructions, many illustrated, dealing with physical care and protection, reproduction and preservation decision making. Kit #70, Basic Preservation Procedures, is available for $7.50 to ARL members and SPEC subscribers, $15.00 to others ($2.00 handling fee; $3.00 if invoice is required). Order from: SPEC, ARL/Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036.


Clearly fills a need.
A valuable addition to our professional literature.
A clearly written, vital reference to the field.

That's what they've been saying about the

ALa World Encyclopedia of Library and Information Services

Robert Wedgeworth, Editor
A major contribution to comparative librarianship and a publishing milestone in the information field.

Here are a few of the many favorable reviews and comments:

"...clearly fills a need for a one-volume reference work that provides extensive and up-to-date information related to libraries and information services." — COLLEGE & RESEARCH LIBRARIES

"...a valuable addition to our professional literature and [one that] will undoubtedly be widely and intensively used." — JOURNAL OF LIBRARY HISTORY

"I congratulate the editors for having produced so truly magnum opus." — ROBERT M. PIERSON, School of Library and Information Science, Catholic University of America.

The professional review media and librarians and information specialists at every level have joined in their praise of the new ALA World Encyclopedia, which made its debut in Spring 1980. This favorable reception supports the editors' initial conviction that there was a need for such a work that, "in one convenient volume seeks to explain fundamental ideas, record historic events and activities, and portray those personalities, living or dead, who have shaped the field."

The Encyclopedia is the result of international collaboration spanning four years of planning and editorial work and engagement almost 400 advisers and contributors from 145 countries of the world. It contains 624 pages, 700,000 words, 452 signed articles, 300 illustrations both historical and contemporary, and 144 statistical tables. Alphabetically-arranged articles, averaging more than a thousand words in length, have been edited for preciseness, readability, and comprehensive coverage.

There are two special features of the work. A topical Outline of Contents gives an overview of the organization of the volume and a fresh view of the organization of knowledge in the field; a precise and informative Parallel Index in the margins of the text pages bring together index references and related alphabetical articles and provide ready reference information.

The ALA World Encyclopedia enhances reference collection services as an invaluable resource for library school students, provides comprehensive coverage for practitioners and general readers.
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"...a carefully-edited, well-organized, and handsomely presented volume." — THE JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP

"The arrangement, featuring cross-references alongside the main entries, makes it very handy to use." — ANTIQUARIAN BOOKMAN

"What a massive piece of work! Congratulations." — ANN MORGAN CAMPELL, Executive Director, The Society of American Archivists

"...a particularly valuable addition to our professional collection because of its authoritative and international scope." — M. RICHARDS, Chief, Library Programs Division, International Communications Agency

"...it will provide basic reading for students, and for all of us who are internationally involved this will provide a valuable tool in the field." — JOSEPH RISS PANG, Professor, School of Library & Information Science, Simmons College
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