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Editorial

Elysian Thoughts on Librarians as Faculty

Preceding the American Library Association Midwinter Conference in January 1992, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Committee on Academic Status invited twelve academic librarians to participate in a Think Tank on Faculty Status. The participants were Mignon Adams, Joan Giesecke, Kathy Jackson, Beverly Lynch, Olivia Madison, Bede Mitchell, Barbara Moran, Jim Murphy, Lester Pourciau, Gloriana St. Clair, Janet Steins, and Rebecca Watson-Boone. Think Tank Task Force Sub-Committee members were Irene Hoadley, Larry Oberg, Gemma DeVinney, Tom Patterson, and Mary Reichel. They assembled the Think Tank to identify strategic directions for the Committee on Academic Status. Irene Hoadley and I made a few remarks to summon the sibyl. Maureen Sullivan, from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), facilitated to keep the group on its Herculean task. This editorial reports the substance of the work: relationships with administrators and teaching faculty, tenure and its ramifications, and the roles of ACRL.

One key relationship discussed was that between campus administrators and the libraries. Being seen as working in cooperation with the administration is a political priority for every college and university library director. On many campuses, serials price increases in the past decade have complicated this task even for the most accomplished library director. College and university administrators continue to face the prospect of either supplying scarce additional financial resources to libraries to cover serials cost increases or listening to faculty complain about a lack of support for essential academic programs when serials cuts are instituted because of declining buying power. Like Cassandra, the library director must again and again prophesy doom, only to see the prophecies ignored, then watch the anguish of a serials cancellation project with campus reverberations.

The causes of this Sisyphean endeavor are better understood by communication with on-campus academic administrators. Library directors who are faculty do this by working as peers with other administrators. Nonfaculty library directors at some institutions do this by meeting regularly with a council of deans. The Think Tank's consensus was that being part of a legitimate, regular deans' meeting facilitates communication with other campus academic administrators.

Think Tank participants also valued relationships with teaching faculty. Faculty librarians serve as full voting members of the faculty senate and its committees. On some campuses, librarians who are not faculty may have this same opportunity to participate in campus governance, but research has shown that this is frequently not the case. The forum of the faculty senate allows librarians to share the library's story through words and actions. Doing so earns them, and the profession they represent, respect.

Because tenure is no longer being granted to academics in higher education in Great Britain, discussion about not continuing that system has once again surfaced in the United States. The discussion is particularly relevant now because, with the country in a recession, job security has become a strong concern for librarians and teaching faculty. Yet
Think Tank participants believed that if tenure no longer exists for teaching faculty, then librarians must share that increased anxiety about job security.

Think Tank members also believed that librarians should maintain control over the process of judging merit in librarianship, professional activities, research, and service. The process calls for a faculty peer review committee to give an initial recommendation on whether a faculty member should continue in an appointment. Non-faculty librarians frequently use the same process. Difficulties arise when teaching faculty are judged by a publish or perish standard with little credit for excellence in teaching. However, Think Tank members agreed that both teaching and librarianship are hard to judge by anything more challenging than numbers of assignments, impressions of colleagues, and subjective analysis of students. Assessment of quality performance needs more thought and research for both teachers and librarians.

Librarians as professionals must educate academic administrators and faculty colleagues about the value and contribution of librarianship to the entire education process. Several recent ACRL presidents have identified dialogue with campus constituents as a high priority. And the ARL has worked to increase the visibility of librarians in the education press. The Think Tank reiterated the necessity of communicating the message of libraries and librarianship beyond the profession.

The Think Tank ascribed to the conviction that ACRL played several key roles in furthering a goal of faculty status for librarians. These roles are publication, continuing education, and defense of those with threatened faculty status.

**PUBLICAION**

Professional organizations foster change, establish professional mores, and direct the growth of the discipline through the publication of a professional literature. Through the process of selecting an editor, editorial board members, and referees, association officers imprint their vision of the future on the permanent literature in their field. C&RL plays out a role apropos of librarians as faculty by providing a top-ranked journal to legitimize and disseminate research done by librarians.

**CONTINUING EDUCATION**

ACRL does not depend on publication alone to keep member competencies current. The association also sponsors a large number of programs on local, regional, and national levels. In these forums, members have an opportunity to discuss their research, to share strategies on common problems, and to cooperate to improve library services. The Committee on Academic Status may increase its offerings to members by focusing in future programs on how to do research, how to prepare understandable librarian dossiers, and how to validate librarianship as a substitute for teaching in promotion and tenure evaluations.

**DEFENSES**

In the open forum of the Think Tank, representatives from two campuses reported on attempts by new provosts to change librarians' status from faculty to staff. The Academic Status Committee typically provides guidance for librarians in such situations. Proven defense strategies are suggested and attempts are made to discover the cause of the threat. ACRL may send letters outlining the Association’s position and reminding administrators of the consequences of their actions. Think Tank members believed that more activities such as these should be developed to educate provosts about the benefits of having librarians who are faculty.

Recently, ARL published Spec. Kit 182, titled *Academic Status for Librarians in ARL Libraries.* In the flyer, editor Jack Siggins reports that sixty-six out of ninety-nine responding ARL libraries have faculty or academic status for librarians who are, thus, eligible for tenure or continuing appointment. The extent to which these numbers reflect the circumstances of college and other university librarians is not known. With ACRL’s stated goal in mind that all aca-
ademic librarians should be faculty, the
Think Tank members concluded the day
by working on a vision statement. That
vision is to achieve parity with teaching
faculty at all academic institutions. For
the Think Tank, parity included protec­
tion through the due process of tenure,
equitable compensation, a faculty estab­
lished process for promotion, and partic­
ipation in campus governance. The
preferred method for achieving parity is
by becoming faculty.

Think Tank members agreed without
discussion that being faculty was the
most valuable mode of participation in
campus life. I value my faculty appoint­
ment because I believe that research is
necessary to the provision of excellent li-
brary service and because I can interact
more effectively for the library with cam­
pus colleagues. Campus society is not egal­
itarian; scientists look down on engineers
and social scientists, who look down on
liberal and fine arts faculty. All look down
on librarians. However, I would rather
serve at the bottom of the faculty hierarchy
than in some “other” status.

For me, being faculty is the Olympian
solution to where librarians fit in the
university. From that peak, librarians
have the best view of the evolving cam­
pus contours. The climb is difficult, the
atmosphere is thin, and the opportuni­
ties to fall off are numerous, but the per­
spective makes it all worthwhile.

GLORIANA ST. CLAIR
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The Impact of CD-ROM Technology on a Bibliographic Instruction Program
Caroline Blumenthal, Mary Jo Howard, and William R. Kinyon

As CD-ROM technology continues to grow in popularity among libraries, its effect will be felt in many different ways. This article examines the effect of such technology on the bibliographic instruction program at Georgia State University's Pullen Library. The preliminary steps to incorporating CD-ROM technology are discussed, followed by an explanation of the changes in the way bibliographic instruction is conducted. The authors also plan for the future with a look at forthcoming developments and their impact on the bibliographic instruction program.

At the heart of a rapidly expanding university in fast-growing Atlanta, Georgia State University's William Russell Pullen Library's faculty and staff have consistently tried to meet the challenges and opportunities of high technology. By the early 1980s, the focus of this effort was a high volume of librarian-mediated online searches on Dialog and BRS. The demand for this service continued to grow as awareness of the service spread throughout the university community and to the surrounding downtown business and government centers. The demand reached more than 800 searches during the 1986-87 school year.

Early in 1987, the Pullen Library faculty decided to respond to the new CD-ROM technology coming into the marketplace. The first step was to subscribe to Infotrac and set up an installation of four workstations, followed by Datext and SilverPlatter's ERIC. In the following years, thirteen databases and ten workstations were added to the CD-ROM service, including such diverse products as Medline, ABI/Inform, and MLA. Also, as a selective depository, the library started receiving a number of federal government documents on CD-ROM, including vitally important Bureau of the Census products and the National Trade Data Bank, in 1989. These conditions forced us to reconsider our teaching role.

USER RESPONSE

Response to this new, almost magical (at least for the students) technology was overwhelmingly enthusiastic. With Datext and ERIC, the large student population in business and education realized they had found a tool that could revolutionize their research. Many students and faculty who were accustomed to fee-based, librarian-mediated online searches perceived a threefold advantage to the new technology: they could perform searches for themselves, there was no direct cost to

Caroline Blumenthal is Reference Librarian and Coordinator of Bibliographic Instruction, Mary Jo Howard is Reference Librarian and Assistant Coordinator of Bibliographic Instruction, and William R. Kinyon is Assistant Head of Reference/Reference Desk Services Coordinator at Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3081.
them, and they could receive immediate results. Also, researchers who had formerly used the print indexes found the CD-ROMs efficient and fascinating.

Of course, there was and continues to be a downside to this new wave of technology and its high use by library patrons. Both have created what David Taylor refers to as a "new bottleneck in the library." He states that "CD-ROMs seem to be a service that people like so much that we will never be able to provide enough of them." Also, at Pullen Library, patron response has caused greatly increased activity at the reference desk as librarians have been called upon to teach people how to use the new systems, as well as to tend to technical problems and printer upkeep. Steven Zink states that CD-ROM's uniqueness and warm user reception have overshadowed an underestimation of the human resources required for its use. The authors have also found this to be true at Pullen Library. There, library staff now have to use time previously spent on other duties on the CD-ROM service. Additional professional and nonprofessional staff have been scheduled during peak times to assist patrons. Another effect of CD-ROM-based research has been a dramatic increase in interlibrary loans and requests for interlibrary use cards. Interlibrary use cards are issued as a result of a cooperative agreement among Atlanta-area academic libraries to allow the faculty, staff, and students of one institution to use the library of another institution for a specific purpose for a limited time.

CD-ROM BEGINNINGS IN BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

Participation in the library bibliographic instruction (BI) program has traditionally been a primary activity of the Pullen Library reference department faculty. For many years prior to library automation, library instruction classes had focused on using print indexes, abstracts, and the card catalog. However, in line with Loretta Caren's thesis that "the new technologies must be incorporated into any state-of-the-art instruction program," use of Pullen Library's new online catalog OLLI was included in BI classes as soon as the system became operational. The library staff equipped the BI classroom with an OLLI terminal linked to an Electrohome projector. The freestanding Electrohome transmits images from the OLLI terminal to a large curved screen visible to the entire class.

When Georgia State University installed its first CD-ROM, all reference librarians went through an intensive period of orientation. Because some of the librarians had not chosen to do online searching, their realization that CD-ROM use would be required at the reference desk as well as in the BI classes caused some apprehension. Each librarian scheduled time at the CD-ROM unit to learn the conventions of the software, database content, and the most effective searching strategies and applications.

Because some of the librarians had not chosen to do online searching, their realization that CD-ROM use would be required at the reference desk as well as in the BI classes caused some apprehension.

The next step was to develop simple and effective handouts on Boolean searching techniques. Also, because many of the school's CD-ROM databases are produced by different publishers and require unique search protocols, specialized instructions were written for each software product and modified for each particular database.

Soon, the CD-ROM technology was incorporated into the BI program. There was a great demand for instruction in the use of CD-ROMs. As Al Kagan stated of his experience at the University of Connecticut's Babbidge Library, "the CD-ROM service acted as a 'hook' to get undergraduates involved in the research process and helped to overcome their library phobias." As CD-ROM usage continued to increase, the reference staff confirmed Craig Gibson's statement that, because students often consider CD-ROM indexes and online catalogs as
magical devices, the need for teaching research concepts is now greater than ever before. Reference faculty found it imperative that these technologies be taught, as he suggested, "within a larger information-gathering or search strategy process." In order to teach CD-ROM concepts, a CD-ROM player with the software of many CD-ROM databases was added to the BI classroom. Most of Pullen Library's CD-ROM vendors granted permission to use superseded discs in class instruction. Like the OLLI terminal, the CD-ROM workstation can be linked to the Electrohome so that both systems can be demonstrated during a BI session. Such demonstrations sparked lively student response and interaction.

TEACHING CD-ROM AT GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The new technology was first introduced to faculty because of their strong liaison to students. Two demonstration sessions for faculty were scheduled during the fall quarter of 1989. The sessions began with a comparison of database contents and print counterparts. The emphasis was on how computerized searching offers a new dimension in combining concepts that print resources lack. Following the introduction and demonstration time, faculty went to the reference department and used the CD-ROM of their choice. They were offered guidance and help from the reference librarians. This approach was successful on many levels. For instance, the new technology was introduced in a nonthreatening, interesting, and involving manner. Also, for many of the faculty, new vistas opened up regarding ease of research, thoroughness of searching, and creative interrelating of subject areas through using Boolean operators. Finally, many professors who had assigned large groups of students to do a search on ERIC within a limited amount of time modified their assignments to allow for a realistic deadline. These professors had learned that there are limits to the number of students who can use the new technology simultaneously.

CD-ROM DEMONSTRATIONS

After the faculty orientation to the new technology was initiated, demonstrations were started for students. Demonstrations were scheduled on a walk-in basis at varying times of the day and week in order to accommodate as many students as possible. To publicize these demonstrations, advertisements were placed in the school newspaper and reminders to faculty, as well as on campus bulletin boards, library signs, and flyers. Schedules of drop-in sessions were placed at the reference desk. Attendance was low at first because the demonstrations were of specific subject areas. Generic sessions were set up to increase attendance. Students were requested to sign up at the reference desk and indicate their area of interest. This format proved to be successful and, therefore, is still used.

Students are alerted to the demonstrations, as well as to the handouts, if they are novices or need more intensive coverage of strategies and conventions to use on the CD-ROM databases. This eases the pressure on reference desk librarians, who are already pressed for time.

While these CD-ROM demonstrations have increased the BI workload, they are important and will be continued. Even though the number of students reached is modest, it is still significant enough to reduce the traffic at the reference desk.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION CLASSES

Cooperative efforts with faculty are a strong factor in reaching students. As a result, perhaps the heaviest impact that CD-ROM service has had on Georgia State University's BI program is on the course-related classes taught each quarter. The courses range from freshman English to graduate-level courses. Before the advent of CD-ROM, the primary focus of the BI classes was a review of the traditional printed indexes and other reference tools, as well as a demonstration of OLLI. Now, however, most of the classes also include a block of time for
demonstrating and discussing compact disc technology. The amount of time spent depends on the class being taught. Graduate students in education usually want (and need) the greatest portion of a BI session to learn how to use ERIC on CD-ROM, while freshman and sophomore classes need a more balanced presentation that includes the CD-ROM discussion but doesn't focus on it entirely.

A variety of opinion exists among Pullen Library's reference librarians as to how much should be said about compact disc databases in beginning-level classes. Some think that the students in these classes should be given the traditional basic instruction with only a mention of the CD-ROMs. Others think that a demonstration, at the very least, is needed because students often ask for a certain CD-ROM database or which computer to use to find certain material. The authors agree that students should be informed about the availability of the CD-ROM resources and encouraged to attend the CD-ROM drop-in sessions.

On numerous occasions, when instructors call to set up a BI session for their class, they have requested that the session include a demonstration of one or several CD-ROMs. There have also been many instances when an instructor will call not to set up a BI appointment, but to set up a CD-ROM demonstration only. For instance, when an accounting professor at Georgia State University learned that the school had Compact Disclosure, he wanted his graduate students to see it. A BI session was arranged for the professor and seven of his graduate students. The session proved to be very productive, as evidenced by the students who have started using Compact Disclosure quite often. It is anticipated that, as time goes on, more upper division and graduate-level classes will request BI for certain databases; education classes will want to learn about ERIC; classes in marketing, management, and other business disciplines will ask for ABI/INFORM; health sciences classes will need MEDLINE, and so on. The classes are likely to include more than just the demonstration and discussion of compact discs. For fullest use of a database, users need to understand Boolean logic, appropriate use of connectors, the importance of thesauri for accessing information, the value of truncation symbols, and crystallizing a topic into the most concise statement possible for identifying the main concepts to search. With this knowledge, users can search in depth rather than superficially. Also, students who recognize the importance of learning skills to access both traditional and new sources become very serious about learning and desirous of help.

THE FUTURE

Critical Selection of Databases

Judging from the changes experienced in the BI program, more modifications are expected in the future. For instance, there needs to be more discussion of the interrelationship of subject matter among databases and/or print resources. This is a hard concept for students to grasp. They tend to think one-dimensionally and focus on one database or index as the answer to all their questions and research needs. As databases grow and expand their scope, it becomes increasingly clear that several databases will provide relevant information to a topic. For example, a student searching for critiques and analyses of Ronald Reagan's speaking style might think of speech communications journals and would be interested in Communication Abstracts. But the ERIC database also covers many of the same speech communications journals, and a search of the database retrieves several excellent references. This topic proved to be much harder to research in the printed Communication Abstracts than in the CD-ROM version of ERIC. In fact, because of the lack of appropriate descriptors, an initial scan of the printed version of ERIC also seemed to indicate that little information was there, but the flexibility of the CD-ROM allowed the searcher to pull up some good references. This creative type of thinking is what needs to be stimulated in the BI classes of the future.

Students also need to be made aware of and encouraged to use more than just
the databases they are accustomed to using. Many medical and nursing students, for instance, know about the Index Medicus and/or MEDLINE on CD-ROM, but they often are unaware that relevant citations can be found in PsycLIT that would be missed in MEDLINE. Librarians at Pullen Library have been teaching about the existence of printed indexes for years and have recently begun teaching about CD-ROM versions of those indexes and new CD-ROM products without print equivalents. This keeps students up with what is available. In the future, the students will need to be taught about the viability and desirability of pulling information from multiple databases. With so much to learn, one question immediately comes to mind—how can a one-hour BI session cover all of this information? There is barely enough time as is. That is a question for another time.

Locally Mounted Databases

In the future, the BI program will probably face the issue of databases loaded on the campus mainframe. Instruction for databases on the mainframe could be incorporated into OLLI classes because they would be accessed from the same terminals and would likely employ the same search software. Another option is for the CD-ROM classes to include instruction on the locally loaded databases because these classes already provide instruction on basic searching concepts and techniques. However, both classes already take up a full hour and often run overtime. Classes could be offered specifically for the databases on the mainframe, although this would increase the already heavy workload of BI classes each quarter. Whatever the solution is, it will have an impact on the CD-ROM service and, therefore, on the BI program.

Librarian/Faculty Communication

As the nature of the BI program changes, there will be a need for more and better interaction between librarians and teaching faculty. BI for particular databases is fine, but it is a mistake to change the entire focus of library instruction from the basic tools and processes of research to a discussion of one or two resources. When requests for BI classes are received, it will be important to determine if the class is one that needs only very specific instruction or if the BI session needs to include the basics that are traditionally covered. One-to-one discussions between the librarian and the instructor who makes the request will be very useful. However, it will be important to continue to offer orientation for CD-ROMs to faculty to alert them to software innovations and new databases.

Technostress

A challenge that already occurs when doing instruction for CD-ROMs, and that will only get worse as more databases are added, is the differing software syndrome. When teaching a class in which several databases are used, it is difficult to demonstrate one database using one software, then switch to another database and another software, perhaps even making a third or fourth switch, all the while explaining the intricacies of each database and its search commands. To counteract this syndrome, librarians will have to practice more on the various databases, and perhaps do more preclass preparation, while lobbying for greater standardization.

CONCLUSION

Georgia State University's BI program has changed and expanded with technological innovations. In short, the program has helped educate the entire university community, from students to faculty. Also, the computerized technology requires critical thinking applications in order to selectively process the overwhelming deluge of information that comes forth. As software changes, and hopefully continues to improve, even more selective applications will be necessary to sift and choose appropriate information.

Georgia State's library is probably typical of most of the United States' academic libraries that are becoming increasingly automated. Beginning perhaps with
online searching, moving to an online catalog, and then to CD-ROM databases, the library is a hub of various high technologies added to a predominantly print collection. While librarians, staff, teaching faculty, and students used to deal primarily with the print format, the situation has changed dramatically with the advent of high technology. Peter Lyman recently wrote that “the teaching role of the librarian will predominate in a digital library to create and support a new culture of information literacy.” Whether in a formal BI class, at a CD-ROM workstation, or in a reference interview, new BI considerations will be imperative. The professional librarian must offer to the student both print and high technology sources. This professional should transmit awareness of the importance of the interrelatedness of topics and how the databases can provide access to a variety of materials. Until formats of high technologies have been standardized, librarians will have to familiarize users with unique features which may affect access.

The impact of new technology makes more intense faculty/librarian communication and interaction mandatory in order to inform students fully of new resources and technologies. Together, their efforts better enable students to become what the ALA termed “lifelong learners” who can always find the information needed for any task or decision at hand. After all, this is our ultimate goal.
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Professional Development Program: Training for Success within Academic Librarianship

Dennis K. Grumling and Carolyn A. Sheehy

In 1985 the research libraries at Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Illinois at Chicago launched a Professional Development Program to address concerns about integrating younger, newer professional staff members into the complex structure of large research libraries and encouraging them to look broadly at the issues facing these libraries. The authors conducted a survey of the program's Fellows to determine how well the program is meeting its goals and the effectiveness of the program in training librarians for success within academic librarianship. The authors conclude that the program could serve as a model for training in other institutions.

HISTORY

In 1985, research libraries at Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Illinois at Chicago initiated a cooperative Professional Development Program (PDP) for select librarians from each of the institutions. The University of Chicago Graduate Library School assisted in initiating the program at the three midwestern universities. The program was intended to address concerns about integrating younger, newer professional staff members into the complex structure of large research libraries and about encouraging them to look broadly at the issues facing these libraries. Launched with a three-year grant from the Council on Library Resources, the Professional Development Program was offered annually from 1985 to 1987. It then changed to a biennial format. After the initial funding grant was expended, the three participating institutions assumed responsibility for program costs.

The administrative structure for the program included a governing board, Fellows, presenters, and a coordinator. The governing board originally consisted of the directors of the three libraries and a representative from the University of Chicago Graduate Library School. Later, one assistant university librarian from each library was added to the board and the representative from the Graduate Library School withdrew. The board planned and guided the program, and occasionally met with the Fellows.

Nine to ten Fellows made up each year's program class, although the current class (1992–93) consists of fifteen Fellows. Three to four were librarians from each of the participating institutions. The board invited librarians with less than seven years of professional experience to apply to the program. Prospective candidates were required to submit an
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The authors hypothesized that the PDP would encourage academic librarians to change position, assume greater responsibilities, shift areas of library specialty, and affiliate with different types of libraries.

The program was intended to fulfill four goals that centered on fostering a broader perspective on research libraries. These goals, which were outlined in the original grant proposal, included expectations that the PDP would "broaden the intellectual and professional horizons of the... Fellows about issues and problems facing the research library"; that both the Fellows "and the senior staff should be more fully aware than before of the dimensions and implications of particular management and professional policies and procedures"; and that "a sense of the nature and value of alternatives will be evident to participants because of the different approaches represented in each library." Another expected outcome was that the seminar approach would foster "the development of analytical thinking and improved communication skills."4

SURVEY

The authors conducted a survey of all Fellows in order to study how well this program met its goals and trained librarians for success within academic librarianship. Respondents were asked to give some background information and to rate the PDP on professional contacts and program content for each position held during or after the program. The ratings were on a Likert scale of one to five, with five being excellent. The two areas to be rated, professional contacts and program content, were intended to correspond respectively to the two program goals of integrating newer professional staff and encouraging them to look broadly at the issues facing libraries. Training for success would then be gauged by examining position changes, especially those that indicated a shift in the area of library specialty or in the type of employing library. The authors hypothesized that the PDP would encourage academic librarians to change position, assume greater responsibilities, shift areas of library specialty, and affiliate with different types of libraries. Statistically significant results were not anticipated because of the limited size of the total population. In order to validate this assumption, a variety of t-tests were performed.

Thirty-six of the Fellows returned the surveys. Information on the remaining two Fellows was obtained by telephone. Unless otherwise noted, all statements in this article are based on responses from thirty-eight Fellows, which is the number of Fellows who had finished the one-year program of intensive seminars when this article was written.

PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND

Of the thirty-eight Fellows, twenty-nine hold graduate library degrees from midwestern universities, eight hold graduate library degrees from North American universities outside the Midwest, and one Fellow does not hold a graduate library degree but is pursuing a subject Ph.D. Nineteen men and nineteen women completed the program. The age
of the Fellows when entering the program ranged from twenty-five to forty-six, with an average of thirty-four.

The Fellows had an average of three years of paraprofessional experience. Paraprofessional experience was interpreted differently by the various respondents, some noting that the experience was part-time or student experience. Nine of the respondents did not indicate any paraprofessional experience, making the average length of paraprofessional experience for those reporting such experience four years.

When they started the program, the Fellows had been at their institutions almost three years and had an average of almost three years of professional experience. However, only nine of the respondents had had professional experience outside of their sponsoring institution. Those nine individuals had been at their institutions an average of one and a half years and had an average of five years professional experience.

Two members of the original board emphasized that the intention of the program was not necessarily for librarians to go on to other positions; an equally important goal was for librarians to do their current jobs better.

Of the twenty-nine Fellows whose professional experience was entirely within the sponsoring institution, the average length of time at the sponsoring institution was three years and the average length of professional experience was two years. This statistic reflects the background of five of the Fellows who worked as paraprofessionals before becoming professionals at the same institution. These five individuals averaged more than six years at their institutions and two years of professional experience.

POSITION CHANGE

The average rating of the PDP for relevance to any position held during or after the PDP was 4.03 for program content and 3.88 for professional contacts. In two cases, respondents rated only the program content for relevance to a given position. One noted that PDP “gave me self-confidence about moving on,” yet did not rate the program for professional contacts. Another stated that the professional contacts were “more beneficial to the organizers [seminar leaders] than to the Fellows.”

Of the thirty-eight Fellows, twenty-three reported holding a different position now than at the time they went through the program. Thus, 60 percent of the Fellows have changed position since PDP participation. Of the twenty-three Fellows who have changed position, sixteen are female, and seven are male.

Ratings for the PDP both in terms of program content and professional contacts appear to be affected by whether or not the Fellow assumed another position following the program. Those who did not report a change in position (fifteen Fellows) rated the program content at an average of 3.71 and rated the professional contacts at 3.75. Those who did report a change in position (twenty-three Fellows) rated the program content at 3.92 and the professional contacts at 4.18 for the position held at the time of the PDP. In relation to their next position following the PDP, these Fellows rated the program content at 4.20 and the professional contacts at 3.82—the professional contacts decreasing in usefulness with a new position. For a second or third position following the PDP, the program content was rated at 4.29, and the professional contacts held at 3.59. Thus, although professional contacts seem to wane in importance with changes in position, a higher rating of the program content—both for the original position and later positions—seems to characterize those that changed positions. Several comments by the Fellows indicate that the decline in the rating of professional contacts may be attributed to changes in area of specialty (e.g., academic librarianship to law librarianship) or to relocation outside of the Midwest. (See figure 1.)

In addition, it was confirmed by phone that two male Fellows had changed
positions but did not report the changes. Of these two changes, one was an enlargement of responsibilities within the same department with a concurrent change in title. The other was a change to acting head of the department. Thus, 65 percent of the Fellows have actually changed position since PDP participation.

By class, 33 percent of the class of 1989, 60 percent of the class of 1987, 80 percent of the class of 1986, and almost 90 percent of the class of 1985 have changed positions. This change in rate is readily correlated with the passing of time and the availability of further career opportunities to each class of Fellows. Therefore, it may be safe to conclude that Fellows value the program content of the PDP more as they change positions and, thereby indirectly, as time passes. The rating of professional contacts seems to diminish slightly with changes in position.

**SPECIALTY SHIFT**

Thirteen of the twenty-three Fellows who reported a change in position also reported a change in area of library specialty. Seven of these thirteen Fellows are still employed by their sponsoring institutions, and an eighth is at another of the three libraries. Three Fellows reported changing from reference to administration/management, one went from cataloging to reference and collection development, and one went from reference to cataloging. Other changes included from reference to systems, and from archives to cataloging. As a subset of those Fellows who changed position, these Fellows also rated the PDP higher than the overall average. The rating for the position held during PDP averaged 3.94 for program content and 4.24 for professional contacts for this subgroup. For the next position held, the average was 4.21 for content and 4.08 for contacts. When a further position was held, the average was 4.25 for content and 3.35 for contacts. Again, we may conclude that a shift in area of library specialty will indicate a greater value placed on the program content of the PDP, while the value of professional contacts will decrease slightly. (See figure 2.)

**INCREASED RESPONSIBILITIES**

Twenty-one of the twenty-three Fellows reporting a change in position also reported an increase in responsibility associated with the change in position. Nineteen experienced this increase in responsibility with the first position taken after completion of the PDP. Two reported an increase with the assumption of a second position. Additionally, seven of the twenty-one reported an increase in responsibility in both their first and second positions held after completing the program. This group of twenty-one includes almost all of the Fellows who changed positions. Therefore, the ratings bear the same characteristics for both groups.

**INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION**

Of the thirty-eight PDP Fellows, twenty-three (61 percent) are still employed at their sponsoring institution—thirteen are in the position they had at the time of participation in the PDP, six are in a new position, and four others are in a second new position since PDP. However, retention has been uneven, with one of the libraries retaining eleven (79 percent) of its fourteen Fellows, one retaining eight (66 percent) of its twelve Fellows, and one retaining only four (33 percent) of its twelve. One Fellow has moved from one of the three libraries to another, meaning that the institutions as a whole have retained twenty-four (63 percent) of thirty-eight Fellows. Twenty-nine (76 percent) of the thirty-eight Fellows are employed at institutions within metropolitan Chicago, including the three sponsoring institutions. Only nine Fellows have left Illinois.

The fourteen Fellows no longer employed by one of the three research libraries have found positions at eighteen different institutions, representing ten types of libraries. Some of the Fellows have held positions at two different institutions since participating in the PDP. Three found positions in other research libraries, three went to special libraries, three went to college libraries, two went to university libraries, and one each went
<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional contacts</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional contacts</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program content</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional contacts</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program content</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
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<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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to academic arts, academic, corporate, industry, law, and public libraries. The terms for type of library are those used by the respondents. One Fellow is employed by a library software vendor. Of the fourteen Fellows no longer employed by the three sponsoring libraries, only one is currently in a research library. Thus, Fellows who have gone elsewhere have primarily gone to nonresearch libraries. Fellows who are still employed by their sponsoring institutions rate the program content for all positions held at an average of 3.90 (below the total average of 4.02) and professional contacts at 3.91 (just above the total average of 3.80). Fellows no longer employed by their sponsoring institutions rate program content at an average of 4.15 and professional contacts at 3.85. The authors conclude that a shift in institution also increases the rating of the program con-
tent, while the rating of professional contacts diminishes.

**RATINGS COMMENTS**

Of all the Fellows, only the two oldest wrote on their survey form significant personal comments about the impact of the program on their lives. Both of these Fellows (one male and one female) entered the program when they were forty-six years old, both had previous nonlibrary careers, and both have since left the institutions that sponsored them to assume library positions with greater administrative responsibility. Following their first position held after completing the PDP, these two librarians gave the program the highest rank for both program content and professional contacts. Their written comments were also similar. One wrote, “The PDP helped give me not only broad-based knowledge of academic libraries, but helped instill in me a sense of confidence regarding my abilities to handle additional responsibilities in the field.” The other Fellow said:

PDP experience was very important to me, not only for its orientation to concerns of large research libraries... the people I met... insights and knowledge I have since applied to my administrative work, [but] it was also important to me in a very personal way. It helped confirm to me that my career change in middle age was a good one: I felt that I was now accepted by professional peers and that I had been identified as a person with much potential.

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS’ EVALUATIONS**

In interviews conducted by telephone or mail with six current or former members of the board, responses to questions evaluating the PDP were remarkably similar in rating program content and professional contacts. All surveyed members of the board perceived the original goals of the PDP to be to expose the Fellows to the broad issues facing research libraries; to develop the Fellows’ understanding that these issues can be addressed and solved by different institutions in a variety of ways; to provide a more satisfactory professional development program for new research librarians that, by being both practical and theoretical, accelerated professional growth; and to increase the opportunities for both Fellows and presenters to interact with librarians from other research libraries in the Chicago area. Two members of the original board emphasized that the intention of the program was not necessarily for librarians to go on to other positions; an equally important goal was for librarians to do their current jobs better.

The success of the contacts made through the PDP was viewed enthusiastically by all members of the board.

The board agreed unanimously that the original goals of the PDP remained stable throughout the program’s history. Board members also concurred that the PDP had been successful in meeting its original goals. Gerald J. Munoff of the University of Chicago stated, “Everyone I have talked with about the program has basically felt very positive about it. We are continually making improvements on something that everyone seems to feel good about.” Lance Query of Northwestern University noted, “Success across the board.” Several of the respondents commented that the three institutions have continued the program at their own expense since grant funding has expired. This support comes, they noted, at a financially challenging time, therefore underscoring their endorsement of the program.

Most members of the board commented favorably on the content of the program, noting the mix of theoretical and practical considerations of core research library issues. Martin Runkle of the University of Chicago pointed out that, among other goals, the program aimed “to develop Fellows’ understanding that there are no easy solutions to many of the problems facing research libraries and that often there is no single
correct solution." The respondents also mentioned the generally high quality of the presenters.

The board's comments on the importance of contacts made through the program were even more extensive than those on the content of the program. The success of the contacts made through the PDP was viewed enthusiastically by all members of the board. Beverly P. Lynch, who was University Librarian at the University of Illinois at Chicago from the inception of the program until 1990, stated, "The professional contacts by Fellows, session presenters, or the Board of Governors were excellent. Friendships were established or strengthened, and professional networking enhanced." One board member noted that relationships among Fellows have remained ongoing, even after their year of seminars together ended. However, another suggested that the Fellows who benefited from the contacts with each other, the presenters, and administrators, may have been high achievers who would have made these contacts even without the program (for example, through professional association meetings).

CONCLUSIONS

The high ratings given by the Fellows to professional contacts, especially for the position held at the time they participated in the PDP, seems to indicate that the program was successful in its goal of integrating newer professional staff into the structure of the sponsoring research library. It is important to note that none of the Fellows has left the profession. That the rating for professional contacts waned with a change in position does not lessen the value of this initial integration, but may be attributed to changes in specialty, type of library, or geographic location. The even higher ratings given to program content indicate that the program was successful in meeting the goal of encouraging program participants to look broadly at the issues facing research libraries. The climb in this rating with changes in position speaks of the long-term value of the program content and its applicability to a variety of academic library positions. Finally, the twenty-five Fellows' changes in position, thirteen Fellows' shifts in area of library specialty, twenty-one Fellows' assumptions of greater responsibilities in new positions, and the affiliations with different types of libraries (ten different types of libraries represented), indicate that the program was effective in training academic librarians for success in the field and could serve as a model for other institutions.
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Difficulties and Characteristics of Students from Developing Countries in Using American Libraries

Ziming Liu

This study was designed to examine the difficulties of students from developing countries in using American libraries. Fifty-four, mostly Asian, students studying at the University of California, Berkeley, were interviewed. The results reveal that these students encountered numerous problems in using their school's libraries. The problems included insufficient English proficiency, making it difficult to understand library terminology and policy; unfamiliarity with American libraries' classification system, subject headings, reference works, and open stacks; and confusion when online catalogs and databases retrieve too many results. Students in natural sciences usually had fewer difficulties than those in humanities and social sciences. Others who encountered fewer difficulties were those who were more proficient in English and whose home countries were more strongly influenced by American culture. This paper also discusses the possible causes of plagiarism. Recommendations are offered for improving library services for foreign students.

Since World War II, and especially since the 1970s, the number of foreign students in American institutions of higher education has consistently increased. It has approximately doubled each decade. The number of foreign students rose from 100,000 in 1966, to 203,000 in 1976, to 356,187 in the 1987-88 academic year. In 1984, the United States ranked first worldwide in the number of foreign students enrolled at its universities. Thirty-two percent of the world's foreign students, or 342,110 students, were attending school in the United States. France followed with the next largest group of foreign students—133,848. By the end of this century, the number of foreign students in the United States could approach one million, and "the presence of foreign students could be one of the most powerful themes in American higher education," according to Malcolm G. Scully. Their presence is viewed by many American educators as a positive development because it could lead to a broader and deeper understanding among the nations and people of the world.

Foreign students in the United States come from approximately 180 countries. At one time, foreign students studying in the United States were predominantly from European countries, where the economy, language, and culture are similar to the United States' economy, language, and culture. Today, more students
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come from Asia, especially from China, India, Japan, and Korea. A 1989 report shows that, for the first time, Asian students constituted more than 50 percent of the total foreign students enrolled in the United States. The number of Asian students had increased from 143,680 to 180,500 between the 1984-85 academic year and the 1987-88 academic year. Most of those students were from China (51,830). Another study shows that, during the 1983-84 academic year, more than 60 percent of foreign students were from countries where English is neither an official language nor a medium of instruction.

Western Europeans tend to adjust most easily to the American academic environment because their social, educational, and library backgrounds are somewhat similar to those of American students. Students from other countries, particularly Asia, encounter more problems adjusting to the new environment because their backgrounds are different. They are not, for instance, familiar with the system used in libraries in the United States. This difference influences their expectation of library services and their adjustment to the new academic and cultural environment. Obviously, these students will encounter many problems, of which using the library is one. Undoubtedly, library skills are fundamental to their success in the new educational system.

Despite the growing number of foreign students in the United States, few librarians seem interested in pursuing how to serve these students better. This article attempts to identify and analyze the problems and characteristics of students from developing countries in using American libraries. Suggestions are made on how to improve library services for this special segment in the academic community. The article addresses the following questions:

- What are the problems that foreign students face in using American libraries, and what are the cultural, educational, and psychological causes of these problems?
- How do the foreign students’ previous environments affect their library use in America?
- How do foreign students cope with their difficulties in using the library?
- How can librarians improve library services for foreign students?

**METHODOLOGY**

Previous related studies relied upon mail questionnaires as the primary means to discover what had been done to orient new foreign students to libraries. For this study, in-person interviewing was employed because in-person interviews result in more answers and fewer misunderstood questions than self-administered questionnaires. Interviews are particularly appropriate for investigating foreign students with insufficient English proficiency because...
they allow for question clarification. Frank W. Goudy and Eugene Moushey stated that a “questionnaire often has severe limitations as a method for obtaining information necessary to present a full view of the issue at hand. Checking answers that provide a brief and predefined statement often limits respondents in communicating any unique situations that are relevant to their situation.”

Interview surveys can achieve a higher response rate than mail surveys and can be more effective in dealing with complicated issues, such as the characteristic style of library use of foreign students in using American libraries, the students’ ability to speak English, and their reactions to the survey.

According to the research design, interview questions for the foreign students focused on their previous library experience and academic environments, their problems in using American libraries, their strategies in solving the problems, and their suggestions for improving library services.

Fifty-four foreign students studying at the University of California, Berkeley were interviewed. Included were fifteen doctoral students, twenty-three other graduate students, and sixteen undergraduate students. Thirty-three of the interviewees were majoring in natural sciences, and twenty-one were majoring in humanities and social sciences. They came from the following developing countries: Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Thailand, the Philippines, and the former Soviet Union. Thirty-two of them were selected from Asian students in order to match the characteristics of the international student population at the University of California, Berkeley, and at other academic institutions in the United States.

Four interviewees failed to answer the questions completely, because of their limited English and limited experience using the libraries. Interviews lasted between eighteen and seventy-five minutes, with the average interview being thirty-five minutes.

A variety of problems arose in surveying students from different social and cultural contexts. These problems were avoided, in part, by speaking slowly and clearly, and avoiding idioms. Also, foreign students were interviewed in small groups so that students with good English proficiency could help to explain unclear responses from poor English speakers. In addition, talking with them in their native languages was helpful.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Depending on what part of the world they come from, foreign students face a variety of difficulties. The problems are described below.

Language Barriers

Although foreign students are usually required to pass a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) before being enrolled in American colleges and universities, they still lack adequate English vocabulary, including library terminology. This hinders them from clearly and fully understanding a library’s policies and practices. A common complaint from interviewees is that they could not fully understand what the librarian said during orientation tours. Limited communication skills and lack of confidence also makes them hesitant to ask for help in libraries. The survey showed that more than 50 percent of the interviewees often turned to their compatriots, instead of a librarian, for help when they faced problems.

Not Accustomed to Open Stacks

Using American libraries is a bewildering experience for many foreign students. Many libraries in developing countries have closed stacks, making the libraries more like study halls than places for research. For example, approximately 90 percent of the libraries in China have closed stacks, and only 20 to 40 percent of these libraries’ collections are in open stacks. When students want to borrow a book, they have to submit a slip to the clerk and wait for the book to be given to them. This survey indicates that, during their first year in the United States, nearly 40 percent of the interviewees were unfamiliar with open
stacks. Twenty-six percent of them did not know they may recall a book when it had been checked out. Book return procedures in some developing countries include a procedure for canceling the loan. Some foreign students said that they hesitated to place books in the return boxes for fear of being accused of not having returned the books.

Many of them rarely ask reference questions because of their poor communication skills in English and the lack of attention to reference services in their home countries.

Self-service often does not exist in many developing countries. It is no small wonder, therefore, that students from an environment in which library personnel make photocopies for them do not know how to operate photocopying machines effectively when they arrive in the United States. It is interesting to note, too, that more than sixty percent of the respondents had left their photocopying cards in the machines the first or second time they used them. Sally G. Wayman's study reported, "An international student leader told me that if I took a survey of international students, I would discover that they like our Map Section the best of all library departments because the Map's staff retrieves the maps and hands them out. As the only nonself-service section of our library system, Maps meets their expectations of what library service should be." Many of them rarely ask reference questions because of their poor communication skills in English and the lack of attention to reference services in their home countries.

Unfamiliar Classification System

Most foreign students are unfamiliar with American classification and subject headings. Classification systems vary in some countries. For example, books on librarianship are classified in G in the Chinese standard classification, while they are grouped in Z by the Library of Congress (LC) Classification. Books on law are in Z according to Colon Classification (India), while they are classified in K in the LC, in D in China, and in X in the Soviet classification. The survey shows that about 45 percent of the interviewees were not familiar with the LC classification, and some had to find books by unsystematic searching. This process would naturally lead them to miss some of the most suitable books. Over 85 percent of them did not know how to use LC Subject Headings. In such cases, they had a habit of searching for a book by title instead of subject. Some students found the University of California's MELVYL online catalog to be effective in dealing with this problem because it provides for title keyword searching. The survey also revealed that there is little difficulty caused by changing classification from Dewey to LC, which presents a striking contrast to Lewis' findings in 1969. Both classifications are new to many respondents.

Card Catalogs: Easier or Harder to Use?

Some studies have revealed that foreign students have difficulties in using card catalogs. However, in this survey, more than 70 percent of the respondents thought that using American card catalogs is easier than using card catalogs in their home countries because American catalogs are in alphabetical order. Nearly half of them found that using the online catalogs is not difficult for them because there is a guidebook beside each terminal. Several students complained that they were confused when the database retrieved too many results. For example, on April 15, 1991, MELVYL retrieved 10,346 results on the subject American history, 3,725 results on biochemistry, and 613 on coastal ecology. One freshman complained she did not know how to choose a suitable book, and she said that she likes to choose books in two languages—English and her native language. Too many search results may cause trouble for new undergraduate students, but several doctoral students suggested they prefer too many results to very few. One doctoral student in biochemistry said, "One main reason why I
could pass the qualifying exam success­fully is because I retrieved a considerable
number of documents from MEDLINE. It
includes almost all important works in
biochemistry."

**Baffled by Reference Material**

The survey showed that foreign stu­
dents, especially those in social sciences,
knew little about American reference
works. Graduate students in natural
sciences were the exception. They said
they could use American reference works
effectively because they had already used
some reference books, such as Biology Ab­
stracts, Chemical Abstracts, and Engineer­ing
Index before coming to the United States.
Fifteen percent of them, however, still did
not know how to find a journal article. In
order to cope with this problem, some
have a tendency to look for relevant arti­
cles cited by the papers they read. Employ­
ing this method, though, means that they
will probably overlook some important
articles.

**Too many search results may cause
trouble for new undergraduate
students, but several doctoral
students suggested they prefer too
many results to very few.**

---

The general impression of the survey
is that students in natural sciences have
fewer difficulties than those in humani­
ties and social sciences. The main ex­
planation is that natural sciences differ
less across national boundaries than do
social sciences.

**Poor English Proficiency**

The study also shows that, although
foreign students must demonstrate ade­
quate English proficiency before enroll­
ing in college, few of them can read or
converse with the accuracy and speed
necessary for communication. There­
fore, it is not surprising that, for those
interviewed for this study, the better
their English proficiency, the fewer diffi­
culties they encountered in using the li­
braries. This result also coincides with
several previous studies. The stronger
the American influence on libraries in
students’ home countries, the fewer dif­
ficulties they found using American li­
braries.

**Plagiarism**

Another common problem amongst
foreign students is plagiarism. Accord­
ing to Sally G. Wayman, “Plagiarism is a
concept of which many foreign students
are unaware, and, oblivious of penalties,
they may unintentionally violate all
rules of scholarship on their initial
papers.” Dick Feldman further ex­
plains, “In many countries, it is con­
sidered sufficient for students to show
that they understand what the experts in
their fields have written. In their written
papers, students show that they have
mastered the experts’ ideas, and they can
restate or synthesize those ideas coher­
ently. As you can imagine, students from
this tradition often encounter serious
conflicts with our ideas of plagiarism.”
The same held true for this study.

It is worth noting that many foreign
students in social sciences have a ten­
dency to write something about their
home countries because of their former
educational background and interest.
Many interviewees in this survey be­
lieved projects about their home coun­
tries are easier to complete and may be
graded higher because professors are
often not very familiar with students’
home countries. The fact that some pro­
fessors lack sufficient knowledge of stu­
dents’ home countries creates an oppor­
tunity for plagiarism.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. In light of the findings in this sur­
ev, foreign students should be in­
formed, before they start their studies in
the United States, about the problems
they might encounter in using American
libraries. They could then be mentally
prepared and avoid some frustration.

2. Glossaries of library terminology
and handouts on the library’s basic rules
and procedures should be written in the
students’ native languages, as well as in
English. If this is so, students with some
basic knowledge of American libraries may have more self-confidence and be more willing to ask questions. Some Chinese students identified a leaflet in Chinese, "Introducing U.C. Berkeley Libraries to Chinese Users," as having been helpful for acquainting them with the library systems.

3. Tours of the library should be offered to foreign students. The tours should be bilingual or in the student's native language if the student does not fully understand spoken English. Also, those conducting the tours should articulate clearly and avoid library jargon. Another recommendation is for the tours to be done shortly after the student arrives on campus. It has been commonly accepted that the earlier the orientation, the easier the adjustment to the American academic environment. In addition, the tours should be done in small groups.

To help bridge the communication and cultural gap between foreign and American students, tour guides should be assisted by foreign students who are familiar in using American libraries. Several studies recommend doing so. Also, American students majoring in foreign languages, such as Chinese, Japanese, or Spanish, should help lead the tours. It has been widely accepted that students' English-language ability and social interaction are always intertwined. Claire Selltiz and others observed that for "the students studying in a foreign country, a thorough acquaintance with that country's language can be a valuable asset. Not only should it ease his academic task but also it should allow him to take more part in social life and to deal more easily with the small transactions and conversations that are part of everyday living in any community." One Chinese student said, "I think in Chinese, I live and work with Chinese, I watch Chinese TV programs, and I go shopping at Chinatown, so my English have [sic] little improve [sic] since I came here." Undoubtedly, the better the students' English, the more likely they are to get involved in American culture and to improve their English further. Both are essential for foreign students' academic success in American education, and for getting needed encouragement and attention from Americans.

4. Special hands-on workshops should be held to teach foreign students about the LC classification and subject headings, online catalogs, and library facilities, such as photocopying machines. Hands-on experience is direct and effective in overcoming communication barriers.

5. Library workers should become more sensitive to foreign students' special needs. Library staff commonly blame foreign students for their lack of familiarity with American libraries and for their English deficiency, while foreign students complain that library staff are insensitive. These two factors can exacerbate each other, as in the following scenario described by Irene Hoffman and Oprita Popa: "A foreign student approaches the reference desk. In a quiet and retiring manner, the student asks for assistance. The librarian on the other side of the desk tenses while straining to understand the question through the heavily accented, soft-spoken voice of the student. The librarian becomes agitated, thinking why doesn't this student speak up? Why can't he speak English? The foreign student senses the librarian's distress, apologizes, and leaves without getting the needed information." This study is a step toward increasing such sensitivity. Terry A. Mood advocated that librarians should cultivate knowledge of students' home culture, appreciate their differences, and establish close relationships with them. It is also necessary that those institutions with a substantial number of foreign students have library staff with a special responsibility for foreign students.
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Salary Equity: A Case Study
Joan McConkey, Susan Anthes, Ellen Robertson, and Barbara Bintliff

Salary equity has been a major employment issue in academia for the last decade. This case study describes a successful library salary equity campaign in the context of a general salary equity program for all women and minority faculty at a state university. Establishing a method for determining gender-based salary inequities proved to be more complex for librarians than for the general faculty. Finally, a male counterpart study similar to the method used for the teaching faculty was developed. The six-year effort involved several committees, turnover among administrators, and, eventually, a higher level of awareness of and attention to women and minority issues at the university.

Salary equity, also referred to as pay equity, has been called the “employment issue of the 1980s.” Yet as Janice Kirkland points out, “a curious observer perusing Library Literature for the past five years for evidence of active and visible pay equity campaigns in academic libraries would find limited information.” This case study is an attempt to add to the discussion of pay equity for academic librarians. At the University of Colorado (CU), the process of developing and implementing a salary equity review for women and minority library faculty members spanned most of the 1980s and did not result in an evaluation of salaries or salary adjustments until 1991.

Like most universities, CU has long been dominated in its faculty and administrative ranks by white males. Recently CU has begun to recognize the importance of a more diverse faculty, and has taken action to improve recruitment and retention of women and minority faculty members. But, like most universities, CU has had mixed success.

One of the biggest problems facing the university in its efforts to enhance faculty diversity has been its salary scale. Salaries are set at the department level and the salary-setting process has been variously described as uncoordinated, arbitrary, and discriminatory. Historically, faculty compensation has been below comparable institutions. CU also suffers from the widespread problem of salary compression. This situation occurs when, because of market pressures, new faculty members are brought in at a salary level equal to or greater than other faculty members who are senior in length of service, rank, and sometimes, even reputation.

In the early 1980s, following several years of informal discussion among faculty groups and the university administration, a universitywide committee was appointed to examine the salary system as applied to women and minority faculty. After extensive deliberations, the committee proposed that a salary equity review using a counterpart method be undertaken in order to investigate the...
relationships between the salaries of women and minority faculty and those of white males. Salary equity is a broad term used to describe the concept of alleviating discrimination in salary. Salary equity requires fair and equitable compensation for work performed. The salary equity movement is based on two principles: salary discrimination by gender is illegal, and equal access to jobs and equal pay for equal work are fundamental rights of all citizens. Salary equity recognizes that issues of merit, seniority, and quality and quantity of work produced must enter into salary determination and will account for a degree of difference in compensation.

Several women library faculty members were involved in the development of the university’s salary equity review process from the beginning. While it seemed incongruous to some that there would be gender-based salary inequities in a predominately female occupation, the librarians successfully insisted that library faculty salaries be reviewed with those of other faculty members. Their insistence was based on experiences at CU and on the growing literature documenting salary disparities throughout the library field. For example, Jean Ray and Angela Rubin report that the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Annual Salary Survey from 1976–77 to 1983–84 found that in academic libraries “women constituted a majority at almost every level (except administrative positions) and earned less in every category.” There was a small decline in women’s relative economic condition through the seven years of the survey.

CU’s inclusion of librarians in its salary equity review was not the first attempt by a university to review and correct salary disparities of librarians. As early as 1971, the University of California, Berkeley Libraries carried out a comparable worth study. Comparable worth is one method used to rectify salary-based employment discrimination. Some academic libraries, including Temple University’s in 1978, have worked to correct salary inequities through union negotiations and/or class action sex discrimination suits. However, accounts of these efforts have been sketchy.

**HISTORY AND BACKGROUND**

CU is a four-campus system, with its central administration located in Boulder, Colorado. The Boulder Campus (UCB) is considered the flagship of the university; it is a major research university, maintaining membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU). It is also the largest campus in terms of student and faculty size and physical space. The other campuses are located in Denver (UCD) and Colorado Springs (UCCS). These campuses are primarily undergraduate institutions. A separate Health Sciences Center (HSC) is also located in Denver.

The administration of the CU system is headed by a president, who is assisted by several vice-presidents, associate and assistant vice-presidents, and directors of universitywide programs. Each campus is headed by a chancellor and one or more vice chancellors. Each campus is responsible for the administration of its library system. The Boulder campus has a main library called Norlin Library and five branch libraries, which are collectively referred to as the University Libraries. Also, there is an administratively autonomous law library. Faculty governance includes a universitywide faculty council and campus faculty assemblies. All have standing committees on women and on minority affairs.

In the 1982–83 academic year, the University Faculty Council Committee on Women began to discuss the issue of salary equity for women. The Boulder Faculty Assembly Committee on Women was asked to join in these discussions. Both committees felt that the statistical studies (regression analyses) done annually by the university administration to monitor salaries did not accurately reflect the gender and minority bias perceived in the salary schedule. The regression analyses identified only the most extreme cases of salary inequity.

The joint committee looked at salary comparisons between CU and similar universities. The results showed lower
salaries for women and men at CU, but women and minority faculty members were further behind than the white males. The joint committee began to negotiate with the then president of the university to find a way to correct the perceived injustices.

In 1984, the joint committee proposed a counterpart study, following a model used by the University of Georgia. The president had refused to consider a statistical model, but agreed to negotiate a counterpart model after the committee consulted a lawyer about a class action suit. Negotiations were delayed when the president resigned to accept the presidency of another university. In 1985, the new president agreed to accept the committee's proposed model.

The president had refused to consider a statistical model, but agreed to negotiate a counterpart model after the committee consulted a lawyer about a class action suit.

The agreed-upon version of the salary equity review counterpart procedure, as set out in a December 1985 letter from the president, included several important provisions. Only full-time tenured and tenure-track women and minority faculty were included. The part-time and nonregular instructional faculty were to be reviewed in a separate process. As of the end of November, 1992, that process had not begun. The president noted that the counterpart approach had limited value for library faculty and nursing faculty because of the lack of suitable male counterparts. He asked that separate procedures be developed and submitted to the appropriate campus administrative officers for these faculties.

Several issues related to salary equity were specifically excluded from the review process. Salary compression was not to be considered. The procedures could not address the issue of the low pay for faculty at CU in comparison to other universities across the country, nor could the issue of comparable worth be considered. The review was to be confined to gender- and minority-based inequities.

PROCEDURES

The procedures specified that women and minority faculty members (subjects) were to choose up to three white male counterparts, from their own departments, if at all possible. Department chairs were required to obtain and to make available to the subjects the curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations, and any other relevant materials of every faculty member in their department. The counterparts had to be mutually agreed upon by the subject and department chair. A Boulder campus committee of eighteen members appointed by the administration reviewed each case individually, comparing the subject and the counterparts to determine if any gender- or minority-based inequity in salary existed. An ombudsperson was appointed to oversee the process and handle complaints, grievances, and problems. While there were some difficulties, the process for classroom faculty was finished in less than a year, and settlements were received by about half of the subjects in 1986. The process for library faculty did not go so smoothly.

The directors of the three campus libraries asked their elected faculty personnel committees to appoint three representatives each to a universitywide committee. The committee was charged with developing procedures, to be sent to the president's office, for a salary equity review for library faculty. The librarians at the Health Sciences Library were excluded from the study because they were state personnel system employees and not faculty. The universitywide committee first met in February 1986.

The Library Salary Equity Committee's members looked at several different ways to define the extent of salary inequity. The committee also explored ways to review librarians' salaries, including: (1) comparing CU librarians' salaries to the salaries of librarians at universities in their respective comparison groups; (2) comparing CU librarians' salaries to the salaries of state
personnel system librarians whose automatic step system was theoretically less vulnerable to gender discrimination; (3) comparing CU librarians' salaries with those of the paraprofessionals on their staffs; and (4) comparing the average salaries of CU librarians and teaching faculty on their respective campuses. While each comparison pointed out problems within the salary structure, none was specifically gender- or minority-based. Therefore, these comparisons were not acceptable to the university administration.

The committee then pursued several other options. A study of CU's public salary and appointment figures clearly showed a high number of male library administrators with correspondingly higher salaries. Various salary formulas were considered but found not to include the merit component mandated by the university administration. CU academic departments with strong service components were also considered for comparison, but differences in terminal degrees, length of appointment, and responsibilities made reasonable comparisons difficult.

OUTCOMES

The committee soon realized that salary inequity conditions varied from campus to campus and that no single procedure would serve to address inequities in all three libraries. The joint committee disbanded, but members continued to work on procedures for their campuses. The Denver and Colorado Springs campuses developed procedures that were implemented after receiving administrative approval.

In 1987, the UCD library developed a model in which a review committee compared the salaries of the library faculty to the salaries of the teaching faculty. Final salary adjustments were negotiated with the UCD chancellor and approximately $30,000 was distributed to ten female library faculty members. Just after the UCD settlement, the librarians at UCCS developed a procedure by which they compared their salaries to their standard comparison group. According to this comparison, the librarians were underpaid by 15.6 percent. Corresponding salary adjustments were approved by the UCCS chancellor and over $24,000 was distributed to seven female librarians.

Concurrently, the Boulder Campus Library Salary Equity Committee sought to develop a procedure that would be acceptable to the librarians and the Boulder campus administration. The committee worked with the university's vice-president for human resources, who was able to provide information and feedback but had no authority to approve a plan. Several proposals were considered, including (1) across-the-board equity adjustments for men and women because of the unequal appointment period (eleven months for librarians versus nine months for classroom faculty) and unequal working conditions, and (2) comparison of average salaries at peer institutions. Neither of these proposals satisfied the campus administration. Finally, at the request of the administration, the committee agreed to review the feasibility of using a counterpart procedure. Since there was only one male in a nonsupervisory position at the time, the committee concluded that a counterpart study was still not feasible.

In late 1987, after these proposals were rejected, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs met with the Boulder committee for the first time. His stated reasons for not accepting any of the proposals included the concern that they were not gender- or minority-based and that, in reality, they were based on the principle of comparable worth. The vice-chancellor asked that the associate director of the University Libraries be involved in future meetings. The committee found this problematic because department administrators were specifically excluded from the process by the president's original memo. The associate director did attend one meeting, but was also unable to provide a plan acceptable to the vice-chancellor. At the request of the vice-chancellor, the matter was turned over to the University Libraries' elected Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). It was now spring 1988.
After reviewing the work of the previous committees, and consulting again with the vice-president for human resources, the FPC decided to approach the salary equity matter by comparing the University of Colorado with its AAU and ARL comparison groups. This study was done in terms of such factors as size of collection, size of professional staff, size of nonprofessional staff, and student body size. This comparison showed that the libraries with equivalent collection size and student body population had significantly larger professional and nonprofessional staffs.

Using this information, the FPC prepared a draft proposal recommending that librarians’ salaries should at least meet the ARL average. The rationale for this suggestion was that the UCB librarians were offering the same services and performing the same duties as librarians at better staffed and better supported university libraries. Therefore, the salaries of the UCB librarians should at least be equal to the average salaries at peer institutions.

The committee did not pursue this proposal. As a result, the salary equity issue for the Boulder campus libraries was dormant until the spring of 1989, when it was revived with the creation of a new pay equity committee. The fact that the issue was revived and actually completed was due to a series of administrative turnovers and political events involving women and minority faculty on the Boulder campus.

THE HARMONIC CONVERGENCE

With the hiring of new administrators, and the high level of awareness of women and minority issues at the university, the Boulder campus libraries salary equity review finally got off the ground in 1989 and was completed in 1991. During the period from 1985 to 1990, there was an unusual turnover among those administrators who had either the responsibility for, or an effect on, the salary equity review process. During this time period, new or reconfirmed occupants were seen in the positions of university president (1985, 1991) and vice-president for human resources (1988), and Boulder campus positions of chancellor (1986, 1989) and vice-chancellor for academic affairs (1986, 1990), University Libraries director (dean) (1988) and Law Library director (1989), and deans of the law school (1988) and arts and sciences (1989). For various reasons, all the new administrators were willing to institute, or reinstitute, discussions of salary equity for librarians.

National searches for the chancellor, vice-chancellor for academic affairs, and dean of arts and sciences resulted in the appointment of the same white male administrators who had been filling the positions on a temporary basis. This move generated heavy criticism from university constituencies and the press. The chancellor and vice-chancellor made public pledges to further the goals of hiring and retaining women and minority faculty on the Boulder campus.

Furthermore, women and minority issues were in the fore of the university’s collective consciousness during this period. Minority students and faculty publicly complained of an inhospitable atmosphere on the campus. Even before his arrival in 1985, the new president was under fire for a possibly sexist remark regarding his wife. In 1988, the law school refused an appointment to a former justice of the Colorado Supreme Court, saying that she was not qualified. Between 1989 and 1990, at least four women faculty members from several campuses filed sex discrimination claims with the U.S. Office of Federal Contract Compliance against the university. Controversy also swirled around the 1990 resignation of the highest-ranking female administrator on the Boulder campus.

In December 1988, when the associate vice-president for human resources resigned, one of her last official acts was to send a memo to Boulder’s vice-chancellor for academic affairs stating that the salary equity review for librarians had not yet been completed. In the memo, she also reminded him that he was responsible for seeing that it was done. The vice-chancellor notified the new director of the University Libraries that the
process should be investigated. The di­
rector, who generally supported the con­
ccept, appointed a new salary equity
committee.

The new committee was chaired by a
female assistant director and included a
member of the former three-campus
committee, a member of the Faculty Per­
sonnel Committee, which had also ad­
dressed the issue, the Law Library di­
rector, whose faculty was not included in
the law school review, a library faculty
member, and a Women's Studies faculty
member who had been active from the
beginning of the university's salary eq­
uity process.

The committee reviewed past at­
ttempts at salary equity for librarians.
The methodology involving peer institu­
tions, which was used by one of the other
campuses, appeared to be the most via­
ble. It called for a special study compar­
ing UCB librarians' salaries with salaries
of librarians in public institutions
belonging to the AAU, the peer group for
the campus. The study was commis­
sioned from the ARL. Salary data for the
libraries' women faculty was compared
to AAU averages for both men and
women with similar positions and years
of experience. Next, tables were
developed by the committee. The tables
listed each faculty woman, her position
by ARL category, years of experience,
and the AAU average salary for her posi­
tion and years of experience. Adjust­
ments were made for campus variations
from average peer group salaries by
rank as reported in campus studies. Ret­
roactive salary adjustments for the pre­
vious two years were projected on the
basis of the average annual salary in­
crease in the libraries. The committee's
proposal included a total request of
$112,677 in current salary adjustments
and $211,535 in retroactive pay.

The next step was to present the new
proposal to university and campus ad­
ministrators. A letter was addressed to
the university president, who had ini­
tiated the universitywide process, re­
questing action on salary equity for
library faculty on the Boulder campus.
Copies were sent to the campus adminis­
trators and the new associate vice­
president for personnel and human re­
sources. For three months, no one re­
sponded. The committee chair called the
president's office and eventually talked
with the associate vice-president. He
said it was a matter for the Boulder cam­
pus administration and was not his re­
sponsibility. He did agree to review the
files on the subject, and he eventually
sent the chancellor a memo which ap­
peared to question the veracity of the com­
mittee. The memo stated, "It is clear to me
that at the very least, there is disagree­
ment between the . . . committee and the Office
of Academic Affairs about whether they
ever received expected salary equity ad­
justments as a result of the 1985-86 pro­
cess." The committee responded, "All pre­
vious salary equity reports from the Librar­
ies to the Boulder campus administrators
have met with no response, and we are
hopeful that [the president] will take ac­tion on the matter once he is fully in­
formed of the situation . . . Let us assure
you that there has been no adjustment."

Meanwhile, several other faculty
women's groups were meeting on equity
issues. In some cases, gains made in the
1985-86 adjustments had been wiped
out in subsequent salary allocations.
There had been no reviews of how the
process was working, nor had the
process been extended to part-time and
nontenure track faculty as promised. In
May 1990, the chair of the Boulder Fac­
culty Assembly Committee on Women re­
ceived a letter from the president in
which he expressed commitment to re­
solving the salary equity problems. He
further stated that he had instructed the
UCB chancellor to work with the Library
Salary Equity Committee in the develop­
ment and implementation of an ac­
ceptable salary equity review procedure.

Boulder campus administrators did
little to facilitate the salary equity review
for librarians. In May and June, the library
committee met with the chancellor and
vice-chancellor separately. Both criticized
the lack of merit factors in the proposal.
Objections were raised regarding the pro­
cedures developed by the new committee,
based on AAU comparisons. Critics said
that the procedures did not conform to those used in 1985–86 for evaluating the instructional faculty. The chancellor did promise, however, that there would be a resolution by July 1, 1990, or that he would personally step in if no agreement was reached with the vice-chancellor.

The vice-chancellor and an associate vice-chancellor proposed a multiple regression formula, similar to the university one that had contributed to the original dissatisfaction with the method used to determine inequities in the early 1980s. They also proposed a method which involved constructing a continuum of white male librarians, and fitting the women in at appropriate places based on responsibilities and years of experience. Despite the committee’s reservations, the vice-chancellor was insistent on using male counterparts, citing the increase of white males on the libraries’ faculty.

The committee agreed to go back to the women and minority faculty in the libraries to discuss using counterparts, a methodology the university administration had ruled out for librarians in the 1985–86 discussions. The vice-chancellor appointed an assistant vice-chancellor as liaison between his office and the committee. At a meeting of the women faculty, the women agreed to try the internal counterpart method but they also voiced their strong support for the AAU comparison method.

The rest of the summer included several meetings with the vice-chancellor’s representative to outline a methodology and to establish a mutually acceptable committee to review the information provided by the libraries and the individuals. This information included vitae, position descriptions, evaluations, five-year salary information when available, the AAU comparison information, and a statement from each woman describing her closest counterparts. The five members of the review committee included two recently appointed but senior faculty members from the University Libraries and the Law Library, the deans of the other CU campus libraries involved in the university equity study, and a member of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Libraries Committee.

The review procedure specified that each affected woman or minority librarian was given the opportunity to choose one or more counterparts from among the white male librarians at the same institution. Counterparts were to be similarly situated to the woman librarian in such areas as records of performance in librarianship, scholarship and service, educational background, years of experience, and specialization. Salaries of the woman and her counterpart(s) were then compared. If no clear reason for salary differences could be determined, the assumption was made that gender-based discrimination existed, and a salary readjustment was recommended.

If no clear reason for salary differences could be determined, the assumption was made that gender-based discrimination existed, and a salary readjustment was recommended.

Once the procedures were agreed on and a committee was selected, the salary equity review progressed smoothly. The new committee began its work in October 1990 and made its recommendations for equity adjustments to current salaries in December 1990. Each woman was given an opportunity to agree or disagree with the committee’s recommendation. The deans of the libraries and the law school also reviewed the recommendations and were given the same opportunity to agree or disagree, although this was outside the scope of the agreed upon procedures. In the meantime, the vice-chancellor’s staff calculated retroactive payment amounts for those women employed since 1985-86. The payment was based on the committee’s current salary recommendations. The salary recommendations were reviewed by the vice-chancellor in March 1991. Adjustments were made in the April 1991 salary checks for those who accepted the committee’s recommendation as approved by the vice-chancellor. Continuing adjustments totaled $73,069 and
retroactive pay amounted to $398,430. At that time, the few women who disagreed with their individual awards, or whose awards were disapproved by the vice-chancellor, were given one week to appeal to the chancellor. Notification of the chancellor’s disapproval of all appeals was received in September 1991. Final appeals to the President’s Oversight Committee were considered in January 1992. The president’s decision due the next month, was received in April and resulted in increases and back pay awards to the appellants.

ADVICE TO THE NOVICE SALARY EQUITY SEEKER

As is obvious from the authors’ case, the trail to a salary equity review is fraught with roadblocks. While the review finally did occur, the final procedure and timetable were far from what was originally envisioned. Along the way the authors learned many lessons, which can be fairly well summarized as four rules: be realistic, flexible, persistent, and watchful.

Be Realistic

Start with a proposal and a timetable to give to the administration, but be prepared to make changes. Decide what is most important or nonnegotiable and what you are willing to cut or change as a compromise. Get a nonlibrarian, preferably someone perceived by the administration as having some degree of authority or credibility, to work with you. It helps to have a broad base of support from campus faculty governance and other recognized campus groups with equity concerns. You are trying to institute a process to which, chances are, many in your institution are opposed. Recognize this and be ready to involve the press, either by writing letters or informing a sympathetic reporter of what’s going on, to go over the head of the administrator with whom you have been dealing, or to call in influential faculty or outsiders. Keep in mind that campus, city, and even state politics may influence the process. Be informed of the history of the salary review issue and keep up with its current status. Most important of all, keep your primary constituency informed. Without their support, any proposed procedure will die in the bureaucratic quagmire.

Be Flexible

Again, be prepared to compromise on your original plan and accept the fact that your timetable may not be met. If you become too insistent on compliance with any one detail, it can derail the entire process. Be willing to work with whomever the administration assigns to the project. You have to develop a working relationship, and some degree of trust, with someone who has the ear of the administration. Be attuned to the political realities inherent in the academic hierarchy.

Be Persistent

Create your own opportunities. Take advantage of turnovers in administrative ranks by making your cause known to newcomers. Enlist the aid of campus groups or organizations with similar objectives. Establish an internal time line for your committee and stick to it. Enlist your library director’s support for your cause, and persuade him or her to make salary equity a constant topic of conversation with administrators.

Be Watchful

Record the proceedings of each meeting, and immediately transcribe them. Create a paper trail by following up all interviews and meetings with memoranda summarizing the conversation and reminding parties of what they agreed to do. Ask for responses in writing. Keep notes on telephone conversations.

CONCLUSION

After six years of effort by various groups, a salary equity review for librarians was completed at UCB. Despite major snags along the way, the results were well received by most of the women involved. Ironically, the amount of the equity payments proved to be higher than it would have been under earlier proposals.
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4. Comparable worth is generally defined by stating that comparable jobs should be compensated at the same rate. Most often, comparability is determined by evaluating the jobs in question and assigning points on the basis of skills or training needed, effort expended, responsibility, and working conditions. In addition to the basic principles underlying salary equity, comparable worth also assumes that those jobs traditionally considered women's work, or associated with some supposed special talent of women, ought to be valued equally to jobs associated with men.
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Job Satisfaction among Support Staff in Twelve Ohio Academic Libraries
Coleen Parmer and Dennis East

This article uses Paul E. Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey to study 434 responses to a 1989 survey of support staff in twelve state-supported academic libraries in Ohio. Satisfaction was reported in five job dimensions (supervision, coworkers, work, benefits, and pay), but workers were dissatisfied in four job dimensions (operational procedures, communication, contingent rewards, and promotion). Dissatisfaction was widespread among technical workers and generally increased with experience for all workers. Surprisingly, satisfaction was high among part-time workers and, except regarding promotion, higher for women than men.

Defining job satisfaction accurately and adequately is no easy task. A review of the literature reveals a variety of terms used to describe the phenomenon. However, most analysts agree that job satisfaction is related to the individual’s feelings or emotions toward work rather than to intellectual or rational reactions. Paul E. Spector defines job satisfaction as “an emotional-affective response to a job or specific aspects of a job: it is assumed to represent a cluster of evaluative feelings about a job.”

Subodh Gopal Nandy suggests,
The experience of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with individual’s work is the consequence of the extent of his positive or negative job attitudes. Job satisfaction is not a permanent attitude nor is it a momentary attitude. It is only a relatively enduring state which undergoes a change with the needs of the individual, the capacity of work situation which fulfills these needs, and the individual’s own perception of the situation.

Nandy’s point bears repetition: the individual’s perception of the work situation and whether or not needs are being met causes either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Two workers in the same setting can have quite different emotional reactions to the work.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Theories of job satisfaction and methods for measuring it abound. Three schools of thought important to the study of job satisfaction have been identified. The physical-economic school emphasizes the role of the physical arrangement of work, physical working conditions, and pay. Contending that man is a rational being, F. W. Taylor reasoned in 1912 that a worker receiving the highest possible earnings with the least amount of fatigue would be satisfied and productive. Proponents of this view studied the effects of hours of work and rest on fatigue and performance, and environmental factors such as illumination, ventilation and noise, boredom, and monotony.

The Hawthorn Studies, conducted in 1920 by Elton Mayo and his colleagues,
emphasized the role of good supervision, cohesive work groups, and friendly employee-management relations in job satisfaction. The social, or human relations, school hypothesized that social relationships were more important to job satisfaction than were economic incentives. The influence of this view extended well into the 1950s.4

Robert Hoppock’s first intensive study of job satisfaction, performed in 1935, concluded that a multiplicity of factors affected job satisfaction. In his view, achievement affected worker attitudes as much as fatigue, monotony, working conditions, and supervision.5 Not until the late 1950s, when the work itself or growth school was expounded by Fredrich Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Block Snyderman, did Hoppock’s views become accepted. Although proponents of the older schools of thought abounded, the growth of skills, efficacy, and responsibility while performing mentally challenging work are recognized as vital to job satisfaction.6

Several researchers utilizing a variety of methods have studied job satisfaction in a library setting. Those studies that have either included library support staff, wholly or in part, or contained conclusions particularly relevant for the authors’ study deserve special attention.

Annette L. Hoage identified low salary and the lack of opportunity for advancement as causes of employee turnover among professionals and nonprofessionals in two university libraries. She concluded that, although salary and chances for advancement were instrumental, they were not the only reasons employees resigned.7 Lawrence D. Prybil’s survey of librarians, clerical workers, and service employees in one university library employed two questionnaires: one to determine the level of job satisfaction and another for direct supervisors to measure job performance. He concluded that a low but positive relationship existed between job satisfaction and performance, but that a direct correlation between occupational level and job satisfaction did not exist.8

William J. Vaughn and J. D. Dunn administered the Job Description Index (JDI) to employees in six university libraries to measure five dimensions of satisfaction: pay, the work, promotional opportunities, coworkers, and supervision. Neither a library nor any department in one of the libraries scored consistently high or low on all aspects of satisfaction. The research emphasized the role and impact of management upon worker satisfaction and productivity and suggested that managers use the findings to determine strengths and weaknesses within their organizations.9

Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), Asadollah Azad measured job satisfaction among paraprofessionals. He found public service employees more satisfied than those in technical service areas. In a refutation of the Herzberg Motivational-Hygiene or Two-Factor theory, Azad concluded that motivational and hygiene factors were not totally independent of each other as originally posited.10 Steven Seokho Chwe’s study of satisfaction among reference librarians and catalogers generally supports Azad’s findings. Although Chwe found no significant difference in the level of overall job satisfaction between the two groups, he concluded catalogers were significantly less satisfied than reference librarians in several dimensions of their jobs: creativity, social service, and variety.11 George P. D’Elia concluded that job environment, rather than gender, type of library, or vocational needs, affected job satisfaction. He identified supervisory climate and intrinsic characteristics of the job itself as the most important determinants of satisfaction.12

In 1983, Beverly P. Lynch and Jo Ann Verdin, surveying 384 library employees in three large academic libraries, adopted a satisfaction scale developed by Jerald Hage and Michael Aiken. They found:

1. Older workers were more satisfied than younger workers.
2. Experienced employees were more satisfied than those with less experience.
3. Those who planned to be working in the same library five years hence
were significantly more satisfied than persons with other plans.

4. Those lacking supervisory responsibility had the lowest satisfaction while department heads were the most satisfied.

5. Reference department employees had significantly higher levels of satisfaction than employees of any other department, except acquisitions.

6. Professional librarians were more satisfied than nonprofessional staff.

In their study, gender did not significantly influence job satisfaction. Lynch and Verdin replicated the study in 1987 and reached a similar conclusion: significant variations in job satisfaction occur among departments and among occupational groups in libraries. Ilene F. Rockman concluded, after surveying 220 university faculty and librarians, that gender alone could not be viewed as a predictor of job satisfaction. Rather, such variables as autonomy and decision making correlated highly with satisfaction.

An analysis of job satisfaction within an institution should serve as an indicator of morale as well as of a successful operation.

In the most recent studies, Donna K. Fitch surveyed support staff in sixteen Alabama academic libraries, using the JDI to test satisfaction and its relationship to seventeen variables. She found that the size of the institution, gender, and years of worker experience had significant impact on worker satisfaction on one or more JDI scales. Patricia A. Kreitz and Annegret Ogden compared job responsibilities and satisfaction of librarians and support staff in California university libraries. This study, the largest one of its kind conducted so far, included 563 support staff and 338 librarians. Finding a surprising amount of overlap in job responsibilities, the study concludes that librarians are more satisfied than support staff, especially in the areas of promotion, job development, and influence.

THE CURRENT STUDY

The notion of a happy worker as a productive worker has been increasingly questioned in recent literature examining job satisfaction. It seems obvious, however, that successful management of any type of organization depends largely upon high morale and satisfaction among the personnel. An analysis of job satisfaction within an institution should serve as an indicator of morale as well as of a successful operation. Support staff in academic libraries comprise the majority of all employees, making them an important indicator of the working climate. Support staff reactions to organizational structure, job classifications, personnel policies, working conditions, and other institutional characteristics can provide strong feedback for library administrators. Accordingly, this study focused on support staff.

Several terms have been used to identify library employees who do not hold a professional position: paraprofessionals, nonprofessionals, subprofessionals, library clerks, technical assistants, and library associates. The term support staff has been chosen for this study because it is the most generic and refers to most personnel in a library except professional librarians, custodial workers, and student assistants. It is also the term preferred by the Academic Library Association of Ohio (ALAO) Support Staff Interest Group, an Ohio library group made up primarily of support staff working in academic libraries in Ohio. In the spring of 1989, library administrators in thirteen state-supported academic institutions in Ohio were sent a request to participate in this support staff survey and to provide a list of job titles, the number of support staff employed, and the name of a contact willing to distribute the surveys and letters. Administrators at twelve of the libraries agreed to distribute the survey to all employees, except professional librarians, custodial workers, and student assistants. A total of 719 surveys were mailed and 434 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 60.4 percent.
SELECTING A SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Three survey instruments, the MSQ, the JDI, and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) were considered for this study. The MSQ was rejected because of its length and its gender bias. The JDI, developed primarily to measure satisfaction in an industrial setting, was eventually rejected in favor of the JSS developed in 1985 by Paul E. Spector for specific use in human service, public, or nonprofit sector organizations. Spector administered his questionnaire to over 3,000 employees. A multitrait, multimethod comparison of the JSS and the JDI provided evidence for discriminant and convergent validity, and further tests determined the relationship of the JSS to other variables, such as employee characteristics, leadership, and organizational commitment. Spector concluded that the overall results were evidence of the JSS's reliability and construct validity.18

DESCRIPTION OF THE JSS

The JSS is composed of thirty-six items, each an evaluative statement about the job. Agreement with a statement indicates either a positive or a negative attitude about the job because half the items are worded positively (i.e., “I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do”), and half are worded negatively (“Raises are too few and far between”). The thirty-six items test attitudes toward nine different aspects of work. These aspects, which Spector calls job dimensions, cover:

- Benefits: including pension, medical coverage, annual leave, and paid vacations.
- Communication: the imparting or interchange of thoughts, opinions, or information by speech or writing.
- Contingent rewards: appreciation and recognition, including praise for accomplishment, credit for work well done, and criticism.
- Coworkers: including their competence, helpfulness, and friendliness.
- Operational procedures: including the organization's rules, procedures, and red tape.
- Pay: including amount, fairness or equity, and method of payment.
- Promotions: including opportunities for, fairness of, and basis for.
- Supervision: including supervisory style and influence, technical and human relations, and administrative skills.
- Work: including intrinsic interest, variety, opportunity for learning, difficulty, amount, chances for success, and control over pace and methods.19

These nine job dimensions are broken down into nine subscales. Each subscale is composed of four items, two worded positively, two negatively. An example from the “coworkers” subscale should clarify this approach.

Item 7: I like the people I work with.
Item 16: I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with.
Item 25: I enjoy my coworkers.
Item 34: There is too much bickering and fighting at work.

Items 7 and 25 are positively worded, while items 16 and 34 are negatively worded. Degrees of agreement or disagreement with these four items explore attitudes toward coworkers.

Each item is measured on a Likert rating scale with six agree-disagree response choices: (1) disagree very much, (2) disagree moderately, (3) disagree slightly, (4) agree slightly, (5) agree moderately, and (6) agree very much. The value of each item ranges from 1 to 6 points. A score of 6 on positively worded items indicates high satisfaction. Negatively worded item responses are inverted so that 1 equals 6, 2 equals 5, and so on. Consequently, strong disagreement on negatively worded items is scored as a 6 and reflects high satisfaction after score inversion. The subscale score consists of a total of the four items' scores for a range of 4 (low satisfaction) to 24 (high satisfaction).

In the example of the coworkers subscale, a respondent circling 6 on items 7 and 25 would score 12 points (6 points per item), and circling 1 on items 16 and 34 would again score 12 points (6 points per item) because of the score inversion of the negatively worded statements. The respon-
dent would receive a total of 24 points (4 items times 6 points)—very high satisfaction—for the subscale called coworkers.

The JSS provides a quantified assessment of nine identified job dimensions, thus permitting the investigation of those aspects of a job a worker finds either satisfying or dissatisfying. The JSS also provides an overall satisfaction score which is a sum of all thirty-six item scores ranging from a low of 36 (low satisfaction) to a high of 216 (high satisfaction).

Some respondents refused to complete all thirty-six items, contending that the subscale questions appeared too similar. In the current study, forty-seven respondents (10.8 percent) failed to answer at least one item. Several respondents said they had answered the question already. Spector reported that 8.8 percent of his test respondents failed to answer one or more questions. To overcome this weakness of the JSS, a single missing item within a subscale was replaced by the mean of responses to the remaining three items.

Having selected the JSS to rate satisfaction, the researchers developed an additional questionnaire to gather information about survey respondents. The personal profile sought specific information about position and personal background, while directly investigating specific research objectives to determine whether worker characteristics such as gender, job classification, and years of experience could be used to predict satisfaction. A third part of the survey asked open-ended questions about the respondents' attitudes toward their jobs.

**ANALYSIS OF THE DATA**

Table 1 shows job satisfaction for all support staff. The total number of respondents (n) of 422 was derived as the lowest number of responses to any single item. Job dimensions are in rank order from highest satisfaction mean to lowest. These means are compared to Spector's returns. The job dimension subscales range from a low of 4 to a high of 24. Mean scores that fall above the midpoint of 14.5 indicate a degree of satisfaction while mean scores falling below the midpoint indicate a degree of dissatisfaction.

Five of the nine job dimensions fell above the 14.5 mid-point. Support staff find supervision, with a mean of 18.41, 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION FOR ALL SUPPORT STAFF MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND STANDARD ERROR OF MEASUREMENT FOR RANKED JOB DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Dimensions</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational procedures</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscales:</td>
<td>4–24</td>
<td>4–14.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td>36–216</td>
<td>36–126.4</td>
<td>126.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the major source of job satisfaction. Co-workers and work itself also ranked high as satisfying job aspects, with means of 17.44 and 16.58, respectively. These same three dimensions also rated as the top three among Spector's respondents. The findings support, in part, D'Elia's conclusions that supervisory climate and intrinsic characteristics of the work itself are the most important determinants of satisfaction. Benefits and pay were also satisfying dimensions for Ohio library support staff but not for Spector's population.

Operational procedures (rules, procedures, red tape) and communication fell slightly below the midpoint, indicating these dimensions were slightly dissatisfying, while staff dissatisfaction was even greater for contingent rewards (recognition and appreciation).

Hoage discovered as early as 1950 that lack of opportunity for advancement played an important role in employee turnover. Kreitz and Ogden's recent study also provides strong evidence that lack of promotion contributes to dissatisfaction, particularly among support staff. In the current study, promotion (that is, the opportunity for promotion) clearly causes the greatest dissatisfaction, with a mean of 10.15. In view of the large number of respondents who identified themselves as having been promoted, this result needs further examination. Question 12 (part A of the survey) asks staff, "Have you been promoted during your employment in this library? (including through job reclassification or job transfer)." A total of 253 (58.3%) responded affirmatively. Yet, contrary to expectations, those who had been promoted were less satisfied than those unpromoted respondents in eight of the nine job dimensions. Only in the pay subscale did promoted workers score higher. The satisfaction means of unpromoted workers, although not statistically significant except on the co-workers subscale, were higher than those promoted. These unusual results may revolve around respondents' perceptions of promotion and may indicate promoted staff's greater recognition of a career barrier. Ultimately, the lack of the M.L.S. degree looms as an impassable barrier to promotion to professional ranks. Job reclassification often injects the employee into an adversarial role with library administration, while job transfer may mean a move away from familiar coworkers, supervisors, and job tasks.

Dissatisfaction with contingent rewards further contributes to the contention that support staff resent the M.L.S. degree barrier. Despite years of service and high levels of education and training, support staff perceive a lack of status, recognition, and appreciation for their work. Administrators should acknowledge that promotion and contingent rewards are the greatest sources of job dissatisfaction among support staff. On the other hand, the overall satisfaction mean (135.96) is well over the midpoint (126.5) and somewhat higher than Spector's results. This, and the fact that five of the nine dimensions are satisfying, should be encouraging news.

Table 1 reveals general trends of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among all respondents, while table 2 examines various worker groups and satisfaction means. Other studies of library staff found that satisfaction is influenced by worker characteristics, such as gender, area of work or department, and years of experience. The current study examines eleven variables: gender, full- or part-time work, educational background, job classification, library size, years of work, area of work, work with patrons, supervisory responsibilities, promotion, and future commitment to the organization. The surveys were coded and run on the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The eleven variables were run against each of the nine subscales and against overall satisfaction. Table 2 shows the eleven variables ranked by the number of subscales and overall satisfaction scale with statistically significant differences in satisfaction means.

The last five variables (commitment, educational background, library size, promotion, and supervising) generated two or fewer significant scales. Analysis of the results would be entirely too impressionistic. Consequently, this study
TABLE 2
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES RANKED BY NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Overall scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with patrons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job classification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

focuses on the first six variables that generated enough significant scales to suggest patterns.

Respondents were asked to identify their area of work as public service, technical service, both, or other. Those who selected both are presumed to work in a branch or department library that does both public service and technical processing, while those who selected other are presumed to work in offices. Table 3 shows job satisfaction means by area of work. Five subscales and overall satisfaction were statistically significant.

The data indicate a strong connection between satisfaction and where one works. Clearly, those who work in public areas express more satisfaction than those in technical services. In scale A (overall satisfaction), B (contingent rewards), C (coworkers), and F (work itself), public service staff exhibited more satisfaction than those in technical service departments. Staff in department or branch libraries ranked second in satisfaction and office workers ranked third. Scale B also illustrates that department library staff showed significantly more satisfaction than technical staff. These results support Azad’s findings that public service employees are more satisfied than their colleagues in technical service.24 A leading factor in such satisfaction may be interaction with users. This interaction provides immediate feedback to library staff on the importance of their work.

Human service workers may view the chance to help people as gratifying and as contributing to self-esteem. It is no statistical accident that scale B, called contingent rewards (recognition and appreciation), confirms that public service and department library staff are significantly more satisfied than technical service staff. Additional support may be found in Chwe’s finding that “catalogers are significantly less satisfied than reference librarians about the social service aspect of their job—the chance to do things for other people.”25

Scale D (communication) also reveals public service workers as significantly more satisfied than technical service workers. Office workers ranked second in satisfaction over the third-ranked department workers. The scores indicate that those in public service and in offices may have more access to official lines of communication.

Only on scale E (operational procedures) did technical service workers not rank last in satisfaction. Public service employees again ranked highest in satisfaction, statistically higher than the last-ranked department library employees. Operational conditions, such as red tape, procedures, and rules, may be viewed as negative factors in the department libraries.

Table 4 displays job satisfaction by years of work experience. Respondents were asked, “How many years have you worked in this library?” Respondents were grouped into four categories: group A (0 to 5 years of experience), group B (6 to 10 years), group C (11 to 15 years), and group D (16 or more years). Previous studies show mixed results. Lynch and Verdin showed the most experienced workers to be the most satisfied.26 Fitch found that experience was generally not significant, but that on the scale category called opportunities for promotion, first-year workers were the most satisfied and workers with the most experience were the least satisfied.27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Work</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Overall satisfaction scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>141.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>137.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>135.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>129.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Subscale: contingent rewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>12.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Subscale: co-workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Subscale: communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Subscale: operational procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Subscale: work itself</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/branch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant pairs
### TABLE 4
**JOB SATISFACTION BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:**
**SUBSCALES AND OVERALL SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience (n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Overall satisfaction scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (0-5)</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (16+)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (6-10)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (11-15)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 3.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Subscale: contingent rewards** | | |
| A (0-5) | 196 | 14.73* |
| D (16+) | 68 | 13.41 |
| C (11-15) | 49 | 13.03 |
| B (6-10) | 98 | 12.96* |
| F ratio 3.27 | | p < .05 |

| **C. Subscale: benefits** | | |
| A (0-5) | 196 | 16.72* |
| D (16+) | 68 | 16.44 |
| B (6-10) | 98 | 16.05 |
| C (11-15) | 49 | 14.67* |
| F ratio 2.95 | | p < .05 |

| **D. Subscale: operational procedures** | | |
| A (0-5) | 196 | 14.81* |
| D (16+) | 68 | 14.07 |
| B (6-10) | 98 | 14.01 |
| C (11-15) | 49 | 12.48* |
| F ratio 3.72 | | p < .01 |

| **E. Subscale: promotion** | | |
| A (0-5) | 196 | 11.13* |
| B (6-10) | 98 | 9.44* |
| C (11-15) | 49 | 9.10* |
| D (16+) | 68 | 8.95* |
| F ratio 5.66 | | p < .01 |

* Significant pairs.

The results in table 4 defy simple explanation. The workers with the fewest number of years (group A) manifested the most satisfaction on all scales that produced significant results. Group B ranked third on three scales, lowest on the subscale contingent rewards, and second on the promotions subscale. Group C showed the least satisfaction on all scales except the subscales contingent rewards and promotion, on which they ranked third. Employees in group D ranked second in satisfaction on all scales except the promotion subscale, on which they ranked lowest. Removing group D from consideration, a pattern of progression emerges in which the more years of service a worker has, the greater the decline in satisfaction. Support for this conjecture can be seen in the promotion subscale in which group A ranked first, B second, C third, and D last. These findings match Fitch's. What may be operating with group D is that those who have remained on the job over fifteen years either may have accepted the perceived
TABLE 5
JOB SATISFACTION BY WORKING WITH PATRONS:
SUBSCALES AND OVERALL SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work with Patrons</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Overall satisfaction scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Yes</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>137.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>130.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 5.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Subscale: contingent rewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Yes</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>14.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 8.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Subscale: communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Yes</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>14.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Subscale: work itself</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Yes</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>16.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 6.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Subscale: promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Yes</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>10.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 11.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant pairs.

limitations of the work or may be looking forward to retirement. The only job dimension that continues to cause great dissatisfaction for this group is promotion.

This pattern—the more experience, the greater the dissatisfaction—if true, has serious implications for libraries. Ideally, as workers gain experience, they should enjoy greater satisfaction. That such is not the case implies that support staff jobs are dead-end positions and that advancement becomes progressively less likely as one gains experience and expertise.

Table 5 compares the job satisfaction means of staff who work with patrons and staff who do not. In the overall satisfaction scale and all four significant subscales, support staff who work with patrons exhibited significantly more satisfaction than their colleagues who do not. Previous studies predicted, and the results in table 3 confirm, this outcome.

Table 6 shows the levels of satisfaction associated with job classification or title. Respondents were grouped into five classifications: office personnel, including secretaries, office managers, typists, word processors, and administrative assistants; library assistants; library technical assistants (LTA); library associates; and other (all whose jobs could not be assigned to the first four categories, such as unit heads, computer systems operators, and audiovisual or media production workers). In general, library assistants and office workers showed the most satisfaction, while LTAs were least satisfied.

This pattern also appears on those scales not showing differences at levels of .05 significance. The researchers received lists of support staff job titles used in the participating libraries. Many titles were similar to titles such as library associate or library media assistant, which were frequently listed. But because more than ninety job titles are used in just twelve libraries, categorizing workers was extremely difficult. Much of the previous literature supports the notion that
### Table 6
Job Satisfaction by Job Classification: Subscales and Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Overall satisfaction scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Library. assistants</td>
<td>141.92*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Office workers</td>
<td>141.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Library. associates</td>
<td>136.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Other</td>
<td>135.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) L.T.A.s</td>
<td>130.84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Subscale: rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Office workers</td>
<td>15.47*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Other</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Library. associates</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Library. assistants</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) L.T.A.s</td>
<td>12.81*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Subscale: promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Office workers</td>
<td>11.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Library. assistants</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Other</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Library. associates</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) L.T.A.s</td>
<td>9.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Subscale: communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Library. assistants</td>
<td>15.70*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Library. associates</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Office workers</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) L.T.A.s</td>
<td>13.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Other</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio 3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant pairs.

Job titles play a significant role in satisfaction. It is, however, virtually impossible to explore this area in the current study because of the wide range of job titles used in Ohio. Perhaps the task would be more manageable by using the American Library Association support staff titles in the questionnaire and asking respondents to select the title that most closely matches their job.

Respondents were asked to identify themselves as either full-time or part-time workers. Table 7 shows the results of satisfaction in these two categories. This study, the first to examine this variable, produced surprising results. Contrary to expectation, part-time workers scored higher satisfaction means in all significant scales (overall, contingent rewards, pay, and promotion). Note that the mean (12.59) on the promotion scale is still below the midpoint (14.5), indicating dissatisfaction. However, this dimension is significantly less dissatisfying to part-time staff than to full-time staff.

The scale called pay, which shows satisfaction among part-time workers, may indicate why these workers are generally more satisfied than their full-time counterparts. If people accept part-
time work in a university library intending to rise to full-time status, then pay may not cause dissatisfaction because gratification has been postponed. In those cases where workers wish to remain as permanent part-time employees, pay generally supplements family income and will not, if it meets or exceeds labor market averages, cause pronounced dissatisfaction. Also, the work environment offers chances for interesting activities and social interactions for the part-time employee, making contingent rewards and promotion—the most dissatisfying dimensions identified for full-time workers—of lesser importance to part-time employees.

The final table, table 9, shows the reliability coefficients of the nine subscales. A coefficient alpha score of .7 indicates high reliability of the scale. That is, the questions that make up the subscales measure what they purport to measure. The subscale, operational procedures, with an alpha of 0.6429, is the only one that is slightly low. Overall, the subscales are highly reliable.

**CONCLUSIONS**

An easy, and essentially accurate, generalization that academic library support staff in Ohio appear to be satisfied with their employment situation emanates from this study. In particular, the workers expressed strong satisfaction with supervision, coworkers, work itself, benefits, and pay while disclosing general dissatisfaction with operational conditions, communication, contingent rewards, and promotion. This study’s results clearly demonstrate that the promotion and contingent rewards issues need further clarification and study as well as resolution. The linkage of these issues with the lack of an M.L.S. degree for support staff promises no easy solution.
TABLE 8
JOB SATISFACTION BY GENDER SUBSCALES AND OVERALL SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Subscale: work itself</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A men</td>
<td>A women</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B men</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B men</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C women</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C women</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant pairs.

TABLE 9
RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE SUBSCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Coefficient Alphas</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.6909</td>
<td>1, 10, 19, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.8230</td>
<td>2, 11, 20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.8888</td>
<td>3, 12, 21, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>0.7318</td>
<td>4, 13, 22, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>0.8373</td>
<td>5, 14, 23, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational procedures</td>
<td>0.6429</td>
<td>6, 15, 24, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>0.7517</td>
<td>7, 16, 25, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>0.7272</td>
<td>8, 17, 27, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.7423</td>
<td>9, 18, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables, by their very nature, may make generalization difficult. Yet, this study supports some conclusions by other researchers, such as Azad, Lynch, and Chwe, that support staff in public areas manifest more satisfaction than those in technical areas. Where one works in a library definitely relates to satisfaction.

The clear, and somewhat disturbing, finding—that the most experienced workers are the most dissatisfied—again provides evidence of the M.L.S. degree roadblock to promotion. This may increase, more than any other variable, dissatisfaction of the most experienced support staff.

Further, the study indicates that the opportunity to work with patrons certainly influences support staff satisfaction. Whether job classification or title influences satisfaction cannot be decided because of the wide range of job titles used in Ohio academic libraries.

The study produced two surprising findings with respect to full- or part-time status and pay. Part-time workers exhibited higher levels of satisfaction than full-time workers on the most significant scales, particularly the issue of pay. That part-time support staff seem more satisfied with pay than their full-time counterparts indicates satisfaction relative to average wages for comparable work and to work and social interactions unique to the workplace. In such a context, contingent rewards and promotion, if full-time work is not the goal of part-time work, offer no reason for dissatisfaction. This
study also supports Fitch’s finding that female support staff exhibit more satisfaction than their male counterparts. With the exception of the promotion issue, women showed greater satisfaction than men on all scales.

The reliability analysis revealed that the subscales of the JSS are acceptably reliable. The instrument which was developed to measure job satisfaction among human service workers lends itself very well to the study of library personnel. The JSS was published with Spector’s article and is available for researchers to use without Spector’s written permission.

Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, while neither a permanent nor secondary attitude, reflects an individual’s perception of the work situation and the meeting of his or her needs. This study provides evidence that while support staff in academic libraries are generally satisfied, significant issues remain to be resolved.

The variety of instruments used to measure job satisfaction among library staff makes comparisons between studies difficult. The use of the JSS in this study produced a number of statistically significant results and has, the authors believe, opened the door to further study using this instrument. In particular, the issues of promotion and recognition should be closely examined in light of worker experience and job classifications. This study adds to the body of conflicting evidence of whether gender is significant or not and if more study in this area is needed. Possibly, gender is a significant factor among support staff, but not among librarians. While this study supports earlier studies that workers in public service are more satisfied than those in technical service, it does not examine workers by departments. The variety of department names among twelve universities produced too many categories to derive statistically sound results, the same as job classifications did. Creating a demographic survey with selected departments and job classifications listed would probably solve this problem and produce interesting results. Finally, since this study was the first to examine full- and part-time workers, additional testing of those results is needed.
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Canon Formation, Library Collections, and the Dilemma of Collection Development
Mark Cyzyk

The purpose of this article is to conceptually clarify the precise function and duties of the collection development officer. In so doing, the relevance of current literary research surrounding canon formation to collection development is suggested. Methods of collection evaluation and development are discussed and shown to be intimately tied to existing canons of research materials/interests. The fact that canons are in flux, and that traditional collection development strategies attempt to anchor themselves in such protean entities, results in a dilemma for the collection development world. On the one hand, collections must be aimed at satisfying the needs of the current user group. On the other hand, the collection development officer has a more cosmopolitan duty to collect items that are not currently of interest or do not directly relate to what is currently deemed canonical, yet may become so in the future. With such a precarious professional position in mind, various strategies for a solution to the dilemma are sketched.

Librarians, and particularly collection development officers, can learn a lot from recent literary research in canons and canon formation. The findings of this research are relevant to the self-conception of collection development and to the general function of the library. The purpose of this paper is to discuss in broad terms (1) the notion of canon formation and evolution, (2) its importance with regard to collection development (essentially, to draw out the connection between the canon as collection development officers find it—ready-made—and the theoretical foundations of collection development), (3) to survey the main instruments of collection evaluation and development, and assess how well they contribute to adequate collection development in what will be referred to as temporally parochial or cosmopolitan terms, and (4) to show how the dilemma of collection development arises through the conflict of present-day literature with the possibility of future disparate canons.

DEFINING CANON FORMATION

The traditional conception of the canon—one that quite recently was brought to the fore and championed, for instance, by Allan Bloom in The Closing of the American Mind—is that the literary canon represents the best in what has been written throughout history. It is assumed that scientific canons are included as well, though they are less problematic than literary canons because they are not as value-laden or as susceptible to blatantly...
subjective influences as are literary canons. Such a view, however, presupposes a thorough absolutism or objectivism in regard to the value of a work. Indeed, such a view presupposes that the classic controversy endemic to theories of value—namely, the conflict between absolute and relativistic theories of value—has been solved in favor of the absolutist/objectivist position. But the controversy has not been patently settled and has begun to lean favorably in the past century toward a relativistic stance.

Essentially, the relativist challenge to the traditional concept of the canon is that instead of a single, absolute realm of value that can somehow be referenced and held as a standard for all works, there are several standards of value, each perhaps incommensurate with the rest, relative to which a work is judged. Therefore, a work judged to be exemplary by one set of standards, and admitted into the formal canon of that particular tradition may be wholly unacceptable in another. It may be totally inappropriate, for instance, to judge a work of contemporary Balinese literature against the standard of the Western tradition (the traditional conception of that tradition, that is). Likewise, what may be considered to be an excellent piece of literature by American standards may be judged a mediocre piece of literature by the Kenyans. Cultural differences are not the only factors figuring into the formation of a canon or tradition. Historical contexts are equally as important. Therefore, what may have once been judged to be a superlative, valuable work within a tradition, may at another time, and within the same tradition, be judged quite differently. Judgments often change, though it is hoped, not abruptly, and so, too, do the traditions which support and validate those judgments. The above explanation is a gross simplification of the relativist position, for it blatantly ignores the fact that there are several varieties of relativistic theory. Nevertheless, it should provide sufficient background for what follows.

LITERARY RESEARCH ON CANONS

Much of the work in literary research about the problems posed by canons can be summed up as research attempting to either (1) prove that the absolutist’s sense of value does not account for the way canons work (with regard to their selective inclusion and exclusion of particular works or bodies of works), or (2) discover and describe the mechanisms responsible for the sometimes radical evolution of various established canons. With respect to the first of these goals, and specifically against the absolutist tenet that canons are composed of items that have been disinterestedly judged to be the best, literary theorist Charles Altieri contends: “Canons are simply ideological banners for social groups; social groups propose them as forms of self-definition, and they engage other proponents to test limitations while exposing the contradictions and incapacities of competing groups.” Barbara Herrnstein Smith promotes this same claim by noting: “As is often remarked, since those with cultural power [those, like editors, who determine what will and will not be published in the first place] tend to be members of socially, economically, and politically established classes (or to serve them and identify their own interests with theirs), the texts that survive will tend to be those that appear to reflect and reinforce establishment ideologies.” With respect to the second above-mentioned goal, Herrnstein Smith further remarks:

[The repeated inclusion of a particular work in literary anthologies not only promotes the value of that work but goes some distance toward creating its value, as does also its repeated appearance on reading lists or its frequent citation or quotation by professors, scholars, and academic critics. For all these acts, at the least, have the effect of drawing the work into the orbit of attention of a population of potential readers; and, by making it more accessible to the interests of those readers (while . . . at the same time shaping and supplying the very interests in relation to which they will experience the work), they make it more likely both that the work will be experienced at all and also that it will be experienced as valuable.]
Such statements by Herrnstein Smith and others are intended to illustrate how social and political mechanisms are in some sense responsible for the formation and evolution of canons. They show that the Enlightenment goal of disinterested judgment is a mere phantasm. Against the traditional conception of the canon, the contemporary fashion is to maintain that the cream does not, solely on its own merit, rise to the top. The worth of a work is insidiously, fundamentally, socially, and historically mediated.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Such a relativistic stance regarding how canons are formed and evolve, if accepted, has profound importance for the self-conception of the goals and purposes of library collection development. The development of library collections is quite different, in one sense, from the development of a canon of superlative literature. Even though the minimal responsibility for the library world is to collect books that have been granted the privileged status of canonical work, many libraries also collect works considered marginal or unacceptable to the established canon. Yet it is possible that the very mechanisms which supported the evolution of canons—namely, the social and ideological mechanisms involved in the publishing and promotions process—also hold true for library collection development. In the following pages it will be shown how the instruments currently employed for evaluating and developing library collections work within and support this larger process.

F. W. Lancaster has identified the following three ways in which collections can be evaluated:

1. The subjective evaluation of parts of the collection by subject specialists. In this impressionistic approach, the subject specialists become, in a sense, an external standard against which the collection is measured.
2. Checking all or part of the collection against some type of list that is accepted as the external standard. The list may already exist (e.g., the holdings of another library presumed to be especially strong in a particular subject) or it may be prepared especially for the evaluation.
3. Evaluating the collection in terms of the volume and type of use it is receiving or has received in the immediate past.

It is easy to see how the first of these three types of collection evaluation works within and supports the structure of an existing canon: any subject specialist is, at once, both a product of and a contributor or potential contributor to the established canon. The specialist has some form of expertise with regard to the canon or segment of the canon of works deemed exemplary. It is against this backdrop that the specialist evaluates any library collection.

Likewise, the second type of evaluation works entirely within and supports the valued status of an existing canon of literature. Good examples of this include use of the Research Library Group (RLG) Conspectus and the Lopez Method or Citation Technique of evaluating collections. Both are primarily methods for evaluating collections, but because evaluation often results in altered development policies, both, in a sense, are also development tools. The famed RLG Conspectus serves as a union list of the collections of several major North American research libraries. It is a list against which individual institutions check their collections. Each institution on the list is assigned a level of collecting intensity for particular subjects so that a collection cooperative is formed. The cooperative allows a library to collect a large number of works most in demand by the local user group while maintaining access from other libraries to research material that is not widely in demand on the local level. This allows the needs of each participating institution to be met without the financial burden of having to collect at higher intensities those materials not generally demanded by the local user group. The result of this process, with respect to canons, is that only materials in the subjects demanded by the local user groups of the particular library are collected at the highest intensities.
items falling into the traditional canon of subjects as determined by a consensus of the academic user group as a whole are pursued for collection as a whole at the highest intensities. At no point does such vigorous collection development proceed outside of the consensually agreed-upon canon of topics. Consequently, use of the RLG Conspectus works clearly within the confines of what is deemed by users to be of legitimate research interest, and hence, of the items that are at least candidates for canonical status. These are items that have been socially and historically projected, in Herrnstein Smith’s idiom, into the orbit of attention of current and future user groups. This is not to say that certain subjects are entirely neglected. Materials on Milton scholarship, for instance, may be collected at higher general intensities throughout the library world than others, such as works on feminist film theory, because they are more historically entrenched topics of scholarship. But there are select institutions collecting materials on feminist film theory at equivalent or higher intensities than those on Milton scholarship.

We are historically situated in the only place ideal for collecting and preserving the artifacts of the present state of society. But our responsibility seems to transcend the satisfaction of the needs of the present members of that society. For whose society should we collect?

The Lopez or Citation Technique of evaluation also works within and supports the existing canon of literature. This technique consists primarily of checking the citations of a random list of journal articles against the collection to determine if the collection contains those items. This procedure is performed for several iterations. The results for each iteration are assigned quantifiable weights. The results are added up to obtain a numerical value for the performance of the collection. What is of importance for the purposes of this article is that, even more than the RLG Conspectus, the Lopez Method relies upon the existing canon of journal articles and the current interests of academicians to determine what will be of lasting importance and what will be included in the collection. The third type of collection evaluation clearly follows the same tack and, therefore, need not be discussed.

These three types of collection evaluation have one thing in common: a conception of what it is that a collection is supposed to accomplish. Each views the collection as a function of current user needs, even though some stress the term current more than others. But this brings us to the following question: Is the goal of collection development merely to collect all works of importance, both the good and the bad, that a particular society has to offer within a particular temporal framework? The resulting collection, assuming it is possible to collect materials in all areas of research interest to that particular society within a particular temporal framework, would be representative merely of the self-conception of that particular society within that particular historical context. Future research may require materials reflecting not a particular self-conception of a society at a given moment in its evolution but, instead, materials reflecting the context within which such self-conceptions are made. The materials necessary for determining this may or may not be collected and maintained. Concern for materials reflecting the self-conception of the current state of society is essentially what the collection evaluation and development strategies sketched above currently focus upon. The very instruments employed in the development and evaluation of library collections are geared toward such goals. But isn’t it the collection development officer’s duty to collect with a view to future user groups, as well as a view of the needs of the current user group? Should the activities of the collection development officer be dictated solely by the societal and historical parochialism of the current user group? Should collection development be a function of the current canon, a canon whose authority has widely been challenged in recent years?
If these two conceptions of the duty of collection development are taken seriously, the result is a dilemma for collection development.

THE DILEMMA OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

A dilemma is essentially a logical construct wherein two mutually exclusive and equally truthful claims compete for acceptance. By this definition, collection development faces a dilemma. The dual duties of the collection development officer are important in their own right, are mutually exclusive (at least in their purest forms), and compete for the attention and financial resources of the individual collection development officer and the entire library world.

The dual duties of the collection development officer are important in their own right, are mutually exclusive (at least in their purest forms), and compete for the attention and financial resources of the individual collection development officer and the entire library world.

The most easily identifiable manifestation of this dilemma is the notion of lost works, which recurs throughout history and historical scholarship. The works of Aristotle, for example, were lost until the Middle Ages. However, through citations from other sources, scholars knew all along that Aristotle’s works existed. Aristotle’s dialogues remain lost even today, yet we know that he wrote dialogues in the Platonic tradition. One can only surmise how important these documents would be to both past and current scholarship if they had survived. More important, though, is the question of what would have happened if the dialogues were not collected and maintained by a library because they were not thought at the time to have been of any value. This is almost certainly a counterfactual explanation of the loss of his works but nevertheless an interesting one to consider in the context of this article. Given such a supposition, the dilemma for collection development is made clear: For whom should we collect? We are historically situated in the only place ideal for collecting and preserving the artifacts of the present state of society. But our responsibility seems to transcend the satisfaction of the needs of the present members of that society. For whose society should we collect?

The loss of the works of lesser known writers is also an issue. It must be kept in mind that, as was maintained by the relativistic theorists of canon formation, authors are evaluated against an existing canon. Canons, like societies, have a tendency to evolve, so a judgment regarding the work of an author made at one time in history may be quite different from one made at another time. James Hulbert illustrates this point in his discussion of the writings of the Marquis de Sade, the eighteenth-century suppression of those writings, and the twentieth-century rediscovery and slow legitimization of them as items worthy of scholarly attention. The dilemma is made manifest when it is realized that de Sade’s work may actually have been destroyed (much of it was, in fact) in the eighteenth century and, as such, would not have survived to prompt a twentieth-century rediscovery. How many past writings of now current value have been doomed to bibliographic oblivion because they simply were not collected and maintained by libraries to await rediscovery?

The net effect of the collection development officer’s neglect of the cosmopolitan side of his dual duties is that the collection of any particular period suffer a blind spot in their coverage. The collection development officer is faced with a dilemma and, more often than not, adopts the parochial duty as the prime concern and responsibility. Such a choice is not difficult to sympathize with, however, since it is upon the current users and the current interests of the current society that the library world relies for its economic sustenance and survival.

In the end, collection development officers play out their roles amid the tension between their theoretic function
and the realities of economic constraint. This tension is heightened by the further epistemological constraint to which collection development officers are subject: They cannot jump outside of their socio-historical situation to know what will be of research interest in the future. Based on the unsteady premise that the canon of future research interest will closely resemble that of the past and of the present, collection development officers can, at best, hope to predict—not calculate—the needs of the future. Such attempts at prediction always involve somewhat of an irrational leap from the actual needs of current users to the merely possible needs of future users.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

In an effort to stave off the disillusionment such conclusions may prompt, it should be pointed out that librarians can go some way toward successful prediction of and provision for future research needs. Librarians can, in many instances, minimize the uncertainty of their choices for collection and maximize the probabilities that their choices will indeed match the needs of a future user group.

Paul Metz and Bela Foltin, Jr. make several interesting points in this regard. They suggest that nondisciplinary areas (areas which have been referred to in this paper as falling outside the traditional canon of subjects) and interdisciplinary areas (areas that may be in the process of canonization) should be paid special attention when selecting materials. A good example, and enunciation of the need for active collection in noncanonical areas, is the more popular naturalist and travel genres which Metz and Foltin stress may be of use, perhaps canonized, in the future. The naturalist writings of Edwin Way Teale and the travel books of Paul Theroux are examples.¹⁴ With regard to nonacademic prose, Metz and Foltin note:

The highly intelligent lay essay is a culturally important contribution, examples of which often attract academic attention in later years. In considering such materials, selectors should ask themselves whether their policies would support the acquisition of T. E. Lawrence's Seven Pillars of Wisdom or George Orwell's Homage to Catalonia if these unquestioned masterpieces describing war and the politics of war were written today.¹⁵

In short, by acting in accordance with the knowledge gained through a careful consideration of the evolution of canons, librarians can perhaps maximize the probability that items chosen for inclusion in collections today, while presently of marginal or no value, will be of use tomorrow.

In the end, collection development officers play out their roles amid the tension between their theoretic function and the realities of economic constraint.

Metz and Foltin's suggestions are, however, aimed at improving the comprehensiveness of the collections of individual institutions, not at improving the comprehensiveness with which bibliographic materials are collected throughout the library world as a whole. But Metz and Foltin, through their suggestions for improving the geographically specific collection, have indeed hinted at a way in which bibliographic coverage in toto can be enhanced. What the library profession as a whole must do is to critically consider what genres, formats, and subject areas—regardless of current user interest or support—are not currently being collected. Such critical scrutiny would give the collection development community a clearer picture of what is presently being allowed to fall by the bibliographic wayside. Based on such knowledge, the library world would be able to form some type of union for special collections perhaps modeled after the organizational framework surrounding the RLG Con-spectus.¹⁶ Such a union would consist of member institutions who take their temporally cosmopolitan responsibilities for collection development seriously and seek to pursue and maintain collections of materials that are of minimal or no interest to current researchers.¹⁷ Representative
materials may include formats and genres such as comic books and pornography, which are items that are being collected by a few academic libraries but could probably be more efficiently collected and maintained if a union of institutions was formed. In this manner, librarians can rationally address their responsibilities for the future.

The purpose of this article is to draw out the connection between the protean canons of literature and of topics of research, and the collection development responsibilities of the library world. If the dual duties suggested for collection development are accepted, the collection development officer becomes entangled in a dilemma. As such, the officer is caught in the unenviable position of either neglecting his or her duty to collect materials that may prove to be of possible interest for future research, or taking the leap of deciding to collect such items. Collecting such items, however, could be to the detriment of collections of materials known to be of at least minimal use to current research.
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Ricks seems to miss the point in this second passage; if a work of literature can inspire a future author, and thus is deemed a valuable work, such a view presupposes that that work has somehow come to the attention of the future author. It is this "somehow," this mediating process, which interests the theorists discussed in the body of this paper and which Ricks skillfully glosses over. His sympathy in the first passage is somewhat disarming, and the problem of how a relativist can manage to make value judgments and claim them to be valid value judgments is a problem that can only be worked out by a large-scale, relativistic, axiological theory. That is an undertaking well beyond the scope of this paper.

8. It is the view of the author that the evaluation of collections and the development of collections are so closely bound, practically and conceptually, that to constantly refer to them in the same breath does not risk conflation, but somewhat alleviates the unwieldiness of an almost false distinction.


13. Hulbert, "The Problem of Canon Formation and the 'Example' of Sade: Orthodox Exclusion and Orthodox Inclusion," 120–33.


17. The current vogue for research in social history attests to the fact that, in many instances, bibliographic artifacts not thought to be valuable enough to warrant collection and maintenance by those populating one segment in a society's evolution (namely, the segment contemporary with the production of the specified items) become the invaluable research resources for another temporally distinct segment of that same society. For commentary in this regard, see William A. Joyce, "The Evolution of the Concept of Special Collections in American Research Libraries," *Rare Books and Manuscripts Librarianship* 3(Spring 1988):19–29. An organized union of special collections could somewhat resolve this problem—a problem which, if artifacts of a solely bibliographic nature are concerned—falls uniquely to the library world to solve.
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Levels of four cognitive abilities were measured in academic librarians and students. It was found that librarians had higher average logical and verbal comprehension abilities than students, and that students had higher average perceptual speed than librarians. Because these cognitive abilities affect information retrieval performance, these findings suggest that different approaches to information retrieval may be appropriate for librarians and students.

ntelligence or mental ability is a complex combination of factors called cognitive abilities. Examples of cognitive abilities are the ability to reason, remember, understand language, and locate and understand material that is presented visually. These cognitive abilities have been investigated in a wide variety of research studies. For instance, management research has shown that cognitive abilities are important indicators of how well people will perform in certain jobs. Library research has demonstrated that people with higher levels of certain cognitive abilities use information retrieval systems more effectively. In separate investigations, the authors assessed the influence of four cognitive abilities on how well academic librarians are suited to their jobs and how well academic library patrons perform in end-user searching. Subsequently, the authors compared the cognitive abilities of librarians and their patrons. This article presents the results of that comparison and suggests that differences in the cognitive abilities of librarians and their patrons have implications for library service.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS

Cognitive abilities have been used to predict a number of work outcomes in organizations. For example, John E. Hunter reviewed the evidence from hundreds of studies showing that relevant cognitive abilities predict the level of work performance. In the library setting, a number of researchers have established firm links between cognitive abilities and performance. Priscilla Teitelbaum-Kronish found that there is a positive relationship between logical reasoning ability and successful online searching. Kim J. Vicente, Brian C. Hayes, and Robert C. Williges showed that vocabulary skills account for a significant portion of the...
variance in the time taken to find items when searching a hierarchical file system. In a study done by Bryce Allen, perceptual speed was shown to have an effect on the quality of searches, while logical reasoning, vocabulary, and spatial scanning abilities affect the degree of success achieved in using search tactics. The combined results from these and other studies led the authors to wonder if librarians have higher levels of important cognitive abilities than do their patrons. The authors thought it possible that people with the abilities necessary to become good information retrieval specialists would be more likely to become librarians. This idea is derived in part from Benjamin Schneider’s attraction-selection-attrition framework. According to that framework, librarians, and particularly those librarians who remain in the profession for an extended period of time, would be expected to display high levels of suitable abilities and competencies and have interests and values similar to other individuals employed in their profession or organizations. Similarly, the authors thought that library administrators, in selecting individuals to fill professional vacancies, would be likely to choose people with higher levels of important cognitive skills. Again, this idea was suggested by a body of management research that makes it clear that administrators seek to recruit individuals with certain skills into their organizations. The authors, therefore, expected that people with higher levels of cognitive abilities would be likely to enter the profession of librarianship, and would be hired by employers who are trying to obtain the most suitable individuals to serve as librarians. Accordingly, the hypothesis for this investigation is that librarians would display higher levels of cognitive abilities (particularly those linked with information retrieval performance) than their patrons, as represented by a group of students randomly selected from the user community served by the librarians.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study analyzed data collected during 1991 in two independent research projects. The first project involved testing the cognitive abilities of eighty-four public service librarians in a large academic library. In the second project, fifty university students who were patrons of that academic library and represented a cross section of the university completed the same cognitive tests from the *Kit of Factor-Referenced Cognitive Tests* by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman, and Diran Dermen. In both research projects, the participants had volunteered to be tested.

The study compared four cognitive abilities of librarians and library patrons. Those abilities were chosen because they were shown to predict successful performance in information retrieval tasks. They were, however, only four of the twenty-three cognitive abilities that had been isolated by the work of French and his colleagues. Therefore, they should not be taken to be representative of all aspects of cognitive abilities or intelligence. The four tests used in this study were perceptual speed, logical reasoning, spatial scanning, and verbal comprehension. They are described below.

- **Perceptual Speed:** Perceptual speed tests measure speed in comparing figures or symbols, scanning to find figures or symbols, or carrying out other simple tasks involving visual perception. The test used to assess this ability was the Identical Pictures Test, wherein the participants checked which one of five numbered geometrical figures or pictures in a row was identical to a figure given at the end of the row.

- **Logical Reasoning:** Logical reasoning tests measure the ability to reason from premise to conclusion, or to evaluate the correctness of a conclusion. The test used to assess this ability was the Diagramming Relationships Test, wherein the participants were asked to select which one of five diagrams best illustrated the interrelationships among sets of objects.

- **Spatial Scanning:** Spatial scanning tests measure speed in visually exploring a wide or complicated spatial field. The test used to assess this ability was the Map Planning Test, wherein the partici-
pents were asked to plan the shortest route between two given points on diagrams representing city maps in such a way that roadblocks were avoided.

- **Verbal Comprehension:** Verbal comprehension tests measure the ability to understand the English language. The test used to assess this ability was the Advanced Vocabulary Test II, wherein the participants were asked to select words, from sets of four possible synonyms, that most closely matched the meaning of stimulus words.

In addition to obtaining measures on these four cognitive abilities of the librarians and their patrons, data were also obtained on the sex and age of each of the participants in the study. A test of homogeneity of slopes indicated that it was appropriate to use Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to compare the measures of the four cognitive abilities with sex and age for the two groups of participants in the study.

**FINDINGS**

**Perceptual Speed**

Librarians were slower than students in carrying out a task involving visual perception. This difference is illustrated in Figure 1, which shows the range of scores and the average scores achieved by both groups. This finding was expected because the librarians were older than the students, and age has been shown to slow down perceptual processes. In this
Logical Reasoning

Scores were adjusted for age differences, librarians outperformed students in logical reasoning. As figure 2 illustrates, there was little difference in the raw scores achieved by the two groups of participants. There was a significant correlation \( r = -0.341, \ p < 0.001 \) between age and scores on the test. In other words, as age increased, the scores on the test fell. Because the librarians were older than the students, age-adjusted scores were calculated for their logical reasoning tests, resulting in an
adjusted average score for librarians of 19.9 out of a maximum of 30 on the test. The average score for students was 13.4.

Spatial Scanning

No significant differences were found in the spatial scanning abilities of the librarians and the students.

Verbal Comprehension

The librarians achieved higher scores than the students on the verbal comprehension test (p<.001). This difference is illustrated in figure 3. Librarians averaged 25.6 out of 36 on the test, while students averaged 14.2 on the test. No significant age or gender effects were revealed in this analysis.

DISCUSSION

This study shows that the cognitive abilities of librarians in logical reasoning and verbal comprehension are better than the cognitive abilities of students, but that the perceptual speed of students is better than that of librarians.

Logical reasoning and verbal comprehension are extremely important and extensively used cognitive skills in librarianship. It is, therefore, understandable that individuals with these abilities would choose to be librarians, be hired by discerning employers, and work to maintain their skills in these areas. With regard to these two skills, the authors' hypothesis was confirmed by the analysis.
In the area of perceptual speed, however, the hypothesis was not supported. The authors speculate that that is because the librarians who were tested were concerned with being careful and thorough in scanning for objects in the visual field. This explanation fits well with some of the popular stereotypes of librarians, but the authors are reluctant to suggest that it provides a complete explanation of this phenomenon.

Although perceptual speed has also been found to be associated with performance in searching on a CD-ROM index, the authors do not wish to suggest that a deficiency in perceptual speed is a professional handicap for librarians. Research has suggested that workers are able to compensate for shortcomings in certain cognitive abilities. For example, modest inverse relationships were found between cognitive abilities and internal work motivation ($r=-.16, p<.05$) and organizational commitment ($r=-.17, p<.01$) in a study by Stephen M. Colarelli, Roger A. Dean, and Constantine Konstans. It is possible that librarians, recognizing that they may be slower than some of their patrons in scanning visual fields, naturally compensate for this lower level of ability by increasing their internal motivation to succeed in their searches, or by becoming more committed to achieving expertise in their information retrieval work.

Although it is difficult to generalize from samples taken in one academic library setting, it seemed to the authors that there may be implications in these findings for how librarians interact with their patrons. One suggestion is that students are likely to be better at tasks that involve scanning large amounts of material, while librarians may be better at tasks that require logical reasoning or good verbal skills. These findings may explain why students appear to do well with simple browse searching, and why librarians prefer more sophisticated search capabilities and interfaces utilizing Boolean combinations of keywords.

**Librarians were slower than students in carrying out a task involving visual perception.**

Another suggestion that arises from these findings is that librarians should be careful to distinguish between their own abilities and those of their patrons when designing information systems, bibliographic instruction programs, and similar library services. The abilities of professionals may lead to preferences for sophisticated interfaces, complex instructional programs, or services that assume high levels of cognitive abilities, while their library patrons may find browse interfaces, simple point-of-need instruction, and basic services to be more appropriate to their levels of cognitive abilities.

As librarians interact with patrons, it is appropriate that the knowledge, skills, and abilities of each be used in meeting the information needs of users. This investigation shows that, in one area, librarians and patrons have different levels of abilities to bring to this interaction. It is important for those designing library services to ensure that the systems are appropriate to the different levels of cognitive abilities of both librarians and patrons.
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Letters

To the Editor:

As one who worked as a library paraprofessional before becoming a librarian at a state university, I was intrigued by the broad-ranging and carefully researched findings of Oberg et al. in "The Role Status and Working Conditions of Paraprofessionals: A National Survey of Academic Libraries" (C&RL 53 [May 1992]: 215-38). But some of the conclusions made me stop and think.

It seems to me that the rapid evolution in professional librarians' tasks, caused by changes in technology and budgetary support, may mean we are in for a long period of ambiguity and overlap as the roles of the professional and paraprofessional continue to shift.

While this situation may make us uncomfortable as professionals, is it really so threatening? Maybe we should just learn to live with the ambiguity. I'm not sure it's possible to delineate professional vs. paraprofessional roles that clearly, at least in a way that would remain valid over time.

In the academic world librarians may continue to be viewed as second-class citizens by faculty, since most of us lack doctorates, many of us never publish a book, and a fair number of us are not on a tenure track. We might as well recognize that as long as academia has a hierarchical structure, each level will want to differentiate itself from the levels below it. Nowadays, possession of an M.L.S. may be the most consistent difference between professionals and paraprofessionals in a library.

I think that the desire of some professional librarians to more clearly differentiate themselves from paraprofessionals can be seen as a process of "othering." In our efforts in this direction, might we simply be more deeply buying into academia's hierarchical system?

ANN BOYER
Center for Health Sciences Library
University of Wisconsin-Madison

To the Editor:

"On Becoming Faculty Librarians: Acculturation Problems" by W. Bede Mitchell and Bruce Morton (C&RL, 53 [Sept. 1992]: 379-91) is a great article. They have identified the vital issues confronting academic librarianship. They have also proposed courses of action for educators, administrators, and all of us in dealing positively with these issues. I trust that many of us have already implemented some of their suggestions or will soon do so.

Thanks, too, for your editorial on collegial and administrative governance in academic libraries. I have been researching this topic for about ten years, and your succinct editorial captures the essence of collegial and administrative coexistence quite well.

DON LANIER
Site Librarian
University of Illinois at Chicago
College of Medicine at Rockford
To the Editor:

Since C&RL gave 14 pages to W. Bede Mitchell and Bruce Morton’s thoughts “On Becoming Faculty Librarians: Acculturation Problems” (September 1992), perhaps you can spare half a page for mine.

1. Does anyone expect lawyers, physicians, nurses, psychologists, or architects who are employed by colleges and universities—not as teachers in professional schools, but as practicing lawyers, physicians, etc.—to publish in professional journals and undergo tenure review as a condition of employment? Of course not. Why, then, are some librarians who are employed by colleges and universities—not as library school faculty, but as practicing librarians—expected to do so?

2. If the professional workload is defined to include both “on-campus and off-campus academic work” (p.389), why can’t the librarians? If professors were expected to be in their offices or classrooms from 9 to 5, without being able to do research, and then expected to read and write on their own time, then it might be reasonable to expect librarians to do the same; but they aren’t: the professorial workweek is always defined to include time for research. Why then—if it’s made part of their job requirements—can’t librarians?

If Mitchell and Morton, or someone else who believes that additional-work-for-less-pay is the wave of the future, would care to provide convincing answers to these two questions, then it might be worthwhile for the profession of librarianship to devote more time to debating faculty status. Otherwise, I suggest we admit that the emperor has no clothes and get on with what we alone know how to do: providing library service.

I suppose we’re just lucky that law librarians aren’t being required to make courtroom presentations, medical librarians aren’t required to perform surgery, bank librarians aren’t required to approve loans... 

HUBERT J. THOMPSON
Chicago, Illinois
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This is a large book in every sense of the word. It combines a broad outline of the history and dissemination of printing technology in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with a comparative analysis of the intellectual and psychosocial consequences of that diffusion, focusing its argument on the similarities between that development and the rapid expansion of computerized communications in our own time. In it the reader sees the lines of a distinguished intellectual pedigree which includes some of the luminaries of modern German thinking on the nature of communication in society, notably Reinhart Koselleck, Paul Raabe, Niklas Luhmann, and Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht. Thirteen years in the writing, the book grew out of the author’s Habilitationsschrift, and it demonstrates many of the strengths and weaknesses of that uniquely Teutonic academic genre: a systematic and exhaustive treatment of every conceivable nuance of the subject, a rigorous organizational sequencing of the arguments, a copious citation and documentation apparatus (over 230 pages of notes, indexes, and citations), and a dense, nearly impenetrable style which at times verges on the soporific.

Nevertheless, Michael Giesecke’s arguments are significant and, for the most part, convincing. He reinterprets the book culture of the incunabula period in modern terms and with modern terminology as a complex system of information processing dependent upon the evolution of a vast array of specific new technologies, communication patterns, and modes of creating, imparting, and receiving knowledge. The printed book as a medium of social and political change has been a regular theme of book-historical scholarship virtually since the age of Gutenberg, but Giesecke goes much further than traditional analysts by insisting that it caused a fundamental change in the notion of what constituted information, and in the ways in which information could be processed. The advent of printing produced not merely economies of scale in production that led to broader dissemination of knowledge but also to a fundamentally different concept of the relationship between literacy and social progress. It caused the traditional structure of institutional censorship to disintegrate gradually over time by producing a volume and variety of material which exceeded the ability of the old censorship apparatus to survey, and by requiring the creation of a vast and complex system of distribution for the organization and supply of markets. In education, it led to the reorganization of curricula and teaching methodologies at all levels, the restructuring of old disciplines, and the establishment of countless new ones. It permitted the production of “Literature” to evolve from the leisurely pursuit of gentlemen to a widely accessible profession having the potential to generate enough revenue to live comfortably, with a concomitant eradication of the barriers of class and caste (with all the attendant implications for a broadened intellectual horizon). In all these areas, and in many, many more instances, the author documents his view that the arrival of book technology swept away the chief ideological underpinnings of medieval and classical thought and paved the way for the rise of modern social, economic, and political structures in Europe.

One of the most interesting aspects of Giesecke’s modern functional analysis is
his attempt to use the early history of the book as a paradigm for the continuing emergence of present-day electronic communications technologies. His notion of the importance of the free market in the development of late medieval information dissemination carries with it the echoes of similar debates on the desirability of commercially viable networks as opposed to publicly supported ones outside the market structure. The question of competition between the old scriptographical tradition and the new typographical science is likewise reflected in the current struggle between the proponents of the paperless society and those whose ideas of scholarship and culture are inextricably bound to the printed book as artifact.

This volume is an original and valuable addition to the literature of the book's history, but the force of its argument is somewhat diluted by its sheer size and the degree of detail to which it resorts to buttress its premises. A more general statement of its principal theses, with a less elaborately documented defense of them, would probably be a desirable middle ground for most potential readers; in its present form it demands an intense and prolonged concentration which is perhaps more appropriate to the narrowest technical specializations than to more broadly conceived humanistic views of the history of the book.—James Henry Spohrer, University of California, Berkeley.


Although the title Cataloging Heresy might suggest that this book proposes radically different ways of looking at cataloging and bibliographic control, it is instead a rather useful overview of some of the problems with uniform titles, subject headings, classification, and the description of special types of library materials.

Editor Bella Hass Weinberg has compiled a well-edited volume of papers from the 1991 Congress for Librarians at St. John's University. It provides a framework for library school students and practitioners to think critically about cataloging data in standard bibliographic records. Managers who look for the most expeditious, most economical method to process library materials are warned of the conflicts and inaccuracies inherent in shared records. The papers examine what data should be included in these shared bibliographic records and how those data might be altered in response to a given collection, special type of material, or special user group.

Part 1 consists of edited papers from ten invited speakers as well as introductory and concluding remarks. The seven contributed articles in Part 2 remind us that for some types of materials (special collections of literature and music, musical sound recordings, nonprint materials, digital cartographic databases), standard practices may not be adequate.

The Library of Congress is attacked, as usual, for not keeping up with current, politically correct terminology in its Library of Congress Subject Headings and for its practice of assigning insufficient and inadequate headings and subdivisions (articles by Sanford Berman and Hope Olson). Fortunately, alternatives and positive recommendations for future direction are provided. The reader is also reminded of the increased efforts on the part of the Library of Congress, as the national bibliographic agency, to inform and consult widely on changes to cataloging policy in order to reflect consensus within the library community (article by John Byrum).

Apart from criticisms of Library of Congress Subject Headings, there are the expected papers on the shortcomings of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, and Library of Congress classification. Other papers provide wonderful historical background for library school students and those in the profession who may have forgotten about the National Library of Medicine classification (Sally Sinn),
Cataloging practices have long recognized the need and desire to permit variations for particular types of materials and for needs of special users. This is reflected in the existence of cataloging rule options and rule interpretations and in the acceptance of specialized thesauri and classification schemes—all part of the standard bibliographic record. Economic pressures to accept shared bibliographic records blindly must be weighed against the possible negative impact on access to the local collection and the needs of local users. This compilation of papers assures that we will retain that perspective.—Barbara B. Tillett, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla.


This New Treatise is a sequel of sorts, following by nearly a dozen years the similar compilation edited by Robert D. Stueart and George B. Miller, Jr., Collection Development in Libraries: A Treatise. It has been issued by the same publisher, appears in the same series as its predecessor, and is virtually indistinguishable from it in design and format. It is tempting, therefore, simply to read this collection of essays as Stueart/Miller Revised.

Upon closer examination, however, it becomes clear that this is a very different work. In the first place, the editors of New Treatise, in contrast to their forerunners, have been freed from the mission of filling a gaping hole in the professional literature. A glance at the bibliographic notes in these volumes demonstrates that the 1980s were busy times for authors writing on the various fields subsumed under collection management; many of them may have been inspired to some degree by articles appearing in the first Treatise. Charles Osburn and Ross Atkinson, in their brief forward, emphasize the dynamism, evolution, diversity, and challenges evident in collection management, and they appear to have accepted as their primary goal the provision of a forum for critiques, new ideas, revisions, and glimpses of future standards change over time and should be questioned periodically in order to improve and to develop even better standards. As noted in the article by Sheila Intner, it is not enough just to teach current practices. Students should also be introduced to nonstandard systems and organizational theory so they will be prepared to design future bibliographic systems.

the Art & Architecture Thesaurus (Cathy Whitehead), the Bliss classification system (Alan R. Thomas), and OCLC and RLIN standards and practices to meet the needs of individual libraries (Liz Bishoff/Glenn Patton and Ed Glazier, respectively). The biases and problems with descriptive cataloging are pointed out by Norman Anderson. An index by Ed Swanson should add to the volume's usefulness as a supplemental text in library schools. The exceptionally tiny type used in many of the examples and notes almost requires a magnifying glass to read.

Several papers specifically focus on academic libraries. Mary Parr's "Standard Cataloging Data and the Academic Library: The Technical Services Manager's Point of View" provides a very brief identification of questions and an addendum of pragmatic opinion on what to do with inaccurate or superseded data on copy. She reminds catalogers of cutting variations due to changed rules for main entry, classification decision differences for general indexes and bibliographies, variant practices for traced and not traced series, typographical errors on copy, and erroneous data printed in publications with CIP copy, including fixed call numbers. Additionally, academic libraries will find useful information in several of the other papers about cataloging needs for special collections (an article by Patricia Elliott and Celia Bakke) and for special types of materials (articles by Charles Whitlow, Bob Armitont, and PohChin Lai and Ming-Kan Wong). The article by Sook-Hyun Kim examines the practice of including serials holdings information in notes in bibliographic records, rather than relegating such information to a linked holdings record.

Standards change over time and should be questioned periodically in order to improve and to develop even better standards. As noted in the article by Sheila Intner, it is not enough just to teach current practices. Students should also be introduced to nonstandard systems and organizational theory so they will be prepared to design future bibliographic systems.
directions. They have moved away from the notion of a book that fixes the state of the art to one that gathers diverse perspectives concerning what is to be done.

It should, therefore, come as no great surprise that both the topics and the authors represented in the New Treatise bear but slight resemblance to those of the original Treatise. Only a handful of individual articles in the New Treatise cover the same ground as counterparts in the earlier compilation, and only one author, Paul Mosher, contributed essays to both projects. Citation studies claimed nearly 20 percent (and three articles) of the first Treatise, only to disappear from the table of contents of the New Treatise. The treatment of specific kinds of collections, types of resources, and modes of selection activity points to the transformation from functional, at times pedagogical, concerns to broader issues in New Treatise. In the earlier compilation, the editors adopted a straightforward separation of articles concerned with format from those dealing with process. Those articles in the New Treatise that deal with areas of collection development practice covered in the 1980 compilation now are scattered among rubrics such as "The Information Universe," "Selection," and "Types of Libraries." The boundaries dividing these categories are not clearly demarcated.

This New Treatise, then, is less a summing up of the theory and practice of collection management than a presentation of viewpoints and stratagems. It offers, in the words of its editors, a "kaleidoscope of perspectives" on collection management. Indeed, according to Osburn and Atkinson, "the authors were asked to be as creative as possible because it is clear that only bold new ideas can be the catalyst required by librarianship to seize control of its destiny in the current environment." The ambition of the editors, in fact, is to explore the various intellectual and practical realignments that hold promise for guiding collection management through troubling times and tempting opportunities.

So much for the target. The aim of the contributing authors is often, but not always, true. A potential problem with the editors' sweeping agenda is the multiplicity of viewpoints, readerships, and vocabularies that it implies. A real danger is incoherence of the parts, and the editors have not skirted it entirely. The reader who proceeds through these two volumes in the order imposed by the topical rubrics should be prepared for a bumpy ride. In part, this is because, as one would expect, some essays are not as interesting as others. Unfortunately, most of the bland or puffy contributions (and it must be said here that these are in the distinct minority) either lead off sections or stand out by taking on broad topics. However, the most daunting obstacle to an integration of the contributions in the reader's mind becomes apparent only as one proceeds through this compilation: for whom, ultimately, is it written? The authors are on several wavelengths with respect to this issue. Some appear to be writing for library administrators; others summarize their experience as bibliographers, curators, and managers for colleagues operating at similar levels of selection practice (these are generally the most consistently informative contributions in the collection); and a third group (the smallest of the three) operates in the rarefied air of theory rather than practice.

In brief, the New Treatise offers the advantages and shortcomings of a diversified portfolio. One expects, and indeed finds, a few losing ventures in the mix. Nonetheless, this package of articles can offer something for most stakeholders in library collection development and management. In the end, a modest profit is virtually guaranteed.—Henry Lowood, Stanford University, Stanford, California.


"In the coming decades fundraising will literally make the difference, for many libraries, between mediocrity and excellence," Susan Nutter predicts in her preface to this volume.
Few of us engaged in the business of fundraising for libraries would argue with this assertion. Although development professionals organize and facilitate the process of fundraising, Victoria Steele and Stephen D. Elder emphasize the need for library directors to lead the fundraising effort if it is to succeed. Few are fully prepared for the role. Directors bring varying degrees of aptitude, skill, and motivation to the job, coupled with a heavy dose of anxiety.

The library director astute enough to read this book will find that this slim volume contains everything you ever wanted to know about fundraising but never bothered (or were afraid) to ask. In ten well-crafted chapters, the authors present the hows and whys (and why nots) of fundraising. Their lively, engaging style relies on metaphors rather than jargon, and it steers clear of the usual nuts-and-bolts approach to the subject. The honesty and candor with which the authors scrutinize the practices of fundraising are refreshing. They convincingly dispel the fears of fundraising and even challenge some of the accepted practices, while offering a new and much needed prescription for library fundraising in the 1990s and beyond.

As part of the strategic planning for fundraising, the book urges library directors toward self-analysis. In the first chapter, the authors, relying on the Myers-Briggs personality test, recommend a "personal feasibility study" to determine a director's suitability for fundraising. The director's fundraising style and the relationship between the development officer and the director are critical components in this study. The authors liken the relationship of a director and his or her development officer to that of a mountain climber and a Sherpa guide. Using the classic American metaphor of the movies, they compare the library director to a star and the development officer to the director. Each has a clearly defined role to play in the fundraising scenario. Effective fundraising depends on strong, supportive relationships founded on mutual trust and respect. The authors discuss the team relationship within the library as well as the building of strong relationships between the library and its donors.

One of the sacred cows of fundraising is the case statement, an expensive, glossy publication that states the fundraising goals and priorities of the library and is generally considered indispensable in a capital campaign. The authors challenge the value of and necessity for the case statement, a brochure that is more image than substance. They recommend as more visionary and practical a strategic plan that outlines how the fundraising goals will be reached. The strategic plan forces a library to prioritize the types of potential donors and to determine where the greatest effort will be spent. Steele and Elder argue for concentrating time and resources on previous donors and individuals with ties to the library rather than on foundations, corporations, and government entities. They note that grants from foundations and corporations nearly always depend on a library's having contacts and advocates from within. Their bull's-eye graphic depicting the donor-prospect target is a very useful tool for gauging the success of a strategy.

Other areas in which this book offers valuable insights are planned giving, library image, special events and Friends groups. The approach to planned giving is sensitive and sensible, a truly rare combination in fundraising literature. On the often neglected subject of library image, the authors include an image self-test. Take it if you dare.

Special events and Friends groups are matters with which fundraisers are advised to "proceed with caution." Special events must be planned and purposefully targeted with the cost/benefits ratio carefully weighed. Friends groups are another matter entirely. The Friends is a time-honored library tradition that needs rethinking and refocusing.

_Becoming a Fundraiser_ offers library directors valuable insights not found anywhere else. Although it specifically addresses library fundraising, any leader of an organization engaged in fundraising could benefit from its rethinking of accepted principles and practices in the pro-
fession. This book belongs in the offices of library directors, development professionals, deans and academic administrators, as well as on the shelves of academic and public libraries throughout the country. Many knowledgeable books have been written on fundraising, but Steele and Elder’s is by far the most intelligent.—Charlene K. Clark, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.


This collection reprints thirty-three articles from the journal Collection Building, founded in 1978 and still published by Neal-Schuman. The articles are grouped into four sections: Management Issues, Selection/Deselection, Evaluation, and Resource Sharing. The preface, which indicates there are only three sections, appears to have been written before the fourth, final section was added.

Most of the major issues in collection development are covered in this anthology. There are articles on collection policies, organization and staffing, selection and deselection, collection evaluation, preservation, and resource sharing. The preface notes, however, that since “this is a retrospective reader there is little here on the effects of technology upon the contents of a library.” Nevertheless, this omission lessens the value of the book. The impact of technology upon collection development is simply too profound to ignore.

There is a heavy emphasis on the academic library, although the editor correctly notes that this is a reflection of publishing activity rather than editorial bias. Of the thirty-three articles only one concerns school libraries, six focus on public libraries, and the remainder are on academic libraries.

Why republish articles that have already appeared in print? The preface states, “The Collection Building Reader brings together some of the most useful and informative articles published in the journal—in a practical one-volume resource for librarians.” Why should a library pay $45 for a paperbound collection of reprinted articles? There are several possibilities: the library never acquired the material when first published, the importance of the material justifies having a second copy, or the collection assembles material from several disciplines in a new way that helps define an emerging, interdisciplinary field.

In this case, neither the first nor third reason will apply in many libraries. Collection Building is a major, commercially published journal in collection development and is widely available. This is clearly not a collection in an emerging field. The decision then rests on the importance of the articles themselves. Are these articles important enough in the field to justify this republication?

Too many either restate what has been said better elsewhere or simply report on local projects that were undoubtedly significant to the participants but do not add anything new to the literature. A few are based on major research projects. These include Judith Serebnick’s “An Analysis of the Relationship between Book Reviews and the Inclusion of Potentially Controversial Books in Public Libraries,” Mary Sellen’s survey, “Book Selection in the College Library: The Faculty Perspective,” Judith Feller’s “Assessing Readiness for Resource Sharing in an Academic Library,” and Bonita Bryant’s “Collection Development Policies in Medium-Sized Academic Libraries,” which is a detailed survey of collection development policy writing. Other articles are useful reviews of the literature, such as Mickey Moskowitz’ “Collection Development and the College Library: A State of the Art Review” and Paul Metz’ “Duplication in Library Collections: What We Know and What We Need to Know.” Others offer practical advice for novices from experienced practitioners: Charles D’Aniello’s “Bibliography and the Beginning Bibliographer” and “Selection and Acquisition of Library Material in Languages Other Than English: Some Guidelines for Public Libraries” by Marie Zielinska and Irena Bell.

Collections of reprinted articles should contain full citations to their initial publication. That no such citations are included...
in *The Collection Building Reader* is a serious flaw. Although timeliness is extremely important in collection development, Zielinska and Bell’s article on the selection of foreign-language materials for public libraries, for example, was originally published in 1980 and is updated only by a short addendum. Furthermore, neither the original article nor the addendum was dated.

*The Collection Building Reader* is a marginal contribution to the literature on collection development. Its publication will probably benefit the publisher more than the profession.—Eric Carpenter, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.


*Origins, Content, and Future of AACR2 Revised* consists of papers by an impressive group of individuals known for their contributions in the area of cataloging, including Ben Tucker, Richard Smiraglia, Ed Swanson, Barbara Tillett, Michael Gorman, and Sheila Intner. The book is divided into three parts: Origins of the 1988 Revision, Contents of the 1988 Revision, and A Symposium on the Future. Parts 1 and 2 provide a historical background on the development and evolution of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Part 3 consists of papers from a symposium on the future of cataloging, and discusses topics such as MARC, OPACs, and AACR2R. Part 3 opens with a paper by Michael Gorman on the future of cataloging. The remainder of Part 3 consists of papers in which the authors react to Gorman’s vision of the future, and also describe their own version of what the future of cataloging might (and should) have to offer.

The book examines the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules as an evolving, constantly developing piece of work. New formats, changing needs of patrons, and electronic technology (cataloguing utilities and OPACs, for example) have led to revisions of the rules. Part 1 offers an important historical perspective that will be valuable to new and relatively inexperienced catalogers. It will be especially important to those who have only known AACR2R or AACR2, giving them a broader sense of what the rules represent. Parts 1 and 2 detail the difficulties encountered in writing and revising the rules, and demonstrate the great effort undertaken to make the rules uniform for the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Australia.

Part 3 is by far the most interesting part of the book. It begins with Michael Gorman’s essay on the future of cataloging. Others respond to Gorman’s essay and also offer their personal vision of what changes should be made to the rules, MARC, OPACs, etc., to improve access and efficiency. Gorman responds in turn to each essay. Contributors offer a variety of suggestions for change. Sheila Intner, for example, asks, “Can’t catalogers be trusted to name physical media appropriately? How earth-shattering would it be if they differed on some terms?” Barbara Tillett suggests developing a MARC III format that “could be used for hierarchically related bibliographic records, such as those for different physical forms of items deemed to be copies of the same manifestation of a work. In this configuration, interrelated bibliographic records would be linked for display capabilities.”

*Origins, Content, and Future of AACR2 Revised* is recommended for cataloging students, as well as for professional librarians. It will give librarians and future librarians a sense of how and why AACR2R has evolved, detailing how the rules arose from the need for a unified system of cataloging rules. It also demonstrates how the rules, along with bibliographic control systems, will have to change to adapt to the increasingly sophisticated needs of an electronic environment.—Mary Beth Fecko, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey.
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