

**This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1980 by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
London, England**

Microfilmed by Univ. of Wis.
Department of Photography

68-5,370

WOODWORTH, Mary Lorraine, 1926-
SCHOOL LIBRARIANS' OPINIONS ON RESEARCH AND RESEARCH
NEEDS IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP

The University of Wisconsin, Ph.D., 1968
Library Science

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

(This title card prepared by The University of Wisconsin)

PLEASE NOTE:

The negative microfilm copy of this
dissertation was prepared and inspected by the
school granting the degree. We are using this
film without further inspection or change. If
there are any questions about the film content,
please write directly to the school.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

SCHOOL LIBRARIANS' OPINIONS ON RESEARCH AND RESEARCH
NEEDS IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP

A thesis submitted to the Graduate School of
the University of Wisconsin in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

MARY LORRAINE WOODWORTH

Degree to be awarded

January 1968

June 19-

August 19-

To Professors: Monroe

Kliebard

Goldgruber

This thesis having been approved in respect
to form and mechanical execution is referred to
you for judgment upon its substantial merit.

Robert M. Beck
Dean

Approved as satisfying in substance the
doctoral thesis requirement of the University of
Wisconsin.

Margaret E. Monroe
Major Professor
Robert M. Beck
John J. Goldgruber

Date of Examination, Sept 12 1967

SCHOOL LIBRARIANS OPINIONS ON RESEARCH
AND RESEARCH NEEDS IN SCHOOL
LIBRARIANSHIP
BY
MARY LORRAINE WOODWORTH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Education - Library Science)

at the
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	11
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
General Statement of the Problem	1
Assumptions	10
Hypotheses	11
Definitions of Terms	12
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	24
General Research Plan	24
The Instrument	25
Description of Subjects and Sampling	30
Research Design and Procedures	47
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	58
Findings Concerned with Hypothesis I	60
Findings Concerned with Hypothesis II	64
Ancillary Findings	120
Summary of Findings	129
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	138
Discussion of the Findings	138
Summary of Hypotheses, Method, and Findings	151
Conclusions	154
Limitations of the Study	155
Implications and Recommendations	156
Suggestions for Further Research	159
BIBLIOGRAPHY	161
APPENDICES	
A. Instrument	165
B. Glossary of Terms Used in the Questionnaire	184
C. Letters Associated with the Questionnaire	190
D. Tables	195
E. Illustrative Quotations, Part II	200
F. Mean Responses for the Areas, According to Biographical Categories	212

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Distribution of Respondents by Age	33
II	Distribution of Respondents by Sex	34
XII	Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status	34
IV	Distribution of Respondents by Level of Highest Educational Attainment	36
V	Distribution of Respondents by the Accreditation Status of the Degree-Granting Institution (Library Science)	37
VI	Distribution of Respondents by the Date of Their Latest Degree in Library Science	37
VII	Distribution of Respondents by Total Years of Experience in Teaching and Library Science	38
VIII	Distribution of Respondents by Years of Experience as a School Librarian	39
IX	Distribution of Respondents by Experience or Inexperience as Library Educators or School Library Supervisors	40
X	Distribution of Respondents by Experience or Inexperience in Libraries Other than School Libraries	40
XI	Distribution of Respondents by Level of Highest Participation in Professional Organizations	41

		iii.
TABLE		PAGE
XII	Distribution of Respondents by Receipt of Professional Honors	42
XIII	Distribution of Respondents by Contributions to Professional Literature	42
XIV	Coding of Biographical Information, Dichotomous Data	49
XV	Coding of Biographical Information, Non-Dichotomous Data	50
XVI	Hypothesis I, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	62
XVII	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis I	63
XVIII	Hypothesis II, a, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	68
XIX	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, a	69
XX	Hypothesis II, b, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	71
XXI	Hypothesis II, c, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	73
XXII	Means of Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, c	74
XXIII	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, c, Area C	75
XXIV	Hypothesis II, d, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	78
XXV	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, d	79

TABLE		iv. PAGE
XXVI	Hypothesis II, e, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	82
XXVII	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, e	83
XXVIII	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means, (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, e, Area A	84
XXIX	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means, (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, e, Area B	85
XXX	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means, (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, e, Area F	86
XXXI	Hypothesis II, f, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	88
XXXII	Means of Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II f	89
XXXIII	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means, (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, f, Area M	90
XXXIV	Hypothesis II, g, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	92
XXXV	Hypothesis II, h, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	94
XXXVI	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, h	95
XXXVII	Hypothesis II, i, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	97
XXXVIII	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, i	98

		V.
TABLE		PAGE
XXXIX	Hypothesis II, j, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	100
XL	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, j	101
XLI	Hypothesis II, k, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	104
XLII	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, k	105
XLIII	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, k, Area C	106
XLIV	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, k, Area E	107
XLV	Hypothesis II, l, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	109
XLVI	Means for Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, l	110
XLVII	Hypothesis II, m, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	112
XLVIII	Hypothesis II, n, F Ratios and Levels of Significance	115
XLIX	Means of Significantly Different Areas, Hypothesis II, n	116
L	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, n, Area I	117
LI	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, n, Area K	118

TABLE		PAGE
LII	Tests on All Ordered Pairs of Means (Newman-Keuls), Hypothesis II, n, Area N	119
LIII	Relative Importance of Areas; Average Placement on Importance- Unimportance Scale by Groups	122
LIV	Rank Order of Importance of Areas by School Librarians (School- Library Leaders and Practicing School Librarians)	124
LV	Rank Order of Importance of Areas by School-Library Leaders	125
LVI	Rank Order of Importance of Areas by Practicing School Librarians	126
LVII	Rank Order of Topics Mentioned in Response to Part II	128
A-I	Geographical Distribution of Returns of Questionnaire, Part I	196
A-II	Distribution of Response by School- Library Leaders and Practicing School Librarians	199
A-III	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to School-Library Leaders and Practicing School Librarians	213
A-IV	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Term of Employment	214
A-V	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Recency of Educational Preparation	215
A-VI	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Highest Level of Educational Attainment	216

TABLE

PAGE

A-VII	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to School Accreditation Status	217
A- VIII	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Years of Total Experience	218
A-IX	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Years of School Library Experience	219
A-X	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Experience in Other Types of Libraries	220
A-XI	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Experience as a Library Educator or Supervisor	221
A-XII	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Contributions to Professional Literature	222
A-XIII	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Receipt of Professional Honors	223
A-XIV	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Age	224
A-XV	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Sex	225
A-XVI	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Marital Status	226
A-XVII	Mean Responses for Each Area, According to Participation in Professional Organizations	227

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with a general statement of the problem, the statement of the assumptions and hypotheses, and definitions of terms.

General Statement of the Problem

School libraries are a relatively new development in education, and school librarianship, a relatively new profession. The 1800's saw the beginnings of libraries in schools and the initiation of state legislation to support such libraries.¹ These libraries were generally book deposits, sometimes under the direction of a clerk or the school custodian. However, as teaching techniques and concepts in education changed, as the multi-textbook approach became popular, and as additional reading assignments increased, so did the role of the school library

¹ S. W. Vought, "Development of the School Library," Library Journal, XLVIII (February 15, 1923), p. 162.

change.² Curricular, extra-curricular, and recreational functions of the library were stressed, and the library became an aid to instruction.³ It was not, however, until 1900 that a library school graduate became the first full-time trained librarian appointed as a high school librarian.⁴

The twentieth century has brought forth the further development of the school library into an integral part of the school's instructional program and of the librarian as the peer of other instructional staff members.⁵ The library today generally occupies an important position within the school, frequently influencing school practices and instructional change. The school librarian, in many schools considered a department head, consults with and assists teachers and department chairmen of all school departments. He also

² A. Wofford, "School Library Evolution," Phi Delta Kappan, XXII (February, 1940), p. 283.

³ T.J. Cole, "Origin and Development of School Libraries," Peabody Journal of Education, XXXVIII (September, 1959), p. 87.

⁴ M.E. Hall, "The Development of the Modern High School Library," Library Journal, XL

⁵ C.I. Whitenack, "Historical Development of the Elementary School Library," Illinois Libraries, XXXVIII (June, 1956), p. 143.

counsels, encourages, and assists students of all abilities and interests. The librarian-student relationship is one of the few within a school that has a strong non-judgmental component, and, thus, the influence of the librarian differs from that of his professional teacher colleagues. Therefore, the school librarian and the school library might be termed influential factors in the educational and extra-curricular programs of the school.⁶

Recent developments in education and school librarianship emphasized anew the importance of the school library. The post-Sputnik era saw a re-examination of the curriculum and the introduction of such curricular developments as the "New Mathematics," the "Biological Science Curriculum Study," the "New English," and others. Changes in centralization, patterns of school administration and organization, scheduling, methods of teaching, emphasis on independent study, and the like were reflected in alterations in the facilities, management, collections, functions, and the role of the school library. The place of the library within the school and the effects of the library

⁶ F.E. Henne, "Toward Excellence in School-Library Programs," Library Quarterly, XXX (January, 1960), pp. 75-90.

on the instructional program have been demonstrated by Gaver,⁷ Jones,⁸ Hastings and Tanner,⁹ Barrileaux,¹⁰ and others. Gaver explored the effectiveness of library services in six elementary schools, and concluded, "The measures developed and the statistical procedures applied here have, for the limited population used in this study, indicated that definite advantages accrue in the school that has a school library manned by a professional librarian."¹¹ Hastings and Tanner showed the effectiveness of systematic library work on the achievement of high school students in the acquisition of English

⁷ M.V. Gaver, Effectiveness of Centralized Library Services in Elementary Schools (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers, Graduate School of Library Service, 1960).

⁸ R.M. Jones, "Selection and Use of Books in the Elementary School Library" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1963).

⁷ ⁹ D.M.H. Hastings and D. Tanner, "Influence of Library Work in Improving English Language Skills at the High School Level," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI (Summer, 1963), pp. 401-05.

¹⁰ L.E. Barrileaux, "A Comparison of Textbooks and Multiple Library References," School Science and Mathematics, LXIII (March, 1963), pp. 245-49.

¹¹ M.V. Gaver, "Effectiveness of Centralized Library Services in Elementary Schools," Library Quarterly, XXXI (July, 1961), p. 256.

language skills, while Barrileaux pointed out the contributions of the use of multiple library resources, in comparison to the use of a single text, to student learning and accomplishment in eighth grade science.

Recognition of the part played by school libraries in the educational program came, in one form, through recent federal legislation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its amendments allowed school libraries to expand their collections, and provided educational opportunities for advanced study for school librarians and school library supervisors. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 re-emphasized the role of the libraries by allowing not only procurement of materials but also the establishment of supplementary instructional materials centers. The Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts and bills also made provisions for school libraries and school librarians. The school library has, therefore, assumed a greater importance in education, as evidenced by the recent increased concern for library materials, library research, and library education on the part of the federal government.

The school library reflected the various changes

in education, and has evolved into an important department in a school. Innovations and research in education have had an impact on school libraries, as have similar experiments and studies in other types of libraries. However, the functions, facilities, processes, and procedures of school libraries appeared to have been generally based on successful past practices. This gradual, but constant, accumulation of experience has resulted in traditional assumptions about school librarianship such as services, standards, and staffing.

Assumptions in school librarianship, as in other fields, need constantly to be challenged by controlled research which systematically tests hypotheses and practices. School librarianship, as other fields, needs to utilize the experimental research techniques as a way of knowing, rather than tenacity, authority, inertia, or "common sense."¹² It appears necessary that scientifically investigated answers provide solutions to the many untested problems in school librarianship. Little research has, however, been conducted.

¹² J. Buchler (ed.), Philosophical Writings of Charles Peirce (New York: Dover, 1955).

This lack of research in school librarianship has been noted by several writers. As pointed out by Hurley, "Although some earlier investigations exist, it can be assumed that the period of systematic research started around 1927... . Since research related to the school library still remains in a pioneer stage, many problems need investigation... . Most functions of the library and objectives of school library service have been formulated pragmatically on the basis of opinion and experience, rather than on research evidence."¹³

Hurley's statement was supported by the findings of Walker, Danton, and others. Walker, in his examination of masters' theses, found that "School libraries represent a weak second with 71 theses or only 10 per cent of the total ¹⁴ (this figure being based on the total number clearly showing a type of

¹³ R.J. Hurley, "School Libraries," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. C.W. Harris (1960), p. 1203.

¹⁴ R.D. Walker, "The Quantity and Content of Masters' Theses Accepted at Library Schools Offering the Doctor's Degree, 1949-1956," Journal of Education for Librarianship, III (Spring, 1963), p. 271.

library). In Danton's review and listing of one hundred twenty-nine doctoral dissertations since 1930, nine dissertations, on the basis of titles, were probably of direct pertinence to school libraries.¹⁵ Of the research projects in librarianship reported by the Office of Education, only eight per cent were directly concerned with school libraries.¹⁶ Thus, it has been shown that little research in school librarianship has been undertaken, and that, presumably, school libraries are currently operating principally with decisions often the results of purely subjective judgments.

This scarcity of research appears, to the present investigator, to be a major problem in school librarianship. The lack of research in school librarianship may imply that school librarians are not concerned with, nor, perhaps, oriented toward, research. In order to ascertain whether or not this apparent indifference to research was, in fact, real, it was

¹⁵ J.P. Danton, "Doctoral Study in Librarianship in the United States," College and Research Libraries, XX (November, 1959) pp. 450-53.

¹⁶ "Library Research in Progress, 1959-1964," Library Research in Progress, No. 14 (1965?), p. 2.

necessary to determine how school librarians viewed research activity and research needs. School librarians' opinions on, and their attitudes toward, research presumably have a relationship to research activity. Also, the absence of concern for research, implied above, might have been attributable to various factors in the school librarians' education and experience.

Therefore, considering the importance of the school library in the educational system, the lack of research in school librarianship, and the importance of research to the development of the profession, it appeared valuable to examine the opinions of school librarians on research and to draw inferences, from the opinions, on school librarians' attitudes toward research. It also seemed of value to indicate the possible relationships of various educational and experiential factors pertaining to school librarians' expressed opinions and implied attitudes. An examination of this nature might serve not only to suggest the desirability for increased attention to instruction in research, research needs, and research

techniques in the curricula for school librarians, but also to stimulate an increased concern for research on the part of school librarians. The purpose, then, of this investigation was to study the school librarians' opinions on, and implied attitudes toward, research, and to examine educational and experiential factors relevant to the opinions.

Assumptions

The following assumptions formed a foundation on which this investigation was built:

1. Research in school librarianship is necessary to provide scientifically tested solutions to the varied problems of school librarianship.
2. Expressed opinion, in structured and unstructured situations, is indicative of attitude.
3. School-library leaders, with experience and interest in national, regional, and state problems in librarianship, are cognizant of research and research needs,

and may be utilized as a standard against which to compare other groups of school librarians.

Hypotheses

This investigation examined the following hypotheses:

1. Hypothesis I: No difference in expressed opinion toward research and research needs in school librarianship exists between "school-library leaders" and "practicing school librarians," as measured by the questionnaire, "School Librarianship: a Survey of Areas of Needed Research."
2. Hypothesis II: School librarians' opinions on research and research needs are not related to certain other educational and experiential factors: full- or part-time employment as a school librarian; recency of educational preparation in librarianship; level of educational attainment; the accreditation status of the collegiate institution's library science program from which the

school librarians received their educational preparation in librarianship; experience in teaching, school librarianship, and other types of libraries; contributions to professional literature; receipt of professional honors; age; sex; marital status; and level of participation in professional organizations.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms, as defined below, were used in this investigations:

1. Practicing school librarians: those librarians employed as full-time school librarians or as teacher-librarians in secondary schools, excepting those included in "school-library leaders."
2. Teacher-librarians: those persons employed and practicing partly as a teacher and partly as a librarian in a secondary school.

3. School-library leaders: those librarians employed as a practicing school librarian, as a library educator, or as a school library supervisor or consultant, and a member of one of the following:

a. directors and officers of the American Association of School Librarians and American Library Association councilors representing the American Association of School Librarians, for the years 1962 to 1967, as identified by the American Association of School Librarians.

b. presidents of American state and regional school library associations, as identified in "State and Regional School Library Associations," published by the American Association of School Librarians.

c. state school library supervisors and consultants, as identified in "State School Library Supervisors,

1965-1966," and supplement,
published by the American
Association of School Librarians.

d. library educators responsible for
school library courses in accredited
library schools, as listed in
Journal of Education for
Librarianship (Winter, 1966).

4. Secondary school: any public or private
school in the United States or its
possessions which was concerned with
instruction to students in grades
seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, or
twelve.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An examination of the literature concerned with research and research needs in school librarianship and with school librarians' opinions on research revealed the paucity of information and controlled study in these subjects. Some aspects of these topics have not been investigated; other phases have been examined. No study was found which was concerned with the orientation of school librarians toward research. No was any study found which compared the opinions on research or research needs of groups of school librarians, or which attempted to identify factors associated with opinions on research.

One aspect, interest in research, has been scrutinized. An indication of interest in research and research needs in school librarianship was discerned in several publications. The first, "Research

Needs of the School Library Program,"¹ was a mimeographed list containing twenty "Areas in which Studies and Investigations are Needed." The areas were recommended by a study group on "The Role of Research in School Library Development," led by Frances Henne, Miriam Peterson, and Sara Fenwick, which met at a workshop in Chicago in 1961 to plan projects to be undertaken by the states in conjunction with the School Library Development Project. This 1961-1962 project, with a \$100,000 grant from the Council on Library Resources, was conducted by the American Association of School Librarians to encourage the implementation of the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs."² The membership of the workshop was composed of at least two representatives from each state, normally the state school library supervisor and the chairman of the state committee on the implementation of the "Standards for School Library Programs." Participants

¹ "Research Needs of the School Library Program" (American Association of School Librarians, School Library Development Project, 1961) (Mimeographed.)

² American Association of School Librarians, Standards for School Library Programs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1961).

selected the study group they wished to attend, with twenty-nine cooperating in the work of the research group. The purpose of this study group on research was "... to identify research needs to which library development projects might conceivably be addressed."³

Group discussions were held with the school librarians and the school library supervisors, and their contributions "... disclosed both interest and need for diversified research embracing varying approaches and methods of investigations and covering phases of the school library organization and program,"⁴ both in individual schools and in school systems. The twenty areas in which investigations were needed were identified by discussions of the research study group, and were concerned with: the education and certification of school librarians; services for, and relationships with, teachers; the library's role in education, and especially in special programs; contributions of the school library to the various levels of education; public school-public library

³ Letter from Sara Fenwick, April 24, 1967.

⁴ Report of the Study Group on the Role of Research in School Library Development, American Association of School Librarians, School Library Development Workshop, April 28-30, 1961 (in the files of the Association).

cooperation; accessibility and use of school libraries; and others. Thus, this listing of research needs indicated an interest in research on the part of a selected group of school librarians and state school library supervisors. In addition, one of the recommendations of the study group, "A List of Needed Research Projects ...," was the original stimulus for this investigation.

Mary V. Gaver's bibliographic essay on elementary school library research surveyed and categorized studies having a direct bearing on elementary school libraries, and included summary of fields in which research was needed.⁵ These fields, presumably determined by the author noting omissions in the then existing research, were concerned with the gathering of statistics, the accessibility of all library facilities, public library-public school relationships, the role of the librarian, the role of the administrator, teachers' knowledge of libraries and literature, the library's contributions to the school, and the recruitment of school librarians. This bibliographic

⁵ M.V. Gaver, "Research on Elementary School Libraries," ALA Bulletin, LVI (February, 1962), pp. 117-24.

essay, then, appeared to be indicative, in some measure, of interest in research and research needs.

A more recent examination of research needs in school libraries was a section from the article by Frank L. Schick and others on general research needs in librarianship.⁶ Concerned with all types of libraries, and based on searches of the literature and resultant bibliographic essays which were prepared originally by the Committee for Research on Inter-Library Cooperation in the Public Library Field (Columbia University), the article was supplemented by suggestions for research requirements in school librarianship, written by Mary Helen Mahar and Richard L. Darling. The recommendations were divided into three areas, administration and supervision, student development and library use, and treated specific aspects such as departmentalization of high school libraries, the school library in teacher education programs, and methods of teaching school library use. These suggestions were "... areas we judged

⁶ F.L. Schick et al., "Library Science Research Needs," *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, III (Spring, 1963), pp. 280-91.

important, without reference to priorities,"⁷ and were described as "...brain storming' rather than logical analysis."⁸

The publications noted above all indicated some concern with research and research needs, and all formed part of the background on the subject of research interests of school librarians. All were further used by the investigator in devising the original questionnaire which served as the instrument in this study. It should also be noted that in all cases the publications, though denoting a measure of interest in research, were themselves reports of group discussions or of individual's judgments, not reports of surveys or research studies.

Another indication of research interest was the Sidney Forman article, which reported an inquiry, by personal letter, of one hundred twenty-six teachers of school librarianship, children's literature, storytelling, or related areas, as listed on the faculty rosters of the American Library Association accredited library schools.⁹ The teachers were asked to send

⁷ Letter from Mary Helen Mahar, April 18, 1967.

⁸ Letter from Richard L. Darling, May 11, 1967.

⁹ S. Forman, "Current Research," School Libraries, XVI (Winter, 1967), pp. 42-3.

"... a description of any research in progress in which they might be involved, or any recently published research appropriate for review..."¹⁰
 Ten replies were received, only one of which (discussed below¹¹) reported any research.

One study which had a more direct bearing on the problem was developed by the present investigator.¹²
 The purposes of this review and study of research needs in school librarianship were "... (1) the identification of major problem areas in the field of school librarianship, (2) the categorization of the problem areas by their relative importance, and (3) the review of available studies pertinent to the areas."¹³
 In this study a questionnaire of one hundred sixty research needs, divided into seventeen areas, was devised. Five different groups of librarians and library school students pretested the questionnaire. A further description of the questionnaire appears in Chapter III.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 43.

¹¹ M.L. Woodworth, An Identification and Examination of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship (Office of Education, 1967).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., p. 8.

The questionnaire was sent to school-library leaders who were asked to respond by indicating on a scale their opinions on the relative importance of each research need. The school-library leaders were defined as those school librarians who, by the nature of the professional offices or occupational positions they held, might have been expected to view school librarianship in its broader aspects. The school-library leaders were officers and directors of the American Association of School Librarians, presidents of state and regional school library associations, state school library supervisors and consultants, and library educators responsible for school library courses in library schools accredited by the American Library Association.

Thus, this study provided an instrument for procuring opinions, and also provided a scaled response on the importance of research needs by one group of school librarians, the school-library leaders. In addition to the structured, scaled responses, the study also elicited unstructured responses on research needs from the same group of school-library leaders.

This study was designed to explore the topic of the importance of research needs in school librarianship. The exploration, then, presented information on accomplished research, and indicated the school-library leaders' opinions on research needs. It might be generalized that, except for historical studies and certain minor items, all the areas of research in the questionnaire were deemed by the school-library leaders to have been worthy of investigation. The unstructured responses indicated the following areas of research needs, in rank order: (1) education of school library personnel; (2) shortage of school librarians; (3) aims and objectives of school libraries; (4) influence of school library programs on students; (5) teachers' and administrators' relationships to the school library; (6) technical processes; and others. The information presented in this study formed a basis for the research undertaken in this investigation.

No other reports of similar investigations were found.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will examine the general plan of the research, a description of the instrument, a report of the sampling, a description of the subjects, and the design of the research, with the procedures employed to carry out the research.

General Research Plan

This investigation compares the opinions of school-library leaders and practicing school librarians on research needs in school librarianship. Frequency counts on the responses of the school-library leaders to the questionnaire, "School Librarianship; a Survey of Areas of Needed Research," gathered for an Office of Education report and hereafter called the "Identification Report,"¹ were used and were compared

¹ Ibid.

with the responses of a randomly selected group, called here the practicing school librarians. The responses of all school librarians (school-library leaders and practicing school librarians) were then compared on the basis of certain biographical information, gathered for this investigation. Comparisons were made using analysis of variance.

The Instrument

The basic data-gathering instrument used in this study was the questionnaire, "School Librarianship: a Survey of Areas of Needed Research," originally designed and utilized for the Identification Report. The questionnaire, which became Part I in this investigation, was devised by means of a search of the literature of librarianship and education to locate items which had previously been identified or mentioned in the literature, by a compilation of published lists of research needs (discussed in Chapter II), and through the personal knowledge and experience of the investigator. A list of items was then compiled and divided into logical categories or "Areas." The list of categorized items was submitted first to members of

the faculty of the Library School of the University of Wisconsin, in all specialities of librarianship, for comments on inaccuracies or omissions and for general reactions. After comments and reactions were received, a second form, revised from the original form, was sent for comments to a small group of Wisconsin school librarians, selected by the investigator and known for state leadership in school libraries.

A third form, revised from the comments on the second form, was pretested on Library School students in the course, "School Libraries," at the Library School of the University of Wisconsin, in the spring of 1966. This form included a scale whereby respondents could indicate the importance or the unimportance of each item. Both a five-point scale and a seven-point scale were tried out, the seven-point scale being abandoned as it was judged too cumbersome by the respondents. Scales were based on reports of scaling in Backstrom and Hursh,² Miller,³

² C.H. Backstrom and G.D. Hursh, Survey Research (Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1963), pp. 75-96.

³ D.C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York: McKay, 1964), pp. 93-6.

Kerlinger,⁴ and others.

Following the revision of the third form, a fourth form was pretested by students in the "School Libraries" course at the Library School of the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1966 and by members of the National Defense Education Act Institute for School Librarians held at the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1966.

The fourth form, the final form of Part I, contained one hundred sixty items, divided into seventeen areas, and utilized an importance-unimportance scale of five. Part I (fourth form) was the data gathering instrument for the Identification Report and for this investigation. A copy of Part I is included in the Appendix to this investigation.

In addition to the scaled responses of Part I, a second inquiry, "School Librarianship: a Survey of Areas of Needed Research, Part II," called Part II in this investigation, was devised and sent to the school-library leaders of the Identification Report and also to the practicing school librarians. Part II

⁴ F.N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 479-99, 514-18.

was specifically designed to draw out unstructured responses and to provide respondents with an opportunity to state their concerns with research in school librarianship, and to comment on any research need not included in Part I. In contrast to the restrictions imposed on respondents in Part I by the listed research needs and the necessity of judging each by a numerical scale, Part II was deliberately designed to allow unstructured responses, stated in the respondents' own words, and eliciting opinions on major research concerns regardless of the availability of funds or the "researchability" of the topic. Part II, for both the Identification Report and this investigation, was sent only after the original questionnaire (Part I) had been returned, so that a copy of the listed research needs of Part I would have minimal effect on the reactions in Part II. A copy of Part II is included in the Appendix, as are copies of the follow-up and other letters used in gathering the data. No follow-up letters were used for Part II.

The research focus of the questionnaire was emphasized through the introductory and follow-up

letters, through the cover letter to the questionnaire, through the cover sheet on the questionnaire (Part I), and through the instructions on the questionnaire.

The introductory letter stated that the project was concerned with "... studying areas in school librarianship in which research is needed," and requested assistance in "... examining our list of research needs and giving us your opinion on their importance." The letter which accompanied the questionnaire acknowledged the respondents'

"... willingness to help us in investigating research needs in school librarianship." Follow-up letters asked for the return of the questionnaire, quoting its full title. In those cases where respondents of the school-library leader group were queried for biographical information, the letter requesting it acknowledged the return of the "... questionnaire for the survey of research needs in school librarianship."

The instructions and the cover sheet of the questionnaire, Part I, further stressed research: "School librarians and library educators have long recognized the need for further research in the field of school librarianship. This survey is an attempt

to identify research areas and to indicate their relative importance."

Part II of the questionnaire requested respondents to state problems "... which should be included in any list of research needs." The letter accompanying Part II stated that it was devised for the purpose of "... soliciting your reaction... in order (1) to provide you with an opportunity to comment further on research needs, and (2) to provide us with your further considered opinion of needs and priorities in school library research."

Thus, it should be noted that the research focus of the questionnaire was emphasized and re-emphasized in the questionnaire and in the correspondence concerning the questionnaire.

Description of Subjects and Sampling

A systematic random sample ⁵ of four hundred fifty-seven of the public and private secondary schools in the United States and its possessions (excluding secondary schools, located in foreign countries, under

⁵ Systematic random sampling is a sampling device whereby every nth item in a population is selected, beginning at some random member in the population.

the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense) was selected from the latest available lists of the Office of Education.^{6 7} Schools representing all states and territories, organized as junior or senior high schools and the varied combinations of junior and senior high schools, and having part-time and full-time teacher-librarians and school librarians were included. An introductory letter which requested the assistance and cooperation of the librarians in the schools sampled was sent. The librarians who replied and were sent the questionnaire constituted the group, "practicing school librarians." Respondents to the questionnaire represented 90.58% of the practicing school librarians.⁸

School-library leaders were selected on the basis of their official positions, as noted on Chapter I in "Definitions of Terms." Introductory letters were sent

⁶ L.W. Ramsey, Directory of Public Secondary Day Schools, 1958-59 (Office of Education, 1963).

⁷ D.B. Gertler and L.W. Ramsey, Nonpublic Secondary Schools, a Directory, 1960-61 (Office of Education, 1963).

⁸ See Table A-2 in Appendix.

this group. Those who replied and were sent the questionnaire comprised the group, "school-library leaders." The proportion of the group who returned the questionnaire was 91.84%.

Description of Subjects

When the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians were combined to form the general group, "school librarians," the demographic data on the subjects revealed certain characteristics.

Over half of the school librarians were in their forties or fifties, with about a fourth in their twenties or thirties and about an eighth in their sixties and seventies (Table I).

TABLE I - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No Answer	18	11.68	8	5.19	26	8.44
20's	9	5.84	28	18.18	37	12.01
30's	18	11.68	22	14.28	40	12.98
40's	34	22.07	32	20.77	66	21.42
50's	52	33.76	47	30.51	99	32.14
60's or more	23	14.93	17	11.03	40	12.98

Over three-fourths of the group was female (Table II) and slightly over half of the whole group was married (Table III).

TABLE II - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX

Sex	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Male	23	14.93	18	11.68	41	13.31
Female	128	83.11	136	88.31	264	85.71
No Answer	3	1.94			3	.97

TABLE III - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Married	63	40.90	103	66.88	166	53.89
Un-married	88	57.14	51	33.11	139	45.12
No Answer	3	1.94			3	.97

In examining the educational background of the group, approximately two-thirds had fifth-year degrees or more advanced preparation (Table IV) and about half had degrees from library schools accredited by the American Library Association (Table V). Most of the group who had degrees received them in the 1950's or 1960's (Table VI).

TABLE IV - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Level	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No Answer	6	3.89	6	3.89	12	3.89
No bach- elor's	1	.64	2	1.29	3	.97
4th Year bachelor	4	2.59	26	16.88	30	9.74
Post- bachelor	13	8.44	42	27.27	55	17.85
B.S.L.S.	10	6.49	17	11.03	27	8.76
M.S.L.S.	58	37.66	31	20.12	89	28.89
Master's, non- library science	17	11.03	14	9.09	31	10.06
Post- Master's	23	14.93	12	7.79	35	11.36
3rd master's or specialist	2	1.29			2	.64
doctors	5	3.24	1	.64	5	1.64

TABLE V - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY THE
ACCREDITATION STATUS OF THE
DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTION
(LIBRARY SCIENCE)

Status	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Accredited	113	73.37	44	28.57	157	50.97
Not accredited	11	7.14	14	9.09	25	8.11
No degree	19	12.33	88	57.14	107	34.74
No Answer	11	7.14	8	5.19	19	6.16

TABLE VI - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY THE DATE OF
THEIR LATEST DEGREE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE

Date of Degree	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No answer, No degree	26	16.88	100	64.93	126	40.90
1920's or before	3	1.94	2	1.29	5	1.62
1930's	17	11.03	3	1.94	20	6.49
1940's	18	11.68	14	9.09	32	10.38
1950's	50	32.46	9	5.84	59	19.15
1960's	40	25.97	26	16.88	66	21.42

Over one-half of the school librarians had had ten to twenty-nine years of experience in elementary, secondary, or collegiate teaching or in libraries, with about one-fifth having less than ten years and approximately one-fourth having thirty or more years (Table VII).

TABLE VII - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING AND LIBRARY SCIENCE

Years of Experience	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
0-9	17	11.03	44	28.57	61	19.80
10-19	42	27.27	43	27.92	85	27.59
20-29	47	30.51	40	25.97	87	28.24
30-39	37	24.02	24	15.58	61	19.80
40 or more	11	7.14	3	1.94	14	4.54

Over four-fifths of the school librarians had had one to nineteen years' experience in school libraries, with over half having one to nine (Table VIII).

TABLE VIII - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A SCHOOL LIBRARIAN

Years of Experience	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
None	16	10.38	2	1.29	18	5.84
1-9	64	41.55	104	67.53	168	54.54
10-19	57	37.01	32	20.77	89	28.89
20-29	13	8.44	11	7.14	24	7.79
30 or more	4	2.59	5	3.24	9	2.92

More than two-fifths of the school librarians had had experience as a library educator or as a school library supervisor (Table IX), and about one-third had worked in libraries other than school libraries (Table X).

TABLE IX - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
EXPERIENCE OR INEXPERIENCE AS LIBRARY
EDUCATORS OR SCHOOL LIBRARY SUPERVISORS

Experience	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Experi- enced	116	75.32	21	13.63	137	44.48
Inexperi- enced	38	24.67	133	86.36	171	55.51

TABLE X - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY EXPERIENCE
OR INEXPERIENCE IN LIBRARIES OTHER THAN
SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Experience	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Experi- enced	61	39.61	40	25.97	101	32.79
Inexpe- rienced	93	60.38	114	74.02	207	67.20

More than a third of the school librarians were members of state education or library associations and almost three-fifths, of national associations, with three-tenths holding national offices or committee responsibilities (Table XI).

TABLE XI - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF HIGHEST PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Level	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 1 ¹	1	.64	30	19.48	31	10.06
Level 2	4	2.59	18	11.68	22	7.14
Level 3	39	25.32	20	12.98	59	19.15
Level 4	28	18.18	59	38.31	87	28.24
Level 5	26	16.88	11	7.14	37	12.01
Level 6	39	25.32	2	1.29	41	13.31
Level 7	12	7.79	1	.64	13	4.22
Level 8	5	3.24	13	8.44	18	5.84

¹ Level 1: member, state education or library association. Level 2: committee responsibility, state education or library association. Level 3: officer, state library or education association. Level 4: member, national education or library association. Level 5: committee responsibility, national library or education association. Level 6: divisional officer or councilor, national library or education association. Level 7: national officer, national education or library association. Level 8: none indicated.

Slightly less than half had received professional honors (Table II), and almost two-fifths had contributed to professional literature in education or librarianship either by writing or editing a book, pamphlet, or periodical article (Table XIII).

TABLE XII - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RECEIPT OF PROFESSIONAL HONORS

Receipt of Professional Honors	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	94	61.03	54	35.06	148	48.05
No	60	38.96	100	64.93	160	51.94

TABLE XIII - DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CONTRIBUTION TO PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

Contributed to Professional Literature	School Library Leaders N=154		Practicing School Librarians N=154		Both Groups N=308	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	92	59.74	31	20.12	123	39.93
No	62	40.25	123	79.87	185	60.06

Thus, it would appear that the total group of school librarians, the school-library leaders combined with the practicing school librarians, was relatively well educated, experienced, and professionally active.

Comparison of the Groups, a Summary.— Tables I to XIII, above, also presented biographical data on the two groups, the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians, for each of the biographical categories. In examining and comparing the two groups, certain characteristics and differences were expected and found.

The subjects in the school-library leader group were principally in their forties and fifties and were women, with more than half of them being unmarried. The leaders had generally a high level of education, most of them having graduate work and some of them having post-master's work. Most of this group graduated with degrees from library schools accredited by the American Library Association, and over half received their degrees in the 1950's and 1960's. In terms of various types of experience, the leaders principally had twenty to thirty-nine years of

experience as an elementary, secondary, or collegiate teacher or as a librarian, one to nineteen years' experience as a school librarian, and had had experience as a library educator or school library supervisor. Two-fifths of the group had worked in libraries other than school libraries. The leaders were generally members of either the American Library Association or the National Education Association or similar national professional organizations, with almost half having committee responsibilities or holding office. Most of the leaders had received professional honors and had contributed to professional literature in librarianship and education. School-library leaders represented every geographic section in the country, as demonstrated in Table A-I in the Appendix.

A random sample of school librarians in American public and private secondary schools was selected. From this sample was derived the group of practicing school librarians. This group was principally forty to fifty-nine years old, female, and married. Less than half of the practicing school librarians had fourth-year bachelor's degrees or some post-bachelor's work, and about one-tenth had had

post-master's work. Approximately a quarter of them had library science degrees from library schools accredited by the American Library Association, with almost a fourth of the total group having received their library science degrees in the 1950's and 1960's. More than half of the practicing school librarians had fewer than twenty years' experience as an elementary, secondary, or collegiate teacher or as a librarian. Most of them had had no experience as a library educator or supervisor, not in libraries other than school libraries. More than half had had one to nine years' experience as a school librarian.

This group, the practicing school librarians, was fairly evenly divided in their memberships in state or national library and education associations. Almost two-thirds had received no professional honors, and approximately four-fifths had made no contribution to professional literature. Practicing school librarians represented every section of the country. The geographical distribution of the practicing school librarians is shown in Table A-I of the Appendix.

Thus, in comparing the two groups, certain differences should be noted. The practicing school librarians were generally less experienced in teaching

and librarianship, in other types of libraries, and in library education and school library supervision. Assuming contributions to professional literature and highest level of participation in professional associations to be a measure of professional activity, the practicing school librarians were not as active as were the school-library leaders. Also, the leaders tended to have done more graduate work, to have been educated more recently, and, typically, to have received their degrees from accredited library schools. The differences noted were probably indicative of the leadership status of the school-library leaders.

Research Design and ProceduresProcedures Used in Administering the Questionnaire, Part I

The questionnaire was sent to each person who responded to the letter introducing him to the project and requesting his assistance. All questionnaires had an identification number making it possible to determine geographic distribution, and, later, to acquire biographical data on each respondent. Time lapses between sending out the introductory letter, the questionnaire, and the follow-up letters were the same for the school-library leaders of the Identification Report and the practicing school librarians. Exactly the same letters and the questionnaire were sent to both groups. The only variation in the treatment between these two groups occurred in the gathering of the biographical data. The school-library leaders' biographical data was acquired by consulting "Who's Who in Library Service"⁹ or by sending the leaders a biographical

⁹ L. Ash (ed.), Who's Who in Library Service (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1965).

data form. Practicing school librarians, on the other hand, were sent the biographical data sheet as an attachment to the questionnaire.

Coding Procedures

As the questionnaires were returned, each questionnaire was coded as to certain biographical information on the respondent. Biographical information on the leaders was secured from "Who's Who in Library Service."¹⁰ In those cases where the leader was not included in "Who's Who in Library Service," a special biographical questionnaire was sent him. A similar biographical form was sent as an attachment to the questionnaire to the practicing school librarians. Biographical items included age, sex, marital status, education, library school, date of library science degree, years of experience in teaching and librarianship, years of experience as a school librarian, experience as a supervisor or library educator, experience as a librarian in libraries other than school libraries, membership and level of responsibility in state and national library

¹⁰ Ibid.

or education associations, honors received, and contributions to professional literature.

Some of the biographical items were simply coded as "yes" or "no" or other similar dichotomies. Some of the others were coded with greater complexity. Coding of this information is noted below (Table XIV and XV).

TABLE XIV - CODING OF BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION,
DICHOTOMOUS DATA

Biographical Item	Coded as
1. Accreditation status of degree-granting institution (librarianship)	1. accredited; non-accredited
2. Experience as a library educator/supervisor	2. experienced; inexperienced
3. Contributions to professional literature	3. contributors; non-contributors
4. Receipt of professional honors	4. received honors; did not receive honors
5. Sex	5. Male; female
6. Marital Status	6. Married; unmarried
7. Experience in other types of libraries	7. Experienced; inexperienced
8. Term of employment	8. part-time; full-time

TABLE XV - CODING OF BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION,
NON-DICHOTOMOUS DATA

Biographical Item	Coded as
1. Age	1. 20's, 30's, 40's, 50's, 60's or more
2. Highest level of schooling	2. no bachelor's; 4th year bachelor's; post- bachelor's; B.S.L.S.; M.S.L.S.; master's, non- library science; 2nd master's; 3rd master's or specialist; doctor's
3. Date of latest degree	3. 1920's or before, 1930's, 1940's, 1950's, 1960's
4. Years of total experience in teaching and/or librarianship	4. 1-9 years; 10-19 years; 20-29 years; 30-39 years; 40 or more years
5. Years of experience as a school librarian	5. 1-9 years; 10-19; 20-29; 30-39; 40 or more
6. Highest level of participation in professional associations, education and/or librarianship	6. member, state organization; committee responsibility, state organization; officer, state organization; member national organization; committee responsibility, national organization; divisional officer or councilor, national organization; national officer, national organization.

"Library School" was interpreted to mean that school from which the latest degree in library science was received, and respondents were divided into those who had degrees from schools with accredited library programs, those who had degrees from non-accredited schools, and those who had no degree.

The date of educational preparation was recorded as the date on which the respondent received his latest library science degree. Although in some cases respondents had had some post-bachelor's or post-master's work, tabulation of the date of such work was not possible. All respondents, however, were treated equally in the use of the degree date as the date of educational preparation.

In tabulating the years of experience as a school librarian, all experience as a teacher-librarian was arbitrarily assigned to school library experience. Experience noted by respondents as "consultants" or "coordinators" or the like was designated as supervisory experience. Experience as a library educator was interpreted to apply to those persons whose major responsibility was teaching. Thus,

summer session experience, except where applicable to regularly employed library educators, i.e., to those also employed during the academic year, was ignored. In tabulating years of experience in any category, with the exception noted above, a fraction was interpreted as a whole number.

To make the section on membership and level of responsibility in professional organizations more meaningful, respondents were categorized according to their highest level of participation. Both current and prior responsibilities were considered.

"Honors" were recorded for special citations, membership in honorary organizations to which the respondents were invited to join, and the like. And, finally, contributions to professional literature were tabulated on a "yes" or "no" basis, intending to indicate authorship or editorship of a book, pamphlet, or periodical articles.

Statistical Means Employed

A standard statistical technique, analysis of variance, was employed to compare responses to the questionnaire. This technique "... provide a basis for comparing not only two, but any number of series simultaneously" ¹¹ and "... is usually used to test statistical hypotheses about the significance of the differences between means." ¹² The general use of this technique was described in Garrett, ¹³ Croxton and Cowden, ¹⁴ Borg, ¹⁵ Kerlinger, ¹⁶ Moroney, ¹⁷ and others. As stated by Moroney,

¹¹ P.E. Croxton and D.J. Cowden, Applied General Statistics (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939), p. 351.

¹² F.N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 206.

¹³ H.E. Garrett, Elementary Statistics (New York: McKay, 1962), pp. 169-78.

¹⁴ Croxton and Cowden, op. cit., pp. 351-59.

¹⁵ W.R. Borg, Educational Research (New York: McKay, 1963), pp. 141-43.

¹⁶ Kerlinger, op. cit., pp. 187-209.

¹⁷ M.J. Moroney, Facts from Figures (Baltimore: Penguin, 1951), pp. 371-90.

"Undoubtedly one of the most elegant, powerful, and useful techniques in modern statistical method is that of Analysis of Variance ... by which the total variation in a set of data may be reduced to components associated with possible sources of variability whose relative importance we wish to assess." ¹⁸

In addition to the analysis of variance, the Newman Keuls method, with non-dichotomous data, was used to determine "... the nature of the difference between treatment means following a significant over-all F." ¹⁹

Treatment of the Data

Responses to each item of the questionnaire, and the coded biographical data, was key-punched onto cards. From these cards a work-deck was generated which retained the biographical data and summed the responses of each person to each item into a total, gross, "all areas" score (a sum of the scores for

¹⁸ Moroney, op. cit., p. 371.

¹⁹ B.J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 80.

all items as indicated by the individual's response on the scale for each item of the questionnaire) and seventeen sub-scores (the sum of the scores for all items within an area of the questionnaire). Thus, for each respondent the following information was available in the work-deck: sample number; group number; age; marital status; sex; education; library school; date of library science degree; years of experience in teaching and librarianship; years of experience a library educator or as a school library supervisor; experience in libraries other than school libraries; level of responsibility in professional associations; honors received; and contributions to professional literature.

For the first hypothesis the groups, the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians, were compared on the total, all areas score and the sub-scores, utilizing analysis of variance of equal cells. The two groups were equalized by randomly discarding fifteen respondents from the school-library leader group. The two groups were then composed of one hundred fifty-four subjects

each, for a total of three hundred eight. Levels of significance of the differences were then determined by using an "F" scale. Significant differences at the .001, .01, and .05 levels were reported.

For the second hypothesis all the subjects were placed together and were then divided by biographical information. Thus, in determining whether any significant differences existed between men and women on the opinions revealed by their responses to the questionnaire, the entire group was divided by sex, and comparisons made utilizing analysis of variance. Similar divisions were made for other dichotomous biographical data, and comparisons were similarly made.

Where the data could not be dichotomized, logical categories were established; the subjects divided into the categories; and comparisons made, using analysis of variance and the Newman-Keuls method.

Procedures Used with Part II

Part II, with a respondent identification number, was sent to every person who responded to Part I. A cover letter accompanied Part II. No follow-up letter was sent. Treatment of the two groups, the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians, was exactly the same, as were the questionnaire, Part II, and the cover letter. A copy of the questionnaire, Part II, and the cover letter may be found in the Appendix.

Part II did not lend itself to statistical treatment. An admittedly rough measure, a ranking of the topics mentioned by the respondents, was used and was supported by quotations from the returns. A general comparison was then made between the rankings of the topics commented upon by the two groups.

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS

Chapter IV is divided into three parts, and will report the findings concerned with Hypothesis I, the findings concerned with Hypothesis II, and ancillary findings. In each case, differences which were found to have existed in opinions on research and research needs and which were significant at the .001, .01, or .05 levels, as determined by analysis of variance, will be reported for each area of the questionnaire. Additionally, for each hypothesis the level of significance for all the areas of the questionnaire will be given.

In those hypotheses utilizing dichotomous data, where differences significant at the .001, .01, or .05 levels in opinions on one or more or all of the areas of the questionnaire were found, group means will be reported. Group means will be used as

an indication of the importance placed on research and research needs by the various groups concerning the various areas. Thus, the higher the mean, the greater degree of importance placed on a particular area by a particular group.

In those cases involving non-dichotomous data, where analysis of variance had shown differences of opinion significant at the .001, .01, or .05 levels, group means will also be reported. Also, results of the Newman-Keuls method of testing ordered pairs of means to determine the patterns of significant differences among more than two groups will be given.

Thus, for each hypothesis concerned with dichotomous data, the following will be reported: F ratios and levels of significance; and group means. For each hypothesis concerned with non-dichotomous data, the findings will include: F ratios and levels of significance; groups means; and the results of the Newman-Keuls.

A brief description of each area appears in the Appendix. Furthermore, tables of mean responses for each area, according to biographical information, also appear in the Appendix.

Findings: Hypothesis I

The null hypothesis that "no difference in expressed opinion toward research and research needs in school librarianship existed between 'school-library leaders' and 'practicing school librarians,' as measured by the questionnaire, 'School Librarianship; a Survey of Areas of Needed Research'," was examined by analysis of variance. F ratios and levels of significance are reported in Table XVI below.

Differences at the .05 level existed in Area J, "Guidance Functions," Area N, "Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs," and Area Q, "Selection and Censorship"; at the .01 level in Area G, "Accessibility and Use," and Area P, "Relations with Other Libraries"; and at the .001 level in Area C, "Patterns of School Library Administration and Control," and Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics." A difference significant at the .05 level also was found in the two groups' opinions on "all areas," i.e., the total of all of the areas.

The hypothesis was rejected, and, therefore,

on the basis of this rejection, it was found that significant differences did exist.

Further, a comparison of group means (Table XVII) indicated that, in each significantly different area, school-library leaders attached greater importance to research needs than did the practicing school librarians, except for Area J, "Guidance Functions." Additionally, in comparing the group means for all areas, it should be noted that school-library leaders rated "all areas" as more important than the practicing school librarians did.

TABLE XVI - HYPOTHESIS I, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (SCHOOL-LIBRARY LEADERS AND PRACTICING SCHOOL LIBRARIANS)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	3.5222			
B- Standards	2.1112			
C- Administration	11.0535		.001	
D- Personnel	2.5745			
E- Collections	1.2133			
F- Budgets	.0742			
G- Access	7.4180		.01	
H- Processes	1.4718			
I- Publicity	1.6092			
J- Guidance	5.2589		.05	
K- Instruction	1.6360			
L- State, U.S. aid	3.1209			
M- Research	14.5235		.001	
N- Services	6.1032		.05	
O- Housing	1.9808			
P- Other libraries	6.9779		.01	
Q- Selection	6.2389		.05	
ALL AREAS (Total)	4.0210		.05	

All areas - $F(1,306) = 4.0210$, $p .05$

TABLE XVII - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT
AREAS, HYPOTHESIS I

Areas	School Library Leaders Group Mean	Practicing School Librarians Group Mean	Grand Mean
C	42.136	38.994	40.565
G	45.974	43.195	44.584
J	17.234	18.494	17.864
M	13.831	11.994	12.912
N	50.617	47.929	49.274
P	20.636	18.838	19.737
Q	32.662	30.617	31.640
All	575.123	555.955	565.539

Findings Concerning Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II, a null hypothesis, was divided and labeled as follows:

1. Hypothesis II, a, school librarians:
opinions on research and research needs
were not related to full- or part-time
employment
2. Hypothesis II, b, school librarians:
opinions on research and research needs
were not related to recency of educational
preparation in librarianship
3. Hypothesis II, c, school librarians:
opinions on research and research needs
were not related to their level of
educational attainment
4. Hypothesis II, d, school librarians:
opinions on research and research needs
were not related to the accreditation
status of the library science program
from which the school librarians
received their educational preparation
in librarianship
5. Hypothesis II, e, school librarians:
opinions on research and research needs

were not related to their total
number of years of experience in
teaching and librarianship

6. Hypothesis II, f, school librarians:

opinions on research and research
needs were not related to their total
number of years of experience as a
school librarian

7. Hypothesis II, g, school librarians:

opinions on research and research needs
were not related to experience or
inexperience in other types of
libraries.

8. Hypothesis II, h, school librarians:

opinions on research and research needs
were not related to experience or
inexperience as a library educator or
school library supervisor

9. Hypothesis II, i, school librarians:

opinions on research and research needs
were not related to their contributing
to professional literature

10. Hypothesis II, j, school librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their having received professional honors
11. Hypothesis II, k, school librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to age
12. Hypothesis II, l, school librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to sex
13. Hypothesis II, m, school librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to marital status
14. Hypothesis II, n, school librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their highest level of participation in professional organizations.

The findings on each of the divisions of Hypothesis II are presented below.

In testing Hypothesis II all subjects, the school-library leaders and practicing school librarians, were grouped together and called, "school librarians."

The school librarians were then categorized and divided into groups according to biographical data.

Hypothesis II, a

Hypothesis II, a, stated, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to full- or part-time employment." Respondents were divided into two groups, those employed full-time and those employed part-time.

Differences significant at the .05 level between the groups' expressed opinions were found in Area K, "Library Instruction," and Area Q, "Selection and Censorship." The hypothesis, then, for Areas K and Q, was rejected. However, no significant difference was found between the groups' opinions on all areas. Therefore, the hypothesis was, in general, supported, and it would appear that the subjects' opinions were, typically, not related to their term of employment, the exceptions being in the areas noted (Table XVIII).

Examining the group means for the two significantly different areas, it was noted that respondents employed full-time indicated research needs as of greater importance than did those employed part-time (Table XIX).

TABLE XVIII - HYPOTHESIS II, A, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (TERM OF EMPLOYMENT)

Areas	F ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.002			
B- Standards	.077			
C- Administration	.531			
D- Personnel	.071			
E- Collections	.617			
F- Budget	.074			
G- Access	.349			
H- Processes	.107			
I- Publicity	.321			
J- Guidance	.000			
K- Instruction	4.093	.05		
L- State, U.S. Aid	.177			
M- Research	.941			
N- Services	1.569			
O- Housing	1.490			
P- Other Libraries	.927			
Q- Selection	5.537	.05		
ALL AREAS (total)	.449	.504		

All Areas - $F(1,280) = .449$, $p = .05$

TABLE XIX- MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, A

Areas	Full-time Librarians Group Mean	Part-time Librarians Group Mean	Grand Mean
K	15.9805	14.4400	15.8440
Q	31.9844	28.4000	31.6667

Hypothesis II, b

Categorization of the subjects for the testing of Hypothesis II, b, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to the recency of educational preparation in librarianship," was based on the date of the receipt of their latest degree in library science. Subjects were divided into groups receiving their degrees in the 1930's or before, the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's.

No significant differences were found in comparing the groups' opinions toward any of the areas of the questionnaire, nor were any significant differences found in their opinions on all of the areas. F ratios and levels of significance may be found in Table XX below.

Thus, the hypothesis was supported, and the recency of educational preparation in librarianship, therefore, apparently was not related to opinions on research and research needs.

TABLE XX - HYPOTHESIS II, B, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (REGENCY OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.908			
B- Standards	.596			
C- Administration	.674			
D- Personnel	.067			
E- Collections	.468			
F- Budget	.094			
G- Access	.027			
H- Processes	1.040			
I- Publicity	.772			
J- Guidance	.395			
K- Instruction	1.378			
L- State, U.S. Aid	1.020			
M- Research	.760			
N- Services	.103			
O- Housing	2.290			
P- Other Libraries	.674			
Q- Selection	.375			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.274		.844	
All Areas - $F(3,163) = .274, p .05$				

Hypothesis II, c

Hypothesis II, c, stated, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their level of educational attainment." Subjects were divided into three groups according to their highest level of educational attainment: pre-fifth-year degree; fifth-year degree; and post-fifth-year degree. F ratios and levels of significance are reported below in Table XXI.

No significant difference was found in comparing the opinions of the groups on all the areas of the questionnaire. Thus, the hypothesis was, in general, supported, and level of educational attainment was apparently not related to the groups' opinions.

However, a difference significant at the .01 level was found among the groups in their opinions toward Area E, "Collections." The hypothesis, as regards to the opinions on Area E, was rejected. Group means in Area E are shown in Table XXII. The Newman-Keuls method found (Table XXIII) that the post-fifth-year degree group was significantly different from the other groups, but that the other groups did not differ significantly from each other. Therefore, the post-fifth-year degree group rated research needs in Area E as less important than the other two did.

TABLE XXI - HYPOTHESIS II, C, F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OF SIGNIFICANCE (LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL
ATTAINMENT)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at
		.05, .01, .001
A- Aims	.391	
B- Standards	.274	
C- Administration	.035	
D- Personnel	.829	
E- Collections	5.418	.01
F- Budget	.574	
G- Access	1.125	
H- Processes	1.618	
I- Publicity	.388	
J- Guidance	2.251	
K- Instruction	.771	
L- State, U.S. Aid	.769	
M- Research	2.025	
N- Services	.428	
O- Housing	3.012	
P- Other Libraries	.864	
Q- Selection	.451	
ALL AREAS (total)	1.200	.303
All Areas - $F(2,270) = 1.200$, $p = .05$		

TABLE XXII - MEANS OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, C

Areas	Pre- 5th Year Degree, Group Mean	5th Year Degree, Group Mean	Post- 5th Year Degree, Group Mean	Grand Mean
E	53.3176	51.8636	48.1071	51.5458

TABLE XXIII - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, C,
AREA C

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- Pre-fifth-year degree, 53.32
Group 2- Fifth-Year degree, 51.86
Group 3- Post-fifth-year degree, 48.11

Ordered Means

	Group 3 (48.11)	Group 2 (51.86)	Group 1 (53.32)
Group 3		3.75(2)	5.21(3)
Group 2			1.46(2)
Group 1			

Dk x Critical Value (.01)

$$.977 \times 3.64 = 3.55 (2)$$

$$.977 \times 4.12 = 4.025 (3)$$

Therefore, Group 3 was significantly different from
Group 1 and 2, but Group 1 and 2 did not differ
significantly from each other.

Hypothesis II, d

In examining Hypothesis II, d, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to the accreditation status of the library science program from which the school librarians received their educational preparation in librarianship," subjects were divided into those having a degree from an accredited library school and those not having a degree from an accredited library school.¹ F ratios and levels of significance are reported below in Table XXIV.

No significant difference was found in the groups' opinions toward all the areas. Therefore, the hypothesis was, in general, supported.

However, in examining differences in opinion as related to the various areas, the following were found: significant differences at the .05 level in opinions on Area E, Collections," and in Area J, "Guidance Functions." In Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics," the difference found was

¹ List of accredited schools from Journal of Education for Librarianship, VI (Winter, 1966).

significant at the .001 level. Thus, the hypothesis for Areas E, J, and M was rejected.

Table XXV below demonstrates that respondents who did not have degrees from accredited schools felt Area E, "Collections," and Area J, "Guidance Functions," to have been more important than did the respondents from accredited schools, the reverse being shown in Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics."

TABLE XXIV - HYPOTHESIS II, D, F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OR SIGNIFICANCE (ACCREDITATION STATUS)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at .05, .01, .001
A- Aims	.001	
B- Standards	1.254	
C- Administration	.505	
D- Personnel	.597	
E- Collections	4.869	.05
F- Budget	.073	
G- Access	2.047	
H- Processes	.373	
I- Publicity	.176	
J- Guidance	5.367	.05
K- Instruction	.409	
L- State, U.S. Aid	.944	
M- Research	11.255	.001
N- Services	.746	
O- Housing	1.658	
P- Other Libraries	3.374	
Q- Selection	1.791	
ALL AREAS (Total)	.280	.597
All Areas - $F(1,267) = .280$, p .05		

TABLE XXV - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, D

Areas	Accredited School, Group Mean	Non-accredited School, Group Mean	Grand Mean
E	50.3916	52.9206	51.5762
J	17.2028	18.5556	17.8364
K	13.8182	12.0794	13.0037

Hypothesis II, e

In this hypothesis, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to total years of experience in teaching and librarianship," subjects were divided into categories according to their total years of experience in teaching and librarianship (one to three years', four to nine, ten to nineteen, and twenty or more).

No significant differences were found in the respondents' opinions toward "all areas" of the questionnaire (Table XXVI). Therefore, the hypothesis was supported, in general.

However, differences significant at the .05 level were found in opinions concerning Area A, "Aims and Objectives of School Libraries," Area E, "Collections," and Area F, "Budgets and Business Practices." In regard to Areas A, E, and F, then, the hypothesis was rejected.

Examining group means (Table XXVII) and the findings of the Newman-Kuels method (Tables XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX) for these areas (A, E, and F), it should be noted that in Area A (Table XXVIII) subjects with one to three years' experience differed significantly in their opinions from the other three groups, which

did not differ from each other significantly, and placed less importance on that area than did the other three groups.

For Area E (Table XXIX) subjects with one to three years' experience differed significantly from the other three groups in their expressed opinions and attached more importance to this area than the others did. The other three groups did not differ significantly from each other.

For Area F (Table XXX) subjects with one to three years' experience differed significantly in their opinions from the other three groups, and placed more importance on this area than the other three groups. Subjects with four to nine years' experience and those with ten to nineteen years' differed significantly from each other (the subjects with ten to nineteen years' attaching more importance to the area), but these two groups did not differ significantly from the group where subjects had twenty or more years' experience.

TABLE XXVI - HYPOTHESIS II, E, F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OF SIGNIFICANCE (TEACHING AND LIBRARY
EXPERIENCE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at .05, .01, .001
A- Aims	3.227	
B- Standards	.518	
C- Administration	.091	
D- Personnel	1.398	
E- Collections	3.418	.05
F- Budget	3.097	.05
G- Access	2.077	
H- Processes	2.610	
I- Publicity	1.151	
J- Guidance	1.298	
K- Instruction	.679	
L- State, U.S. Aid	.696	
M- Research	.284	
N- Services	1.301	
O- Housing	2.133	
P- Other Libraries	.611	
Q- Selection	1.744	
ALL AREAS (Total)	1.980	.118
All Areas - $F(3,239) = 1.980$, p .05		

TABLE XXVII - MEANS OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, E

Areas	1-3 Years Experience Group Mean	4-9 Years Experience Group Mean	10-19 Years Experience Group Mean
A	15.0000	20.8000	20.9625
E	68.5000	50.2000	52.4875
F	28.0000	20.4667	22.9875
Areas	20 or More Years Experience Group Mean	Grand Mean	
A	21.6233	21.3004	
E	50.0822	51.0329	
F	21.0479	21.7078	

TABLE XXVIII - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, E,
AREA A

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- 1-3 years' experience, 15.00
Group 2- 4-9 years' experience, 20.80
Group 3- 10-19 years' experience, 20.96
Group 4- 20 or more years' experience, 21.62

Ordered Means

	Group 1 (15.00)	Group 2 (20.80)	Group 3 (20.96)	Group 4 (21.62)
Group 1		5.80(2)	5.96(3)	6.62(4)
Group 2			.16(2)	.82(3)
Group 3				.66(2)
Group 4				

Dk x Critical Value(.05)

$$.4355 \times 2.77 = 1.206 (2)$$

$$.4355 \times 3.31 = 1.441 (3)$$

$$.4355 \times 3.63 = 1.58 (4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 was significantly different from Groups 2, 3, and 4, but Groups 2, 3, and 4 were not significantly different from each other.

TABLE XXIX - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, E,
AREA B

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- 1-3 years' experience, 68.50
Group 2- 4-9 years' experience, 50.20
Group 3- 10-19 years' experience, 52.49
Group 4- 20 or more years' experience, 50.08

Ordered Means

	Group 4 (50.08)	Group 2 (50.20)	Group 3 (52.49)	Group 1 (68.50)
Group 4		.12(2)	2.41(3)	18.42(4)
Group 2			2.29(2)	18.30(3)
Group 3				16.01(2)
Group 1				

Dk x Critical Value (.05)

$$1.2396 \times 2.77 = 2.43 (2)$$

$$1.2396 \times 3.31 = 4.10 (3)$$

$$1.2396 \times 3.63 = 4.49 (4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 was significantly different from Groups 2, 3, and 4, but Groups 2, 3, and 4 did not differ significantly from each other.

TABLE XXX - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, E,
AREA F

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- 1-3 years' experience, 28.00
Group 2- 4-9 years' experience, 20.47
Group 3- 10-19 years' experience, 22.99
Group 4- 20 or more years' experience, 21.05

Ordered Means

	Group 2 (20.47)	Group 4 (21.05)	Group 3 (22.99)	Group 1 (28.00)
Group 2		.58(2)	2.52(3)	7.53(4)
Group 4			1.94(2)	6.95(3)
Group 3				5.03(2)
Group 1				

Dk x Critical Value(.05)

$$.739 \times 2.77 = 2.047 (2)$$

$$.739 \times 3.31 = 2.446 (3)$$

$$.739 \times 3.63 = 2.683 (4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 differed significantly from Groups 2, 3, and 4. Groups 2 and 3 differed significantly from each other, but not from Group 4.

Hypothesis II, f

In Hypothesis II, f, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to years of experience as a school librarian," subjects were divided according to their total years of school library experience (one to three, four to nine, ten to nineteen, and twenty or more).

Hypothesis II, f, was, in general, supported, as no significant differences were found in opinions on all the areas of the questionnaire. F ratios and levels of significance may be found in Table XXXI.

However, differences significant at the .01 level were found in opinions among the groups on Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics." For Area M, then, the hypothesis was rejected. In Area M, significant differences were found, in examining the results of the Newman-Keuls method (Table XXXIII), between those respondents with ten to nineteen years' experience and those with twenty or more, the latter placing less importance on the area than the former (Table XXXII).

TABLE XXXI - HYPOTHESIS II, F, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (SCHOOL LIBRARY EXPERIENCE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	2.153			
B- Standards	1.686			
C- Administration	1.058			
D- Personnel	1.268			
E- Collections	1.899			
F- Budget	2.480			
G- Access	1.555			
H- Processes	.538			
I- Publicity	.555			
J- Guidance	1.822			
K- Instruction	.595			
L- State, U.S. Aid	1.283			
M- Research	4.494		.01	
N- Services	1.817			
O- Housing	.540			
P- Other Libraries	2.019			
Q- Selection	.226			
ALL AREAS (Total)	1.808		.146	
All Areas - $F(3,277) = 1.808$, p .05				

TABLE XXXII - MEANS OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, F

Areas	1-3 Years Experience Group Mean	4-9 Years Experience Group Mean	10-19 Years Experience Group Mean
N	13.1406	12.2547	14.0714

Areas	20 or More Years Experience Group Mean	Grand Mean
N	11.1111	12.8897

TABLE XXXIII - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, F,
AREA M

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- 1-3 years' experience, 13.14
Group 2- 4-9 years' experience, 12.25
Group 3- 10-19 years' experience, 14.07
Group 4- 20 or more years' experience, 11.11

Ordered Means

	Group 4 (11.11)	Group 2 (12.25)	Group 1 (13.14)	Group 3 (14.07)
Group 4		1.14(2)	2.03(3)	2.96(4)
Group 2			.89(2)	1.83(3)
Group 1				.93(2)
Group 3				

Dk x Critical Value (.01)

$$.5132 \times 3.64 = 1.86(2)$$

$$.5132 \times 4.12 = 2.11(3)$$

$$.5132 \times 4.40 = 2.26(4)$$

Therefore, Groups 3 and 4 differ significantly from each other, but not from 1 and 2. Groups 1 and 2 did not differ significantly from any other group nor from each other.

Hypothesis II, g

The hypothesis tested was: "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to experience in other types of libraries."

No significant differences were found between the opinions of those experienced and those inexperienced in other types of libraries in examining all the areas and any of the areas. The hypothesis was supported.

F ratios and levels of significance are in Table XXXIV below.

TABLE XXXIV - HYPOTHESIS II, G, F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OF SIGNIFICANCE (OTHER LIBRARY
EXPERIENCE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.008			
B- Standards	1.610			
C- Administration	.582			
D- Personnel	1.009			
E- Collections	3.849			
F- Budget	.860			
G- Access	.605			
H- Processes	2.595			
I- Publicity	.524			
J- Guidance	1.132			
K- Instruction	.524			
L- State, U.S. Aid	3.294			
M- Research	.269			
N- Services	.079			
O- Housing	1.602			
P- Other Libraries	.399			
Q- Selection	.760			
ALL AREAS (Total)	1.532		.217	

All Areas - $F(1, 280) = 1.532$, $p = .05$

Hypothesis II, h

Hypothesis II, h, was: "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to experience as a library educator or school library supervisor." F ratios and levels of significance are reported in Table XXXV below.

Significant differences were found at the .05 level between the opinions of those school librarians experienced and those inexperienced as a library educator or school library supervisor in Area E, "Collections," and at the .001 level in Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics." Therefore, the hypothesis, as it related to Areas E and M, was rejected.

Table XXXVI below reveals that school librarians with experience as a library educator or as a school library supervisor rated Area E as more important than did the respondents who lacked such experience, and Area M as less important.

No significant differences were found in the subjects' opinions on all of the areas of the questionnaire, and, thus, the hypothesis was, in general, supported.

TABLE XXXV - HYPOTHESIS II, H, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (LIBRARY EDUCATOR OR SUPERVISOR EXPERIENCE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	2.024			
B- Standards	.449			
C- Administration	3.034			
D- Personnel	.976			
E- Collections	4.528	.05		
F- Budget	.113			
G- Access	3.479			
H- Processes	.577			
I- Publicity	.050			
J- Guidance	2.940			
K- Instruction	1.928			
L- State, U.S. Aid	.036			
M- Research	15 .660			.001
N- Services	.218			
O- Housing	2.447			
P- Other Libraries	3.339			
Q- Selection	.328			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.601			.439
All Areas - $F(1,280) = .601, p .05$				

TABLE XXXVI - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, H

Areas	Experienced, Group Mean	Inexperienced, Group Mean	Grand Mean
E	52.5849	50.1626	51.5284
M	12.0063	14.0325	12.8901

Hypothesis II, 1

This hypothesis, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their contributing to professional literature," concerned contributions to professional literature in education and/or librarianship.

A difference significant at the .05 level between those who did and those who did not contribute to professional literature was found in opinions on Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics." Therefore, the hypothesis as it was concerned with Area M was rejected.

Table XXXVIII below demonstrates that respondents who made contributions to professional literature attached more importance to Area M than did those who made no such contribution.

No significant difference was found in opinions on all the areas of the questionnaire, and, thus, Hypothesis II, 1, was, in general, supported (Table XXXVII).

TABLE XXXVII - HYPOTHESIS II, I, F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OF SIGNIFICANCE (CONTRIBUTIONS TO
PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.223			
B- Standards	.779			
C- Administration	1.377			
D- Personnel	.366			
E- Collections	2.220			
F- Budget	.083			
G- Access	.548			
H- Processes	.655			
I- Publicity	.161			
J- Guidance	2.517			
K- Instruction	.169			
L- State, U.S. Aid	.061			
M- Research	4.326	.05		
N- Services	2.209			
O- Housing	2.148			
P- Other Libraries	.364			
Q- Selection	1.535			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.103		.748	
All Areas - $F(1,280) = .103$, p .05				

TABLE XXXVIII - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT
AREAS, HYPOTHESIS II, I

Areas	Contributors, Group Mean	Non- Contributors, Group Mean	Grand Mean
M	13.5487	12.4497	12.8901

Hypothesis II, j

This hypothesis tested: "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their having received professional honors." F ratios and levels of significance are reported in Table XXXIX.

A difference significant at the .05 level between those respondents who had and those who had not received professional honors was found in Area N, "Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs." Therefore, the hypothesis, as related to Area N, was rejected.

Area N was rated as more important by subjects who had been recipients of professional honors than by those who had not, as reported in Table XL.

No significant differences were found in the opinions on all areas of the questionnaire, and the hypothesis was, in general, supported.

TABLE XXXIX - HYPOTHESIS II. J. F RATIOS AND LEVELS
OF SIGNIFICANCE (RECEIPT OF PROFESSIONAL
HONORS)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.005			
B- Standards	1.155			
C- Administration	.011			
D- Personnel	.036			
E- Collections	.034			
F- Budget	.677			
G- Access	.855			
H- Processes	1.361			
I- Publicity	.019			
J- Guidance	.191			
K- Instruction	.279			
L- State, U.S. Aid	2.935			
M- Research	.037			
N- Services	4.366	.05		
O- Housing	.068			
P- Other Libraries	.459			
Q- Selection	1.503			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.159		.691	
All Areas - $F(1,280) = .159$, $p = .05$				

TABLE XL - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, J

Areas	Received Professional Honors, Group Mean	Not Received Professional Honors, Group Mean	Grand Mean
N	50.5956	48.1712	49.3404

Hypothesis II, k

Subjects for this hypothesis, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to age," were categorized into age groups: twenties; thirties; forties; fifties; and sixties or more.

Differences among the groups were found in opinions on Area C, "Patterns of School Library Administration and Control," at the .05 level of significance and in Area E, "Collections," at the .001 level. Thus, the hypothesis as related to Areas C and E was rejected.

In examining group means (Table XLIII) and the results of the Newman-Keuls method (Tables XLIII and XLIV), it should be noted that, for Area C, the groups from twenty to twenty-nine years old and thirty to thirty-nine years old (where greatest importance was placed on the area) differed significantly from the other three groups, but not from each other. Groups from forty to forty-nine years old and fifty to fifty-nine years old (where least importance was placed on the area) differed significantly from the other groups, but not from each other. The other group, those sixty years old or more, differed significantly from the other four groups.

For Area E, Group 1 and 2 (twenty to twenty-nine years old and thirty to thirty-nine years old), who placed the greater importance on the area, differed significantly from the other groups, but not from each other. Groups 3, 4, and 5 (forty to forty-nine years old, fifty to fifty-nine, and sixty or more), who placed lesser importance on the area, differed significantly from Groups 1 and 2, but did not differ significantly from each other.

No significant differences were found among the groups on their opinions on all areas of the questionnaire. The hypothesis was, in general, supported.

F ratios and levels of significance may be found below in Table XII.

TABLE XLI - HYPOTHESIS II, K, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (AGE)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at .05, .01, .001
A- Aims	.457	
B- Standards	1.862	
C- Administration	2.701	.05
D- Personnel	.307	
E- Collections	4.885	.001
F- Budget	1.541	
G- Access	1.671	
H- Processes	1.055	
I- Publicity	1.136	
J- Guidance	1.836	
K- Instruction	1.055	
L- State, U.S. Aid	.859	
M- Research	.396	
N- Services	.687	
O- Housing	.445	
P- Other Libraries	1.034	
Q- Selection	.998	
ALL AREAS (Total)	1.228	.299
All Areas - $F(1,277) = 1.228, p .05$		

TABLE XLII - MEANS OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS,
HYPOTHESIS II, K

Areas	20's Group Mean	30's Group Mean	40's Group Mean
C	43.3784	42.9756	39.1970
E	55.7838	54.9024	49.4545

Areas	50's Group Mean	60's or More Group Mean	Grand Mean
C	39.6263	41.3077	40.7376
E	50.8586	49.1538	51.5284

TABLE XLIII - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, X,
AREA C

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- 20-29 years, 43.38
Group 2- 30-39 years, 42.98
Group 3- 40-49 years, 39.20
Group 4- 50-59 years, 39.63
Group 5- 60 or more, 41.31

Ordered Means

	Group 3 (39.20)	Group 4 (39.63)	Group 5 (41.31)	Group 2 (42.98)	Group 1 (43.38)
Group 3		.43(2)	2.11(3)	3.78(4)	4.18(5)
Group 4			1.68(2)	3.35(3)	3.75(4)
Group 5				1.67(2)	2.07(3)
Group 2					.40(2)
Group 1					

Dk x Critical Value (.05)

$$.352 \times 2.77 = .975(2)$$

$$.352 \times 3.31 = 1.165(3)$$

$$.352 \times 3.63 = 1.278(4)$$

$$.352 \times 3.86 = 1.359(5)$$

Therefore, Group 5 differed significantly from all other groups. Group 1 and 2 differed significantly from Groups 3, 4, and 5, but not from each other. Groups 3 and 4 differed significantly from 1, 2, and 5, but not from each other.

TABLE XLIV- TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS.
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, K.
AREA E

Group and Group Means

Group 1- 20-29 years, 55.78
Group 2- 30-39 years, 54.90
Group 3- 40-49 years, 49.45
Group 4- 50-59 years, 50.86
Group 5- 60 or more, 49.15

Ordered Means

	Group 5 (49.15)	Group 3 (49.45)	Group 4 (50.86)	Group 2 (54.90)	Group 1 (55.78)
Group 5		.30(2)	1.71(3)	5.75(4)	6.63(5)
Group 3			1.41(2)	5.45(3)	6.33(4)
Group 4				4.04(2)	4.92(3)
Group 2					.88(2)
Group 1					

Dk x Critical Value (.01)

$$.391 \times 3.64 = 1.42 (2)$$

$$.391 \times 4.12 = 1.61 (3)$$

$$.391 \times 4.40 = 1.72 (4)$$

$$.391 \times 4.60 = 1.79 (5)$$

Therefore, Groups 1 and 2 differed significantly from Groups 3, 4, and 5, but not from each other. Groups 3, 4, and 5 differed significantly from Groups 1 and 2 but not from each other.

Hypothesis II, 1

Hypothesis II, 1, concerned: "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to sex."

A significant difference at the .05 level was found in opinions of the two groups on Area N, "Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs." The hypothesis, as related to Area N, was rejected. From Table XLVI below it would appear that women rated Area N as higher in importance than did men.

No significant difference was found in the subjects' opinions on all areas of the questionnaire, and, therefore, the hypothesis was, in general, supported.

F ratios and levels of significance may be found in Table XLV below.

TABLE XLV - HYPOTHESIS II, L, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (SEX)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.120			
B- Standards	1.022			
C- Administration	.129			
D- Personnel	.130			
E- Collections	.622			
F- Budget	.327			
G- Access	.070			
H- Processes	.916			
I- Publicity	.018			
J- Guidance	.000			
K- Instruction	.041			
L- State, U.S. Aid	2.143			
M- Research	1.666			
N- Services	4.645	.05		
O- Housing	.016			
P- Other Libraries	.595			
Q- Selection	.365			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.005		.942	
All Areas- $F(1,241) = .005$, p .05				

TABLE XLVI - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT
AREAS, HYPOTHESIS II, L

Areas	Male Group Mean	Female Group Mean	Grand Mean
N	46.2250	49.9212	49.3128

Hypothesis II, a

In Hypothesis II, a, "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to marital status," subjects were divided into those married and those unmarried.

No significant differences were found in opinions on all areas of the questionnaire or on any of the areas. The hypothesis, then, was supported.

F ratios and levels of significance may be found below in Table XLVII.

TABLE XLVII - HYPOTHESIS II. M, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (MARITAL STATUS)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	.921			
B- Standards	.267			
C- Administration	.286			
D- Personnel	.103			
E- Collections	.045			
F- Budget	1.005			
G- Access	.405			
H- Processes	.314			
I- Publicity	.081			
J- Guidance	1.026			
K- Instruction	.078			
L- State, U.S. Aid	.039			
M- Research	1.439			
N- Services	.271			
O- Housing	.889			
P- Other Libraries	.015			
Q- Selection	.770			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.035		.852	
All Areas - $F(1,280) = .035$, p .05				

Hypothesis II, n

Hypothesis II, n, stated: "School librarians' opinions on research and research needs were not related to their highest level of participation in professional organizations." Respondents were divided according to their level of activity: membership in a state education or library organization; officer or committee responsibility in a state library or education organization; membership in a national education or library organization; and officer or committee responsibility in a national education or library organization.

Significant differences at the .05 level were found in group opinions on Area I, "Publicity and Public Relations," and Area K, "Library Instruction," and at the .001 level in Area N, "Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs." Thus, for Areas I, K, and N, the hypothesis was rejected.

Examining group means (Table XLIX) and the findings of the Newman-Kuels method (Tables L, LI, and LII), it should be noted that, in Areas I, K, and

N, group 1 (state membership) differed significantly from the other groups which did not differ significantly from each other. Group 1, members of state library or education associations, placed less importance on these areas than the others did.

No significant differences were found in the groups' opinions on all areas of the questionnaire, and the hypothesis was, in general, supported.

F ratios and levels of significance may be found below in Table XLVIII.

TABLE XLVIII - HYPOTHESIS II. N, F RATIOS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE (PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS)

Areas	F Ratios	Significant at		
		.05	.01	.001
A- Aims	1.381			
B- Standards	.943			
C- Administration	.334			
D- Personnel	.119			
E- Collections	1.122			
F- Budget	1.412			
G- Access	.998			
H- Processes	.612			
I- Publicity	2.690	.05		
J- Guidance	2.220			
K- Instruction	3.680	.05		
L- State, U.S. Aid	1.372			
M- Research	1.044			
N- Services	5.999	.001		
O- Housing	1.677			
P- Other Libraries	.174			
Q- Selection	2.168			
ALL AREAS (Total)	.751		.522	
All Areas - $F(3,264) = .751, p .05$				

TABLE XLIX - MEANS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AREAS.
HYPOTHESIS II, N

Areas	Group A Mean	Group B Mean	Group C Mean
I	20.0968	23.5200	22.600
K	13.9355	16.4800	15.8875
N	44.3871	52.0800	48.4875

Areas	Group D Mean	Grand Mean
I	22.5122	22.5410
K	15.9390	15.8433
N	50.2195	49.5485

Group A: member of a state organization
 Group B: officer or committee responsibility,
 state organization
 Group C: member of a national organization
 Group D: officer or committee responsibility,
 national organization

TABLE I - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, N,
AREA I

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- membership in state organization, 20.10
Group 2- officer or committee responsibility,
state organization, 23.52
Group 3- membership in national organization, 22.60
Group 4- officer or committee responsibility,
national organization, 22.51

Ordered Means

	Group 1 (20.10)	Group 4 (22.51)	Group 3 (22.60)	Group 2 (23.52)
Group 1		2.41(2)	2.50(3)	3.42(4)
Group 4			.09(2)	1.11(3)
Group 3				.92(2)
Group 2				

Dk x Critical Value (.05)

$$.6899 \times 2.77 = 1.91(2)$$

$$.6899 \times 3.31 = 2.28(3)$$

$$.6899 \times 3.64 = 2.51(4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 was significantly different from Groups 2, 3, and 4, but Groups 2, 3, and 4 did not differ significantly from each other.

TABLE LI - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, N,
AREA K

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- membership in state organization, 13.94
Group 2- officer or committee responsibility,
state organization, 16.48
Group 3- membership in national organization, 15.89
Group 4- officer or committee responsibility,
national organization, 15.94

Ordered Means

	Group 1 (13.94)	Group 3 (15.89)	Group 4 (15.94)	Group 2 (16.48)
Group 1		1.95(2)	2.00(3)	2.54(4)
Group 3			.05(2)	.59(3)
Group 4				.54(2)
Group 2				

Dk x Critical Value (.05)

$$.4414 \times 2.77 = 1.22 (2)$$

$$.4414 \times 3.31 = 1.46 (3)$$

$$.4414 \times 3.63 = 1.60 (4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 was significantly different from Groups 2, 3, and 4, but Groups 2, 3, and 4 were not significantly different from each other.

TABLE LII - TESTS ON ALL ORDERED PAIRS OF MEANS
(NEWMAN-KEULS), HYPOTHESIS II, N,
ABBA N

Groups and Group Means

Group 1- membership in state organization, 44.39
Group 2- officer or committee responsibility,
state organization, 52.08
Group 3- membership in national organization, 48.99
Group 4- officer or committee responsibility,
national organization, 50.22

Ordered Means

	Group 1 (44.39)	Group 3 (48.49)	Group 4 (50.22)	Group 2 (52.08)
Group 1		4.10(2)	5.83(3)	7.69(4)
Group 3			1.73(2)	3.59(3)
Group 4				1.86(2)
Group 2				

Dk x Critical Value (.01)

$$1.09 \times 3.64 = 3.97 (2)$$

$$1.09 \times 4.12 = 4.49 (3)$$

$$1.09 \times 4.40 = 4.80 (4)$$

Therefore, Group 1 was significantly different from Groups 2, 3, and 4, but Groups 2, 3, and 4 were not significantly different from each other.

Ancillary FindingsResponse Rate

Table A-II in the Appendix reports the rate of response by school-library leaders and practicing school librarians. Although the rate of response in the return of the questionnaire, Part I and Part II, did not differ markedly between the two groups, the rate of response to the letter introducing the project did. A majority of the school-library leaders (65.24%) responded to the introductory letter, while only a minority of the practicing school librarians (37.19%) responded to it.

Importance of the Areas to the School Librarians

An indication of the relative importance placed on each of the areas of the questionnaire by the school-library leaders, the practicing school librarians, and both of the groups was suggested through an averaging of the group opinion on each area. This was accomplished by using the sub-scores of the subjects for each area, summing them, and dividing by the number of subjects and the number of items in the area. This, then, constituted, in effect, the mean of each group's opinion on the relative importance of each area. This is reported below in Table LIII which should be read in the context of the importance-unimportance scale of one to five. It should be noted that on the one-to-five scale: one indicated that the respondents considered the area as "unimportant"; two, "of limited importance"; three, "important"; four, "very important"; and five, "absolutely essential."

TABLE LIII - RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF AREAS; AVERAGE
PLACEMENT ON IMPORTANCE-UNIMPORTANCE
SCALE BY GROUPS

Areas	Leaders	Practi- tioners	Both Groups
A- Aims	3.5854	3.4729	3.5292
B- Standards	3.5797	3.6762	3.6280
C- Administration	3.5113	3.2494	3.3804
D- Personnel	3.5663	3.4441	3.5052
E- Collections	3.3818	3.4649	3.4233
F- Budget	3.6536	3.6266	3.6401
G- Access	3.8311	3.5995	3.7153
H- Processes	3.3863	3.2646	3.3254
I- Publicity	3.8322	3.6980	3.7651
J- Guidance	3.4467	3.6987	3.5727
K- Instruction	4.0227	3.8928	3.9577
L- State, U.S. aid	3.7326	3.5335	3.6331
M- Research	3.4561	2.9983	3.2272
N- Services	3.8936	3.6868	3.7902
O- Housing	3.4040	3.5490	3.4765
P- Other libraries	3.4393	3.1396	3.2895
Q- Selection	3.6291	3.4018	3.5155
All Areas	3.5934	3.4750	3.5342

Data from the table immediately above was then arranged in rank order, firstly for both groups of school librarians, secondly, for the school-library leaders, and thirdly, for the practicing school librarians. The rank orders are reported below in Tables LIV, LV, and LVI.

TABLE LIV - RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF AREAS BY
SCHOOL LIBRARIANS (SCHOOL-LIBRARY
LEADERS AND PRACTICING SCHOOL LIBRARIANS)

Rank order	Area	Average on scale
1	Instruction	3.9577
2	Services	3.7902
3	Publicity	3.7651
4	Access	3.7153
5	Budget	3.6401
6	State, U.S. aid	3.6331
7	Standards	3.6280
8	Guidance	3.5727
9	Aims	3.5292
10	Selection	3.5155
11	Personnel	3.5052
12	Housing	3.4765
13	Collections	3.4233
14	Administration	3.3804
15	Processes	3.3254
16	Other libraries	3.2895
17	Research	3.2272

TABLE LV - RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF AREAS BY
SCHOOL-LIBRARY LEADERS

Rank Order	Area	Average on scale
1	Instruction	4.0227
2	Services	3.8936
3	Publicity	3.8322
4	Access	3.8311
5	State, U.S. aid	3.7326
6	Budget	3.6536
7	Selection	3.6291
8	Aims	3.5854
9	Standards	3.5797
10	Personnel	3.5663
11	Administration	3.5113
12	Research	3.4561
13	Guidance	3.4467
14	Other libraries	3.4393
15	Housing	3.4040
16	Processes	3.3863
17	Collections	3.3818

TABLE LVI - RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF AREAS BY
PRACTICING SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

Rank Order	Area	Average on scale
1	Instruction	3.8928
2	Guidance	3.6987
3	Publicity	3.6980
4	Services	3.6868
5	Standards	3.6762
6	Budget	3.6266
7	Access	3.5995
8	Housing	3.5490
9	State, U.S. aid	3.5335
10	Aims	3.4729
11	Collections	3.4649
12	Personnel	3.4441
13	Selection	3.4018
14	Processes	3.2646
15	Administration	3.2494
16	Other libraries	3.1396
17	Research	2.9983

Response to Part II

Part II of the questionnaire, and a cover letter, was sent to all subjects who returned Part I. No follow-up letter was sent. The rate of response to Part II was: school-library leaders, 44.37%; practicing school librarians, 47.40%.

Quotations from Part II from the school-library leaders might be found in the Identification Report. Quotations from the practicing school librarians are assembled in the Appendix.

Responses from both groups were categorized by topic, with the topics mentioned placed in rank order according to the number of times each was mentioned and commented upon by the respondents. The rank order of the topics is noted below in Table LVII.

TABLE LVII - RANK ORDER OF TOPICS MENTIONED IN
RESPONSE TO PART II

School-library leaders	Practicing School Librarians
1. Education of school library personnel	1. Relations with teachers and administrators
2. Shortage and recruiting of school librarians	2. Education of school library personnel
3. Effectiveness of school libraries (especially as instructional materials centers, & with students)	3. Workload and tasks of school librarians
4. Relations with teachers and administrators	4. Selection (and censorship)
5. Centralized cataloging and processing	5. Shortage and recruiting of school librarians
6. Selection	6. Standards
7. Federal aid to school libraries	7. Public library-school library cooperation
8. Supervision and supervisory practices	8. Library instruction
9. Workload and tasks of school librarians	9. Federal aid to school libraries
10. Establishment of regional centers for school libraries	10. Adequate budget
11. Public library-school library cooperation	11. Effectiveness of school libraries
12. Library instruction	12. Centralized cataloging and processing

Summary of Findings

Findings of this investigation, as related to the total "all areas" scores, resulted in the rejection of the first hypothesis, for significant differences at the .05 level were found between the opinions of school-library leaders and practicing school librarians. The leaders attached more importance to "all areas" than did the practicing school librarians.

Further, significant differences were found between the leaders and the practitioners at the .05 level in three areas (Guidance, Services, and Selection), at the .01 level in two areas (Access and Other Libraries), and at the .001 level in two areas (Administration and Research). School-library leaders placed more importance on these areas than did the practicing school librarians, with only one exception.

In addition, differences between the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians were noted not only in their proportion of response to the letter introducing the investigation, but also in the rank order of the areas for Part I and in the rank order of the topics listed in response to Part II.

The second hypothesis, when tested by the total "all areas" scores, was supported, for in no case did the investigation of the groups categorized by biographical information result in significant differences between or among the groups.

No differences were found in comparing any of the seventeen areas when subjects were divided according to recency of educational preparation in librarianship, to experience or inexperience in libraries other than school libraries, or to marital status.

In examining differences in areas when subjects were categorized according to other biographical data, some significant differences were found. These differences, and their direction and source, are noted below, organized area by area.

Area A, "Aims and Objectives of School Libraries," was found to have significant differences at the .05 level when respondents were categorized according to their total number of years of experience in teaching and librarianship and whether they were experienced or inexperienced as library educators or supervisors. The area was considered more important

by experienced library educators/supervisors and by those with more than one to three years' total experience in teaching or librarianship.

Differences in Area C, "Patterns of School Library Administration and Control," were found to have been significant at the .001 level when the subjects were divided by school-library leaders and practicing school librarians categories, and at the .05 level, by age. Thus respondents who felt this area to be more important were school-library leaders, and were those from twenty to thirty-nine years old.

Respondents differed significantly in their opinions on Area E, "Collections," and differed at the .001 level when divided by age, at the .01 level when divided according to the highest level of educational attainment, and at the .05 level when categorized by accredited or non-accredited school library program and by the total number of years of experience in teaching and librarianship. Therefore, subjects who had post-fifth year degree work, who had degrees from accredited schools, who had more than one to three years of total experience in teaching and librarianship, and who were forty years old or

more rated this area as less important than other groups did.

Significant differences at the .05 level were found in Area F, "Budgets and Business Practices," when subjects were categorized by the total number of years of experience in teaching and librarianship. In this area, persons with one to three years' experience in teaching and librarianship rated the area as more important than the other groups. Also, a difference was noted between those of four to nine years' experience and ten to nineteen years', the latter placing more importance on the area than the former.

In Area G, "Accessibility and Use," a significant difference at the .01 level was found when subjects were divided by school library leaders and practicing school librarians grouping. School-library leaders felt this area to have been more important than practicing school librarians did.

Differences significant at the .05 level were found in Area I, "Publicity and Public Relations," when respondents were grouped according to their highest level of participation in professional organizations. Respondents who held memberships in

state library or education associations, but who held no offices or had no committee responsibilities on the state level, and who did not participate in national organizations placed less importance on the area than did the others.

In Area J, "Guidance Functions," differences significant at the .05 level were found when subjects were grouped by school-library leaders and practicing school librarians, and by the accreditation status of the library school program. Practicing school librarians and those who had received degrees from non-accredited schools attached more importance to this area than the other groups did.

Differences significant at the .05 level were found in group opinions on Area K, "Library Instruction," when the subjects were divided by term of employment and highest level of participation in professional organizations. Subjects who were employed as full-time librarians rated this as more important. Subjects who were members of state library or education associations but who had no memberships or responsibilities above that level placed less importance on the area than the others did.

Differences in group opinion on Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics," were found to have been significant at: the .001 level when the respondents were divided into school-library leaders and practicing school librarians groups, accredited and non-accredited school library programs, and experience or inexperience as a library educator or supervisor; at the .01 level when subjects were grouped according to total number of years of experience as a school librarian; and at the .05 level when subjects were divided by whether or not they contributed to professional literature. Subjects who felt this area to have been more important were school-library leaders, held degrees from accredited school library programs, had ten to nineteen years' experience as a school librarian, contributed to professional literature, and were inexperienced as a library educator or supervisor.

Differences were found in group opinion on Area N, "Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs," which were significant at the .05 level when subjects were divided by school-library leader

and practicing school librarian grouping, by receipt or non-receipt of professional honors, and by sex, and at the .001 level when categorized by the highest level of participation in professional organizations. Subjects who were school-library leaders, had received professional honors, and who were women rated this area as more important than other groups did. Subjects who held memberships in state library or education associations, but without responsibilities above that level, rated this area as less important.

In Area P, "Relations with Other Libraries," significant differences at the .01 level were found when subjects were divided by school-library leaders and practicing school librarians groupings. School-library leaders attached more importance to this area than did the practicing school librarians.

In Area Q, "Selection and Censorship," differences in group opinion were found to have been significant at the .05 level when subjects were categorized according to school-library leaders and practicing school librarians groupings and to term of employment. Thus, subjects who were school-library

leaders and who were employed full-time as school librarians found this area more important than did the other groups.

No significant differences among group opinions were found for Area B, "School Library Standards," Area D, "School Library Personnel," Area H, "Technical Processes," Area L, "State, Regional, and Federal Programs," or Area O, "Housing and Equipment."

Areas of particular interest were Area E, "Collections," which well-educated, experienced, and mature respondents rated as less important than other groups did, and Area M, "Library Research Methods and Statistics," where the school-library leaders, with experience and with degrees from accredited library schools, rated the area as more important.

It was interesting that Area J, "Guidance Functions," primarily concerned with the role of the librarian and the library in general guidance and reading guidance, was not considered as important by library leaders as by practicing school librarians and graduates of unaccredited schools.

It was also interesting that, with much publicity having been given federal aid programs and library standards, no significant differences were revealed in any of the group opinions toward these topics. Nor, with the division of subjects into those experienced and inexperienced in other types of libraries, did any differences appear in the area concerned with relations with other libraries.

Another interesting factor appeared in the level of participation in professional organizations and opinions expressed toward various areas. Interestingly, subjects whose participation was limited to membership in state associations consistently rated the significantly different areas as less important than did those subjects who were members of national organizations or who had responsibilities in state or national organizations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter V will first present a discussion of the findings. The chapter will then summarize the hypotheses, methods, and findings, and will present conclusions, limitations of the study, and implications and recommendations suggested by the study.

Discussion of the Findings

This section will discuss the findings previously reported. It is intended to answer the following questions: how did the school librarians rate the importance of research and research needs in school librarianship; were there differences in group opinions between school-library leaders and practicing school librarians; were there differences in school librarians' opinions when the school librarians were grouped by other categories. It will also present whatever causes can be ascertained for these differences.

Opinion of Research Needs

When the opinions of the school librarians (school-library leaders and practicing school librarians)

were placed in rank order, the first area of concern was "instruction" in library skills. This high ranking might have been reflective of the everyday concerns of practicing school librarians on the problems of orienting and teaching students library and research skills, and of the recent emphasis and study of the American Library Association on problems of instruction in all types of libraries. The second ranking was that of "services," both to teachers and pupils, and special services offered by librarians working with special school programs. This ranking was not unexpected, for it appeared not only to indicate the concern for ways of improving the traditional library services, but also might have been indicative of the interest in the relatively unexplored region of services to the special educational programs. The third ranking was "publicity." As this area dealt not only with publicizing the library and its services, but also with relations with the library's public, the ranking, it is speculated, might have been reflective of the growing concern of the profession for its public image.

Differences between School-Library Leaders and
Practicing School Librarians

In determining whether there were differences in group opinions toward research and research needs on the part of school-library leaders and practicing school librarians it was necessary to examine various portions of the findings.

Differences in the two groups were apparent in the average group scaling of the relative importance of all of the areas and of each area. The findings here demonstrated clearly that, in the total for all the areas, the leaders rated the total areas of research needs as more important than did the practicing school librarians. In considering each area, the leaders rated all but "standards," "guidance," and "housing" as more important than practicing school librarians did.

Significant differences appeared between the two groups' opinions on the total of all the areas and on seven of the individual areas: "administration"; "accessibility"; "guidance"; "research"; "services";

"relations with other libraries"; and "selection." In all but one of these ("guidance"), school-library leaders felt the area (and the total of all the areas) to have been more important than did the practicing school librarians:

Only the area of guidance did the practicing school librarians rate as higher in importance (where a significant difference existed) than the leaders. The reasons for this difference between the groups were unknown. It might well have been a measure of a possible isolation of the school-library leaders from the everyday reading and social guidance work practiced by the other group. It might well have been an awareness on the part of practicing school librarians of their unusual non-judgmental role in schools. Or, it might have been the possible orientation of the leaders to service to the faculties and administration or to services on a group basis, rather than a postulated service-to-individual-students viewpoint of the practicing school librarians. The unknown factors affecting this area appear to require further research.

Further differences were revealed between the school-library leaders and the practicing school

librarians in their rank ordering of the importance of the areas. Although practicing school librarians ranked guidance as second, school-library leaders ranked it as thirteenth. Problems in selection and censorship were also ranked differently, with the leaders placing it as seventh and the practitioners as thirteenth (the difference was found significant). The difference in ranking here might have been a difference in outlook on the selection process, who ought to be involved, and the extent of involvement. Or, it might have been an indication of a differentiation in viewpoint on research needed on censorship problems. Questions raised in this area need further research.

Another area which was ranked differently was that of research. Leaders ranked the area as twelfth and practitioners as seventeenth, and last. This area (in which the difference between the groups was significant) was concerned with state, national, and local patterns of gathering statistics, of the effectiveness and use of such statistics, and with the effectiveness of use studies, cost studies, attitude studies, and various methods of evaluating school libraries.

One area which the investigator anticipated as being ranked higher was that concerned with relations with other libraries. There was a significant difference between the leaders' and the practitioners' opinions on this area, and it was classified in the fourteenth position by the leaders and the sixteenth by the practitioners.

Although accessibility was placed as fourth in rank order by both groups, there was a difference, and a significant difference, in the groups' opinions. A further difference (which was significant) was found in the area on administration, which was rated higher by the leaders. This was an expected difference, as the leaders were probably more experienced and interested in problems of administration than the practicing school librarians were.

Other differences were apparent between school-library leaders and practicing school librarians in their opinions on Part II of the questionnaire. Major differences between their rankings on various facets appeared: (1) leaders ranked the effectiveness of school libraries as third, while practitioners, as

eleventh; (2) shortage and recruiting of personnel was placed second by the leaders and fifth by the practitioners; (3) relations with the school staff was ranked fourth by leaders and first by the practitioners; and (4) centralized services were placed fifth by the leaders and twelfth by the practitioners. Both groups appeared generally to agree on the importance of the education of school librarians, with the leaders ranking it as first and the practitioners as second.

An interesting difference, incidentally, appeared in the rankings of the education of school librarians, which was a major concern when listed in response to Part II and relatively minor when scaled for Part I. This would appear to indicate that the combining of education with other items concerning library personnel in Part I probably obscured the opinions of the subjects on the importance of this topic.

In addition to the differences revealed by the average importance-scaling of the areas, the rank order of the importance of the areas, and the findings of significant differences, a further variety was found

between school library leaders and practicing school librarians in their response to the first letter which introduced the investigation. The response percentages here were indicative of the interest of the leaders and of a lesser interest by practicing school librarians. Little difference was experienced in the response of the two groups to the actual return of the questionnaire, Part I, or to the return of Part II. However, had the timing for the mailing of Part II for the leaders been changed to avoid conflicts with the mid-winter American Library Association meeting and with between-semester vacations for the library educators, there might have resulted a noticeable difference in response between the leaders and practitioners.

Thus, differences between the group opinions of the school-library leaders and the practicing school librarians did appear, and the hypothesis of the existence of such difference was supported. Although reasons for the differences were not completely investigated, it would appear reasonable that they might have been based on the broader view of the profession which was expected of school-library leaders. The

leaders, with their interest in education, supervision, and professional activities, would seem to have been oriented toward a more perceptive outlook on, and a deeper concern for, the questions of school librarianship in which research was necessary. The broader viewpoint afforded by professional activities would appear to have been supported by the findings on the differences between school librarians' opinions when they were categorized by their highest level of professional activities. The evidence, as related to supervisory or teaching activities, was inconclusive.

Differences Related to Other Biographical Data

Differences among school librarians (school-library leaders and practicing school librarians combined) when they were divided by categories such as education or experience were reported in the findings for Hypothesis II, and were summarized. If the group opinions of school librarians, thus divided, were considered on the basis of their views on all the items of the questionnaire, then no significant differences could be reported. However, there were some significant differences reported among group opinions

toward individual areas of the questionnaire. Some of these differences, or lack of differences, were of interest.

The difference in opinion when the subjects were divided by highest level of participation in professional organizations was discussed above.

It was believed by the investigator that school librarians who had had experience in libraries other than school libraries would tend to place more emphasis on inter-library cooperation and the solving of inter-library problems than would the inexperienced. However, no significant differences were found in the opinions of the experienced and the inexperienced group. This might have been because the experience in other types of libraries was not as influential as presumed, or that unknown factors, such as the content of the educational preparation, might have influenced the data.

Also contrary to expectations, the findings, when the subjects were divided by the date of their latest library science degree, showed no significant differences among the groups. It was postulated by the investigator that those with more recent degrees would have tended to have been more acutely concerned

with research needs, as the profession began to accentuate this topic more than in the past, and as this accentuation presumably was reflected in library schools' curricula. It would seem that either the increased emphasis on research was not taking place, or else a certain measure of research had been emphasized and this emphasis had not appreciably changed.

The area on collections, their scope, the problems of building print and non-print collections, and the selection tools had definite differences of opinion concerning it. Although this is one of the principal professional tasks of the school librarian, surprisingly enough, school librarians who were experienced and well-educated felt this as less important than the others did. This appeared to have been an inexplicable difference, but might have been attributed to the successful experiences in this area of the well-educated and experienced librarian as opposed to the less experienced who presumably were still groping for solutions to the problems.

The area concerned with reading and social guidance also showed significant differences among the groups. Here practicing school librarians and those

who had received degrees from non-accredited library schools found this area more important than other groups did. It was believed by the investigator that this finding was indicative of a change in emphasis of service, from the student as an individual to the student as a member of a group, and from service to students to service to teachers, these changes being more strongly reflected in the leadership group.

A vital area of concern in this investigation was that on research, the effectiveness of methods of studying libraries, and the gathering of statistical information on school libraries. It was expected that the better educated, more experienced, and more sophisticated (as related to professional problems) school librarians would place significantly more emphasis on research than would the less well educated, less experienced, and less sophisticated. The findings supported this expectation, except for the division of subjects by experience as a library educator or supervisor. Those inexperienced as educators or supervisors rated the area as more important than did the experienced. This might have been a reflection of an opinion on the so-called impossibility of conducting research on research, or it might have been indicative

of the possible inadequacy of the instrument to test opinion in this particular phase of research. However, in the other categories concerning the respondents' school library experience, leadership, accredited school library programs, and contributions to professional literature significant differences did appear, and made more puzzling the lack of significant difference discussed above.

Thus, the findings show that differences existed between school library leaders and practicing school librarians and between school librarians variously grouped. Some explanations of these differences were suggested.

Summary of Hypotheses, Method,
and Findings

Essentially, this investigation was intended to test whether any differences existed in the expressed opinion on research and research needs in school librarianship of the subjects, variously grouped. Null hypotheses were used. The first hypothesis concerned opinions of the subjects categorized into school-library leaders and practicing school librarians. The second examined opinions of subjects grouped according to certain biographical information.

A mail questionnaire of one hundred sixty items, organized into seventeen areas, with an importance-unimportance scale, was the data-gathering instrument. A total sum for all the one hundred sixty items ("all areas") was found for each respondent, as were seventeen sub-scores, reflecting the sum of the items in each area of the questionnaire.

The existence of differences between group opinion was tested by analysis of variance, and differences were reported for each of the seventeen areas of the questionnaire. Levels of significance were also reported for the totals of the areas combined ("all areas").

When the subjects were divided into two groups, results of the analysis of variance were used to indicate whether any significant differences existed, and a comparison of group means indicated where the differences lay. When the subjects were divided into more than two groups, analysis of variance was used to denote the existence of differences, the Newman-Keuls method, to establish the precise location of the differences among groups, and a comparison of group means, to indicate the level of importance assigned by the groups.

Findings of this investigation, as related to the total, "all areas," scores, resulted in the rejection of the first hypothesis, for significant differences were found between school-library leaders and practicing school librarians. The leaders attached more importance to "all areas" than did the practicing school librarians.

Further, significant differences were found between school-library leaders and practicing school librarians at the .05 level in three areas, the .01 level in two areas, and at the .001 level in two areas.

School-library leaders placed more importance on these areas than did the practicing school librarians, with only one exception.

In addition, differences between the school-library leaders were noted in their proportion of response to the letter introducing the investigation, where leaders indicated their greater interest in research and research needs by their percentage of response, as compared to the practicing school librarians. Differences also appeared in the scaling and rank order of Part I and in the rank order of the topics listed by subjects in response to Part II.

The second hypothesis, when tested by the total, "all areas," score, was supported, for in no case did investigation of the groups categorized by biographical data result in significant differences between or among the groups.

When subjects were grouped by biographical information and compared on the basis of differences of group opinion toward each area, some significant differences were revealed. Areas which appeared to have been of greatest interest in comparing groups divided by biographical information were those

concerned with library collections, library research methods and the gathering of library statistics, and the level of participation in the activities of professional organizations. However, no general pattern of group differences of opinion affecting the individual areas emerged.

Conclusions

The conclusions which follow were based on the findings of this investigation.

A significant difference of opinion on research and research needs in school librarianship existed between school-library leaders and practicing school librarians in their over-all opinions on all of the areas of the questionnaire, and also in some of the areas. School-library leaders, in general, placed more importance on the research needs than did the practicing school librarians.

In over-all opinion on research needs, no significant differences of opinion existed between groups of school librarians when they were divided according to the biographical data. On scattered areas

of the questionnaire, however, differences of opinion did exist between groups of school librarians when they were divided according to the biographical data.

Thus, it would appear that the leadership positions held by school librarians, either occupational positions, such as state school library supervisors, or professional association positions, such as presidents of state school library associations, were related to school librarians' opinions on research and research needs.

Also, school librarians who were active in professional associations tended to view as more important the research needs in school librarianship than did those who were inactive.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the instrument employed, by the relatively small sample, and by the self-selection factor inherent in the procedures employed to introduce the project and to secure response.

The use of the mail questionnaire, though an eminently practical method of acquiring response from a widely distributed population, had, of course, certain inherent liabilities. Various factors influencing the

response of subjects could not, of course, be identified or controlled, and it was, thus, impossible to determine whether or not subjects responded with the research focus of the questionnaire in mind or whether the response reflected the subjects' beliefs on the pressing major problems of school librarianship. Although every effort was made to reinforce the research focus of the questionnaire (as described in Chapter III), it cannot be stated that all subjects responded within that framework. It was possible, given the length of the questionnaire and the failure to restate the research focus at intervals throughout it, that a shift in attention from "research" to "major problems" might have occurred. No evidence exists that such a shift did or did not happen. The focus of response, then, remained an unknown factor in this investigation, as it must in all utilizing a mail questionnaire.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this investigation, an exploration into the differences in the opinions of school librarians on research and research needs in school librarianship, might be indicative of the attitudes of school librarians toward research. To the extent that opinion was expressive of attitude, and

it appeared as though it logically were, then it must be stated that school librarians' implied attitudes toward research differed, and differed according to their leadership position. School librarians not in a leadership position, appeared, from this investigation, to have placed less importance on research and research needs than did the leaders. Thus, it would seem that school-library leaders, those whose positions afforded them a broader view of the profession, as opposed to practicing school librarians, whose daily concerns related more closely to the operations of a single school or school system, were more cognizant of, and more concerned with, research needs in school librarianship.

If the differences in opinions, established here, between leaders and practitioners were based on the differences in opportunities for observing the over-all broad picture of school librarianship and its research needs, and they would appear so, then it would seem that there was an implication of the contributions made to individual insight by participation in professional organizations and by seizing opportunities for professional growth through activities

in supervisory duties, teaching responsibilities, and other contributions to the development of the profession. It would appear, then, that activity in professional organizations might contribute to increasing the understanding of, and broadening the viewpoint of, the active participants.

In order to create an appreciation of the role of research in school librarianship, the need for which appeared to have been pointed out in this investigation, it would seem necessary to examine and strengthen the curricula, in the role of research, research needs, and research techniques, for prospective school librarians, and to provide educational opportunities for practicing school librarians to acquaint themselves further with these topics.

This investigation, then, implied that various experiential and educational factors (particularly the leadership roles and active participation in professional organizations) affected the opinions and attitudes of school librarians toward research needs, and that there was a need for increased insight into the research needs of the profession (particularly on the part of practicing school librarians).

Suggestions for Further Research

This investigation was replete with research possibilities, indicating, as it did, those areas which were considered by school libraries to have been particularly important.

It would also appear that research into reasons underlying the assignment of importance or unimportance to certain categories of research needs would be productive. In some cases, where expected or unexpected ratings occurred, reasons could only be surmised. Thus, for example, further research into an area such as reading guidance, where a shift in attitude on individual guidance was hypothesized, might be enlightening. Research into library services, and the possible shift in emphasis from service to the individual student to group service or to faculty service, might also prove interesting. An investigation into the involvement of school personnel in the selections of materials, and the academic preparation of teachers in selecting and using the present variety of materials should be productive. Case studies and other investigations of inter-library cooperation and of the distinctive roles and functions of various types

of libraries might produce information useful to those concerned with inter-library relationships.

It would also appear that extensive investigation into problems of instructing library patrons in library and research skills might prove most helpful to the profession. Furthermore, the present investigation has pointed out the interest in the educational preparation of school librarians. Examinations of the present curricula of library school programs, the various emphases of the programs, the dual educational preparation as a school librarian and as a teacher, and the inclusion of the multi-media approach of teaching and librarianship in the curricula might be productive, as would other experimentation in the academic preparation of school librarians.

Further replication of this investigation, with other groupings of librarians, might also prove interesting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "American Association of Library Schools," Journal of Education for Librarianship, VI (Winter, 1966), 228.
- American Association of School Librarians. "Board of Directors, 1962-1963." Chicago, 1962. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. "Board of Directors, 1963-1964." Chicago, 1963. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. "Board of Directors, 1964-1965." Chicago, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. "Board of Directors, 1965-1966." Chicago, 1965. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. "Board of Directors, 1966-1967." Chicago, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. Standards for School Library Programs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1961.
- American Association of School Librarians. "State and Regional School Library Associations." Chicago, n.d. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians. "State School Library Supervisors, 1966." Chicago, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

- American Association of School Librarians. "State School Library Supervisors, 1966. Corrections." Chicago, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians, School Library Development Project. "Research Needs of the School Library Program." Chicago, 1961. (Mimeographed.)
- American Association of School Librarians, School Library Development Project. "The Role of Research in School Library Development." A Report of the Study Group on the Role of Research, School Library Development Workshop, Chicago, April 28 to April 30, 1961. Chicago, 1961. (Mimeographed.)
- Ash, L. (ed.) Who's Who in Library Service. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1966.
- Backstrom, C.H. and Hursh, G.D. Survey Research. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Barrilleaux, L.E. "A Comparison of Textbooks and Multiple Library References," School Science and Mathematics, LXIII (March, 1963), 245-49.
- Borg, W.R. Educational Research. New York: McKay, 1963.
- Buchler, J. (ed.) Philosophical Writings of Charles Peirce. New York: Dover, 1955.
- Cole, T.J. "Origin and Development of School Libraries," Peabody Journal of Education, XXXVIII (September, 1959), 87-92.
- Croxton, F.E. and Cowden, D.J. Applied General Statistics. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939.
- Danton, J.P. "Doctoral Study in Librarianship in the United States," College and University Libraries, XX (November, 1959), 436-53.
- Darling, R.L. Personal letter. May 11, 1967.

- Fenwick, S.I. Personal letter. April 24, 1967.
- Forman, S. "Current Research," School Libraries, XVI (Winter, 1967), 42-3.
- Garrett, H.E. Elementary Statistics. New York: McKay, 1962.
- Gaver, M.V. Effectiveness of Centralized Library Services in Elementary Schools. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers, Graduate School of Library Service, 1960.
- Gaver, M.V. "Effectiveness of Centralized Library Services in Elementary Schools," Library Quarterly, XXXI (July, 1961), 245-56.
- Gaver, M.V. "Research on Elementary School Libraries," ALA Bulletin, LVI (February, 1962), 117-24.
- Hall, M.E. "The Development of the Modern High School Library," Library Journal, XL (September, 1915), 627-32.
- Hastings, D.M.H. and Tanner, D. "Influence of Library Work in Improving English Language Skills at the High School Level," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI (Summer, 1963), 401-05.
- Henne, P.E. "Toward Excellence in School-Library Programs," Library Quarterly, XXX (January, 1960), 75-90.
- Hurley, R.J. "School Libraries," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. C.W. Harris. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Jones, R.M. "Selection and Use of Books in the Elementary School Library." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1963.
- Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

"Library Research in Progress, 1959-1964," Library Research in Progress, No. 14 (1965?), 1-6.

Mahar, M.H. Personal letter. April 18, 1967.

Miller, D.C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: McKay, 1964.

Moroney, M.J. Facts from Figures. Baltimore: Penguin, 1951.

Schick, F.L., et al. "Library Science Research Needs," Journal of Education for Librarianship, III (Spring, 1963), 280-91.

Vought, S.W. "Development of the School Library," Library Journal XLVIII (February 15, 1923), 161-64.

Walker, R.D. "The Quantity and Content of Master's Theses Accepted at Library Schools Offering the Doctor's Degree, 1949-1956," Journal of Education for Librarianship, III (Spring, 1963), 264-79.

Whitenack, C.I. "Historical Development of the Elementary School Library," Illinois Libraries, XXXVIII (June, 1956), 143-49.

Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Wofford, A. "School Library Evolution," Phi Delta Kappan, XXII (February, 1940), 285-88.

Woodworth, M.L. "An Identification and Examination of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship." A report to the U.S. Office of Education, 1967. (Typewritten.)

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire used in this study is noted below, with the spacing in some instances condensed.

A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH IN SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP

Circle the number that best indicates your opinion on the importance of new research on each item. If you are undecided, draw a line through all the numbers of the item.

The numbers on the scale have the following meanings:

- 5 - absolutely essential
- 4 - very important
- 3 - important
- 2 - of limited importance
- 1 - unimportant

A. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Contributions of the school library to the learning process (especially effects on academic achievement) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Contributions of the school library to the teaching process | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Historical study of school library development | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. School library laws (development, current status, contrasts among states, etc.) | 5 4 3 2 1 |

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 5. School libraries as instructional materials centers | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Status studies of school libraries | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. * | |

B. SCHOOL LIBRARY STANDARDS

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Historical development of school library standards | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Study of states' standards and enforcement of standards | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Study of regional standards, and enforcement | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Present status of school libraries as compared with the 1960 "Standards for School Library Programs" | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Establishment and revision of school library standards (How often? By whom? etc.) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. How do standards impede or help school library development? | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Tools for evaluating school libraries (type, effectiveness, etc.) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. | |

C. PATTERNS OF SCHOOL LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Organization & administration of school libraries in a campus-house organization (large schools organized into self-contained schools or houses) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Relations of local school libraries to regional materials centers | 5 4 3 2 1 |

* Space is provided at the end of each area for your suggestions for additions to the list.

3. Organizational patterns of multi-librarian school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
4. Practices in organizing & administering elementary, junior high, and/or senior high school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
5. Organizational patterns and problems of public-library-administered school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
6. Relations of elementary, junior, & senior high school libraries & librarians in a school system 5 4 3 2 1
7. Problems & patterns of organization & administration of separate & combined school libraries & audio-visual depts. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Comparison of availability of materials, services, costs, personnel, etc. between centralized school libraries and departmental resource centers 5 4 3 2 1
9. Role of the local school library supervisor, & relationships to local school librarians 5 4 3 2 1
10. Role of the state school library supervisor, & relationships to local school librarians 5 4 3 2 1
11. Exploration of the effectiveness, services, & use of a single "community" library serving junior colleges, elementary & secondary schools and the public 5 4 3 2 1
12. Practices & problems in the use of traveling school librarians (those assigned to more than 1 library in more than 1 building) 5 4 3 2 1

13.

D. SCHOOL LIBRARY PERSONNEL

1. Certification of school librarians 5 4 3 2 1

2. Educational preparation of school librarians (recency of training)	5 4 3 2 1
3. Training of non-professional library workers	5 4 3 2 1
4. Continuing education of school librarians	5 4 3 2 1
5. Personality and image of the school librarian	5 4 3 2 1
6. Use & value of students assistants in the library	5 4 3 2 1
7. Value to student of student assistance experience	5 4 3 2 1
8. School librarians as members of professional organizations (participation, benefits, attitudes, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1
9. National inventory of school library personnel resources and needs	5 4 3 2 1
10. Working conditions in school libraries	5 4 3 2 1
11. Study of the optimum number of personnel (professional, technical, clerical) required to give adequate service	5 4 3 2 1
12. Study of methods used to fill vacancies temporarily	5 4 3 2 1
13. Study of placement services for school librarians	5 4 3 2 1
14. Study of the motivation of personnel to enter, remain in, or leave school librarianship	5 4 3 2 1
15. Study of recruitment methods & their effectiveness	5 4 3 2 1
16. Study of the mobility of school librarians	5 4 3 2 1

17. Study of the need for double certification requirements for school librarians (education and librarianship)	5 4 3 2 1
18. Study of the distinctions (duties, pay, responsibilities, training, etc.) among clerical, technical, & professional workers in school libraries	5 4 3 2 1
19. Educational preparation of school library supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
20. Certification of school library supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
21. Duties, responsibilities, & workload of local school library supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
22. Role & responsibilities of state school library supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
23. Methods of recruitment & appointment of state school library supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
24. Relations of local school library supervisors with local administrators & with other local supervisors	5 4 3 2 1
25. Special educational preparation/experience for librarians working with special programs (e.g., work with the culturally deprived, retarded)	5 4 3 2 1
26. Non-library tasks assigned to school librarians (especially in relation to non-teaching tasks assigned to teachers)	5 4 3 2 1
27. Relative value of classroom teaching experience as background for the school librarian	5 4 3 2 1
28. Relative value of an undergraduate liberal arts background for the school librarian	5 4 3 2 1
29.	

E. COLLECTIONS

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Practices & problems of selling materials (paperbacks, etc.) in school libraries | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Professional materials collection- selection, location, size, recency, utilization, etc. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Selection principles for printed materials (especially in different subject areas) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Selection principles for non-print materials (especially in different subject areas) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Effectiveness of selection tools for printed materials (especially in different subject areas) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Effectiveness of selection tools for non-print materials (especially in different subject areas) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Paperback books in school libraries (use, effectiveness, organization, costs, etc.) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Methods of evaluating the school library collections | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Various methods of acquiring materials (problems, comparative costs, etc.) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Methods and costs of weeding collections | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 11. Use & effectiveness of state-approved lists in materials selection | 5 4 3 2 1 |

12. Study of the use, justification, & problems of reserve book collections 5 4 3 2 1
13. Study of the use, justification, & problems of "closed-shelf" collections 5 4 3 2 1
14. Study of the extent of duplication necessary and desirable in a school library 5 4 3 2 1
15. Study of "loss" rates in school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

16.

F. BUDGETS AND BUSINESS PRACTICES

1. Adequacy of school library budgets 5 4 3 2 1
2. Planning and controlling library budgets 5 4 3 2 1
3. Study of business practices and records of school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
4. Problems of allocating library funds to school depts. for purchase of library materials 5 4 3 2 1
5. Methods of allocating, distributing, and accounting for state and federal aids for school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
6. Relationship of the school library budget to the total instructional budget 5 4 3 2 1

7.

G. ACCESSIBILITY AND USE

1. Programs of extended use of school library facilities (evening, weekend, summer)	5 4 3 2 1
2. Evaluating student use of the school library	5 4 3 2 1
3. Accessibility of school libraries to bus-transported students	5 4 3 2 1
4. Patterns of controlling access to school libraries	5 4 3 2 1
5. Use of school libraries by students in independent study programs and in traditionally organized programs	5 4 3 2 1
6. Influence of various factors (such as accessibility) on the utilization of library services	5 4 3 2 1
7. Teacher use of school libraries (especially relationships between recency of educational preparation and use, subjects taught and use, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1
8. Administrators' use of school libraries	5 4 3 2 1
9. Advantages/disadvantages of a library-study hall combination	5 4 3 2 1
10. Effect of centralized libraries in all levels of schools on teacher/pupil use	5 4 3 2 1
11. Effect of individualized reading programs on pupils' attitudes toward the library	5 4 3 2 1

12. Attitudes of librarians toward the teaching function & the information service function, & their possible conflicts 5 4 3 2 1

13.

H. TECHNICAL PROCESSES

1. Centralized services at local, county, state and regional levels 5 4 3 2 1
2. Use of book-jobbers in acquiring materials 5 4 3 2 1
3. Problems of purchasing and using printed catalog cards 5 4 3 2 1
4. Use of commercial processors by school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
5. Problems in the care of books (mending, binding, housing, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
6. Problems in the acquisition & care of periodicals (storage, binding, microfilming, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
7. Evaluating circulation methods 5 4 3 2 1
8. Use of automation in the various phases of library operations 5 4 3 2 1
9. Methods, problems, & costs of organizing, cataloging, storing, and circulating audio-visual materials (including repair) 5 4 3 2 1
10. Study of the use of the catalog, including effectiveness of simplified catalog cards 5 4 3 2 1
11. Which system of classification & arrangement is most effective & useful (Dewey, L.C., "Interest," Other?) 5 4 3 2 1

12. Studies of technical processes
(including workplace, process
charts, time & motion) 5 4 3 2 1

13.

I. PUBLICITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

1. Administrators' attitudes toward
school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
2. Teachers' attitudes toward school
libraries 5 4 3 2 1
3. Community attitudes toward school
libraries 5 4 3 2 1
4. Non-school librarians' attitudes
toward school libraries and
librarians 5 4 3 2 1
5. Examination of school library
publicity methods 5 4 3 2 1
6. Students' attitudes toward school
libraries 5 4 3 2 1

7.

J. GUIDANCE FUNCTIONS

1. Role of the school library and
librarian in guidance 5 4 3 2 1
2. Effectiveness of the library in
providing occupational
information 5 4 3 2 1
3. Effectiveness of the library in
providing information for the
college-bound 5 4 3 2 1
4. Relationships between the school
library and the guidance dept. 5 4 3 2 1

5. Personal guidance through books:
What role for the school
librarian? 5 4 3 2 1

6.

K. LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

1. Efficacy of various programs of
library instruction for pupils
(formal instruction, instruction
integrated with teaching units,
library orientation, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
2. Articulation of library
instruction at all levels 5 4 3 2 1
3. Integrated use of reference
materials in the instructional
program of the school 5 4 3 2 1
4. Effectiveness of various teaching
techniques and devices 5 4 3 2 1

5.

L. STATE, REGIONAL, AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS

1. Role of state departments of education
in school library improvement 5 4 3 2 1
2. Role of regional accrediting (and
other) associations in school
library improvement 5 4 3 2 1
3. Role of library & education
associations in school library
improvement 5 4 3 2 1
4. Effects of state aids on local
school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
5. Effects of federal aids on local
school libraries 5 4 3 2 1

6. Survey of school library aid programs on the state and federal levels 5 4 3 2 1

7.

M. LIBRARY RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS

1. Development of a national pattern of the gathering of uniform library statistics at the state and local levels 5 4 3 2 1
2. Gathering, use & effectiveness of statistics & other information about local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
3. State requirements & patterns in gathering statistics & other information about local school libraries 5 4 3 2 1
4. Effectiveness of various methods of studying school libraries (use studies, cost studies, evaluative methods, attitude, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

5.

N. SERVICES TO TEACHERS AND STUDENTS, AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

1. Role of the library in team teaching 5 4 3 2 1
2. Effect of advanced placement programs on the library 5 4 3 2 1
3. Role of the library in programs for the mentally handicapped 5 4 3 2 1
4. Library orientation practices for teachers (especially new teachers) 5 4 3 2 1
5. Role of the library in programmed/automated instruction 5 4 3 2 1

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 6. Library programs for the non-library oriented subject areas | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Role of the library in programs for the culturally deprived | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Student reading (Why? Areas? Sources of materials? Effect of school library?) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Influence of the school librarian on local curriculum development | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Functions of the library in programs of reading instruction | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 11. Study of the services requested by teachers and students, and effective provision of such services | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 12. The school library in teacher education (teacher-training institutions) | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 13. Library programs for the gifted | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 14. | |

0. HOUSING AND EQUIPMENT

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Location of the library within the school | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. The school library as housed in a separate building | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Effective internal arrangement of facilities and equipment | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Study of facilities in a school library | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Comparative costs, efficiency & life of school library equipment | 5 4 3 2 1 |

6. Determination of the desirable library seating capacity in various size schools 5 4 3 2 1
7. Study of the effective use, housing, & equipment of audio-stations, listening booths, listening rooms, electronic carrels, & study carrels 5 4 3 2 1
8. Effective methods of organizing & housing special collections (college catalogs, maps, pictures, charts, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
9. Librarian's role in planning new libraries or remodeling old libraries 5 4 3 2 1

10.

P. RELATIONS WITH OTHER LIBRARIES

1. Relationships of school & public library service (distinctive functions & areas of cooperation) 5 4 3 2 1
2. Interlibrary loan practices (individual pupil's requests & teachers' requests for class use) 5 4 3 2 1
3. Role of public library service to schools in improving/retarding school library development 5 4 3 2 1
4. Advantages/disadvantages of the school-housed public library 5 4 3 2 1
5. Relations of the school librarian & teachers with the public librarians 5 4 3 2 1
6. Relationships of student use of school, public and collegiate libraries & effects 5 4 3 2 1

7.

9. SELECTION AND CENSORSHIP

1. Teacher's role in selection (& educational preparation of teachers in selection)	5 4 3 2 1
2. Administrator's role in selection	5 4 3 2 1
3. Censorship in school libraries by non-school groups or individuals	5 4 3 2 1
4. Internal censorship by librarians or other school personnel	5 4 3 2 1
5. Role of professional organizations in combating censorship	5 4 3 2 1
6. Problems of centralized selection of materials	5 4 3 2 1
7. Effectiveness of book selection committees	5 4 3 2 1
8. Use and effectiveness of book selection policies	5 4 3 2 1
9. Practices and problems of students participation in selection	5 4 3 2 1

Biographical Information Sheet

PERSONAL DATA - GROUP _____

1. Age _____
2. Circle one: Male Female
3. Circle one: Married Unmarried
4. Education (list briefly colleges, degrees, and dates degrees received) _____
5. Years of experience as an elementary or secondary school teacher (not librarian) _____
6. Years of experience as a practicing school librarian or teacher-librarian in an elementary or secondary school _____
7. Years of experience as a library supervisor/ coordinator/consultant _____
8. Years of experience as a library educator _____
9. Years of experience in other types of libraries (not school) _____
10. Recipient of honors, fellowships, membership in honorary societies?
Circle one: Yes No
11. Author or editor of book, pamphlet, etc.?
Circle one: Yes No
12. Contributor to library or education periodicals?
Circle one: Yes No
13. State library or education associations (place a check in front of the items that apply to you)
 member of state library or education association
 have, or had, committee responsibilities
 am or was a section or division officer
 am or was an officer of the state association

14. National library or education associations
(place a check in front of the items that apply
to you)

member of a national library or education
association
have, or had, committee responsibilities
am, or was, a section or division officer
am, or was, an officer of the national
organization

15. I am presently employed as: (check one)

an elementary school librarian
an elementary school teacher-librarian
a secondary school librarian
a secondary school teacher-librarian
a school library supervisor/coordinator/
consultant in a local school system
(not state)
other, specify _____

Questionnaire, Part II

Code No. _____

**SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP; A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED
RESEARCH. PART II**

Please state below those problems of school librarianship which are of prime concern today, which should be included in any list of research needs, and which should have the highest priority.

NOTE: Opinions will not in any way be identified with the person expressing them.

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Area A. Aims and Objectives of School Libraries

This area was concerned with the general objectives of the library within the school and with the contributions of the library to the teaching and learning process.

Area B. School Library Standards

This section dealt with the development, use, effectiveness, and enforcement of state, regional, and national standards for school libraries.

Area C. Patterns of School Library Administration and Control

This area treated the organization and management of school libraries, questions on the departmentalization of school libraries, relations with audio-visual departments, and the role and position of supervisors.

Area D. School Library Personnel

The section on personnel was concerned with the education, certification, background, image, working conditions, and activities of school librarians. Also, questions on non-professional workers and student assistants were included.

Area E. Collections

This area dealt with the problems of all the types of materials, print and non-print, found in school libraries, and, more specifically, with their selection, with special kinds of materials, with evaluating collections, and with special collections assembled for special purposes.

Area F. Budgets and Business Practices

This area principally treated the adequacy, distribution, planning, and accounting for local school library budgets and supplementary state and federal aids.

Area G. Accessibility and Use

This portion examined the various programs and problems related to the use of school libraries, extended hours for school libraries, and various influences on library usage by students and staff. It also investigated the accessibility of the library.

Area H. Technical Processes

This area was concerned with questions on the acquisition, cataloging, processing, storage, conservation, and other technical processes associated with individual school libraries and with systems having centralized service centers.

Area I. Publicity and Public Relations

This area dealt principally with the attitudes of administrators, teachers, pupils, other librarians, and the general public toward school libraries. It also included the effective publicizing of school library services.

Area J. Guidance Functions

This section concerned the guidance functions of the school librarian in general and reading guidance, the relationships between the guidance department and the library, and the provision of special library materials for students.

Area K. Library Instruction

This area treated the efficacy of programs of instruction to students in research skills and library skills. It also included articulation of library instructional programs and effective methods and devices used in instruction.

Area L. State, Regional and Federal Programs

This area examined the roles of state, regional, and national governmental departments and professional associations in improving school libraries, and, also, the effects of state and federal aids on local school libraries.

Area M. Library Research Methods and Statistics

This portion concerned the gathering, use, effectiveness, and requirements for compiling statistics on school libraries. It also was comprised of the various methods of studying school libraries and their operations.

Area N. Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs

This area investigated the various types of services offered by school libraries. It also examined the role and effectiveness of the school library in providing various services to the school staff and to pupils, and to certain special school programs or special groups of pupils.

Area O. Housing and Equipment

This portion examined aspects of the planning, housing, facilities, and arrangement of school libraries, and multiple types of equipment used in libraries.

Area P. Relations with Other Libraries

This section was concerned with the relationships and cooperation among libraries and librarians, and particularly with the school library and the public library.

Area Q. Selection and Censorship

This area treated the roles of various school staff members and pupils in the selection of materials, certain problems in materials selection, and problems and responsibilities in censorship.

APPENDIX C

LETTERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Introductory Letter¹

Dear Colleague:

I am working on a project studying areas of school librarianship in which research is needed. The project is composed of two sections. One section is concerned with the identification of needed research areas and their categorization by leaders in school librarianship. The other is an examination of accomplished research. The areas of research needs were identified through a search of the literature, by personal experience, and by querying other school librarians. These areas now require categorization according to their relative importance.

Would you be willing to assist us by examining our list of research needs and giving us your opinion on their importance? The list will be approximately nine pages and will require only a checking to mark your opinion. I am enclosing a post card on which you may reply.

I am hopeful that this project will be useful to school librarians and library educators and will act as a stimulus to further research.

Cover Letter for Questionnaire

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for the post card indicating your willingness to help us in investigating research needs in school librarianship.

We are enclosing the questionnaire, and ask that you give us your frank opinion of the items. The code number on the questionnaire is for statistical purposes and to insure proper geographical distribution. Your anonymity is absolutely assured.

We appreciate your contribution to this investigation.

¹Addresses and closings omitted from letters.

Cover Sheet for Questionnaire**SCHOOL LIBRARIANSHIP; A SURVEY OF AREAS OF NEEDED RESEARCH**

School librarians and library educators have long recognized the need for further research in the field of school librarianship. This survey is an attempt to identify research areas and to indicate their relative importance.

On the following pages are various questions and proposals for needed research in school librarianship. These research needs were identified through a search of the literature, by personal experience, and by querying other school librarians. Acknowledgement is made to the identification in American Association of School Librarians, RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM (May, 1961) and in F.L. Schick et al., "Library Science Research Needs," JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP (Spring, 1963).

The research needs identified in this survey are organized into the following areas:

- A. Aims and Objectives of School Libraries
- B. School Library Standards
- C. Patterns of School Library Administration and Control
- D. School Library Personnel
- E. Collections
- F. Budgets and Business Practices
- G. Accessibility and Use
- H. Technical Processes
- I. Publicity and Public Relations
- J. Guidance Functions
- K. Library Instruction
- L. State, Regional, and Federal Programs
- M. Library Research Methods and Statistics
- N. Services to Teachers and Students, and Special Programs
- O. Housing and Equipment
- P. Relations with Other Libraries
- Q. Selection and Censorship

May we ask you to assist us by considering these

questions and by indicating your opinion of the relative importance of each? Please categorize your opinion of each item by circling the appropriate number.

Follow-up Letter

Dear Colleague:

A reminder! May we ask you to return the questionnaire for "A Survey of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship."

Please ignore this if you have already returned it.

Request for Biographical Information

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for returning your questionnaire for the survey of research needs in school librarianship. I am hopeful that the results of the survey will be of interest to our profession.

To assist us in the compilation of the survey may we ask you to complete the brief form attached? No name is necessary - we will match it with the questionnaire by the sample number.

We appreciate your assistance.

Cover Letter for Part II

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for the return of the questionnaire on research needs in school librarianship. We appreciate the time involved in your answering it. The questionnaires are now being tabulated and the tentative results appear highly interesting.

May we call on you for further comments? Will you review those problems in school librarianship which in your opinion are of prime concern today, and from these will you select those problems which you believe should be included in any list of research needs and should be given the highest priority? We are soliciting your reaction in this way in order (1) to provide you with an opportunity to comment further on research needs, and (2) to provide us with your further considered opinion of needs and priorities in school library research.

We feel that your expressed beliefs, and the tabulated results of the questionnaire, will better enable us to reflect accurately your interest in school library development and research.

APPENDIX D

TABLES

TABLE A-I - GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF RETURNS
OF QUESTIONNAIRE, PART I

Geographic Region ¹	School-library Leaders N= 154	
	f	%
New England	6	3.89
Mid-Atlantic	15	9.74
East North Central	40	35.97
West North Central	14	9.09
South Atlantic	24	15.58
East South Central	5	3.24
West South Central	14	9.09
Mountain	14	9.09
Pacific	22	14.28

¹New England: Maine; New Hampshire; Vermont; Rhode Island; Connecticut; Massachusetts. Mid-Atlantic: New York; New Jersey; Pennsylvania. East North Central: Ohio; Indiana; Illinois; Michigan; Wisconsin. West North Central: Minnesota; Iowa; Missouri; North Dakota; South Dakota; Nebraska; Kansas. South Atlantic: Delaware; Maryland; District of Columbia; Virginia; West Virginia; North Carolina; South Carolina; Georgia; Florida. East South Central: Kentucky; Tennessee; Alabama; Mississippi. West South Central: Arkansas; Louisiana; Texas; Oklahoma. Mountain: Montana; Idaho; Wyoming; Colorado; Utah; New Mexico; Arizona; Nevada. Pacific: Washington; Oregon; California; Alaska; Hawaii; other. Regional divisions from World Almanac, 1967 (New York, Newspaper Enterprise Association, 1967), p. 322.

TABLE A-I - GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF RETURNS
OF QUESTIONNAIRE, PART I (CONT.)

Geographic Region	Practicing School Librarians N= 154	
	f	%
New England	11	7.14
Mid-Atlantic	24	15.58
East North Central	31	20.12
West North Central	18	11.68
South Atlantic	20	12.98
East South Central	11	7.14
West South Central	13	8.44
Mountain	8	5.19
Pacific	18	11.68

TABLE A-I - GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF RETURNS
OF QUESTIONNAIRE, PART I (CONT.)

Geographic Region	Both Groups N= 308	
	f	%
New England	17	5.51
Mid-Atlantic	39	12.66
East North Central	71	23.05
West North Central	32	10.38
South Atlantic	44	14.28
East South Central	16	5.19
West South Central	27	8.76
Mountain	22	7.14
Pacific	40	12.98

TABLE A - II- DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE BY SCHOOL
LIBRARY LEADERS AND PRACTICING SCHOOL
LIBRARIANS

	School Library Leaders		Practicing School Librarians	
	f	%	f	%
Introductory letter sent	282		457	
Response to letter, Questionnaire, Part I, sent	184	65.24	170	37.19
Questionnaire, Part I, returned; Part II sent	169	91.84	154	90.58
Questionnaire, Part II, returned	75	44.37	73	47.4

APPENDIX E

ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTATIONS, PART II

ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTATIONS, PART II

Below are illustrative quotations from the returns of the questionnaire, Part II, of the practicing school librarians. These are arranged in the same rank order and with the same headings as reported in Chapter IV, Findings. Any portion of a quotation which would identify the respondent, the library, or the like has been omitted. Statements have also, in some cases, been edited in the interest of brevity, all editions being conventionally indicated.

Relations with Teachers and Administrators

Establishing more understanding relations between faculty and librarians, and showing teachers the real value of library use for future enrichment.

Conversion of a non-materials-center oriented faculty into a co-operative body to make a materials center work.

Why the lack of interest on the part of teachers to become acquainted with the facilities in the library, to assist in choosing books for their respective departments to be placed in the library and to make assignments that will stimulate students to use the library.

Problem of teacher-librarian cooperation and understanding in the use of the library and its materials.

The whole area of teachers and their lack of understanding of the role of the library and what it can do for them and the students is a vital one. Many teachers do not have any idea how to use the library for themselves, let alone knowing how to utilize it for better teaching and learning. On the other hand many librarians find their training has not helped them to know how to go about gaining the cooperation of teachers, or showing them how the library can play a vital part in teaching and learning.

... The absolute lack of preparation given by universities and colleges to potential teachers in materials and sources available or methods of using them.

... Library science for all members of the faculty required for certification.

As long as schools of education will not provide within some course something called 'library orientation' high school teachers themselves will continue to be the worst enemies of the average student and themselves when it comes to using the high school library wisely and effectively.

The need for courses in schools of education emphasizing for teachers the role of the library in the whole education program, and how to utilize libraries for better teaching and learning.

The need to educate administrators as to the values and place of library and librarians in the school system.

Administrators need 'enlightening' in their course of study on library management and needs.

Principal's unawareness of duties involved in maintaining a well-run library.

... Trying to get the administration ... to understand the place of the library in the total school program. To them the library is a place for students when they have no where else to go.

Education of School Library Personnel

Ways of librarians holding B.A. degrees to gain additional courses for M.A. without a lengthy leave of absence when so few courses, particularly when job standards are so high and there is great need for specialization.

In ... we have no graduate school of librarianship. One of the state colleges ... has an undergraduate major in library science. These girls are quite adequate for the elementary school libraries, but they do not have the background for the high school libraries. Our biggest problem is that the university ... has extension courses... Students get credit toward certification as librarians ... by taking these courses. They are not adequate. However, we have several 'librarians' ... who have had no library training except the above. They fill a temporary need, but they are not considered temporary people at all. It is an appalling situation, but one for which there seems to be no immediate solution.

The states and federal government should be cooperating to place graduate library science courses in different sections of the states so these courses could be taken by persons wishing to become librarians but who must continue to work at a regular job. Is this being done?

A.L.A. accredited schools vs. graduate and undergraduate unaccredited programs to prepare school librarians.

The need for more realistic courses in library school in keeping with present day scientific and technological advances. Some courses in elementary business methods and finance seem necessary for those coping with budgets, government money, etc.

Library schools should closely examine their programs and reorganize (revamp) the curriculum. Today's librarians are probably not as well equipped to handle professional problems as were their predecessors. ... That, of course, means that one's undergrad. major or minor has to be adjusted accordingly.

A broader knowledge of subject areas such as science, humanities, literature would be most desirable for the ... general librarian.

Still another area for research would be the general educational background of school librarians. It seems to me that a broad educational background is essential for good librarianship, as well as professional courses in library work.

Minimum professional training allowed for one who is hired for small schools.

I am one of many teacher-librarians who are 'manning' libraries without the benefits of formal training in library science. I believe research is needed on how best to give us on the job training and summer workshop opportunities on varying levels. ... Facing reality means realizing people like me are going to continue being pressed into service and need to be trained in the essentials.

Continued training of librarians. Planned programs of refresher courses to keep librarians abreast of changing trends in education with a choice of subject matter concerning the type of library service in which the particular librarians are involved should be worked on.

Library education - train different levels for school librarians - supervisory, subject-oriented aides, etc.?

The need for training courses for non-professional library personnel either in state or junior colleges or in adult education (evening) classes in schools?

Workload and Tasks of School Librarians

Extra-curricular activities for librarians, such as yearbook advising... .

Staffing: realistic staffing, that is. If the present standards (ALA) are not so then they should be revised accordingly, up or down. As matters stand now, school administrators are making a mockery out of them because they come nowhere near these recommendations. They readily admit that there may be a basis for them but they also look at them as an ideal, not a reality. In the past, some administrators could rightly maintain that there just weren't enough funds to pay for a second librarian or library assistant (clerk) but most school districts are now well funded. There are always funds to hire a second or third coach - the librarian's image, on the other hand, continues to be that of the submissive and mousy type that can and will be cajoled or coerced into performing unprofessional tasks which should rightfully be done by a clerk.

I just do not have the time to do all the things required of a school librarian, since I also have charge of audio-visual aids and textbooks. Although our enrollment is small, the methods of teaching and curriculum require extensive use of the library by students.

Determining whether a school librarian is responsible for the 'machinery' of learning in his library. What is the librarian's responsibility?

Determining whether a full time librarian is a teacher or an administrator and what duties outside the library he should be expected to handle.

Lack of time by librarian to carry out professional work. This, of course, is due to inadequate staff.

Emphasize the numerous responsibilities of a librarian which involve professional library skills as well as duties that might be performed by clerical or non-professional assistants in order to free the librarian to perform to her full capacity.

... Misuse of professional librarian time and competence on semi or nonprofessional work, and how to remedy this situation. First, it would be necessary to see just how much work is nonprofessional.

Division of labor among librarians and semi or nonprofessional help is in need of research today.

Sufficient clerical help to free trained personnel for professional duties.

Selection and Censorship

Book selection processes, as relating to school courses (i.e., reference, research) need to be readjusted and re-examined

Wise book selection. With such a dearth of material in the book market librarians need to be informed and selective and choose their materials according to the scholastic ability, needs and interests of the students.

Materials for a school with bi-lingual students.

Identification of curricula materials to enable pupils to become discriminate and independent users of communication media. Techniques of selecting, using and evaluating media.

Good reviews from authoritative sources for non-book materials.

The degree of censorship when 'approved' books are listed and librarians instructed or encouraged to buy from such lists.

Freedom for the librarian to order within a realistic budget.

Censorship practices by pressure groups and individuals.

The problem of the availability of 'adult literature' in school libraries. Should they be shelved separately; marked especially; or avoided.

Shortage and Recruiting of School Librarians

... Something constructive could be done on the undergraduate level to encourage more students to enroll in library science courses. Perhaps it would be interesting to know from the results of research why so few students are attracted to librarianship and what librarians might be able to do to increase an interest in their profession.

The problem of insufficient manpower in the school library field is of high importance. This would include recruiting, seeking professional status for the librarian

Make a library career attractive to young people, by example and spreading the good news of opportunities in the field. Emphasize the positive and dispel the gloom, e.g., I've so much work to do, etc. Quality of personnel. Scholarship, sense of humor, charm, and love of people are requisites.

A general upgrading of the image of library personnel.

Standards

Standards that can be applied to evaluate the use being made of the library by students and teachers.

State requirements of school libraries. How close are the libraries to the requirements? What can be done to make the libraries meet the requirements? Is it possible to make a '5 year plan' and if a library has not met the requirements in that specified time, it would lose state aid?

Policies and specifications for equipment and quarters for large schools, i.e., a high school that serves an entire county or parish.

What advances have been made in elementary and secondary schools to provide proper facilities, adequate personnel, and ample book collections since the Standards were published? We need to know the present conditions of libraries before the New Standards can be applied.

The need for states to set up standards (realistic ones) for school libraries in cooperation with state departments of education, and ways of supervising the carrying out of these standards each time a new library is started.

Public Library - School Library Cooperation

Relationship of school libraries to public libraries. Need to avoid duplication in spending and to encourage more centralization of resources and services.

Cooperative use of materials - perhaps on a county basis.

Cooperative projects between school and public or junior college libraries.

What role should a school library play in a community that has no public library?

Better communication and inter-relationship between the various library science agencies - colleges, universities, schools, etc.

More effective ways of cooperating with public and other libraries. An interesting project might explore students' preference of one library over another - public in preference to school and vice versa - one library used in exclusion to all others?

Library Instruction

Teaching of library skills - methods and carry-over.

Ways of presenting library skills which will last in the students' minds long enough to carry them through high school and college.

How to make library instruction more meaningful.

... Teaching of how to use the library. I am very interested in seeing some study about the measurable results of library methods teaching at the high school level. ... Is teaching 'how to use the library' as worthwhile as we librarians would like to think it is?

A survey of value of library instruction in high school and college of students who have had and those who did not receive instruction?

Federal Aid to School Libraries

Continued federal aids to school libraries including private schools.

The effect of federal legislative programs in improving and extending library services and facilities.

Relationship of public school libraries to federal government funds, programs, or projects. Especially the way funds have been used in the purchase of library materials and/or re-modeling.

Adequate Budget

... Sufficient funds to make possible a well rounded up to date collection in each school library.

... Most schools do not have sufficient funds to create ideal centers (or any kind of center).

Effectiveness of School Libraries (Students,
and Instructional Materials Centers)

The role of the library in implementing curriculum innovations.

Effectiveness of school libraries serving various age groupings.

Contributions of the school library to learning.

A complete and broad study of all that an instructional materials center does do, could do, should do for maximum benefit for the student... .

The importance and need of multi-media curriculum centers within school districts.

Centralized Cataloging and Processing

Centralized processing: how much time does it save? Whose time does it save? How much money does it save?

Study of the advantages of central cataloging and processing in order to free the secondary school librarian for more work with students and teachers.

The value and need of centralized library cataloging in school districts.

Others

... Work with the disadvantaged child. It is not too much help to stock our libraries with the materials from NDEA and ESEA if some research is not done and made available on how to make these children read and write and understand what the materials contain.

... The availability of the library to students in secondary schools. In my own school, we are increasing our library collection, but students are not able to use the facilities because the schedule is so arranged that no student has a study period.

A readership survey among students to determine their preferences.

How much should a library be self-service and how much librarian-service?

Advantages and disadvantages of combining or separating elementary and secondary school libraries.

... The use of, and the value to students of Library Clubs at the high school level. I have always felt that the Library Club was misused - that it is simply a way of getting janitorial and custodial work done in the library. ... So many high school librarians are 'gungho' about library clubs. Are they fooling themselves?

Study halls held in the library?

The use and value of automation in a small high school library.

Organization of a complete system of cataloging and classification unified for all materials.

How to stimulate reading of culturally deprived students.

What should be the librarian's place in the reading and remedial corrective reading programs?

A review of the Dewey system so a more stable system could be found. These constant revisions are too time consuming and expensive.

... Some honest presentations of moderate, conservative, useful, and financially possible library programs and buildings for the average school district...

APPENDIX F

MEAN RESPONSES FOR THE AREAS,
ACCORDING TO BIOGRAPHICAL
CATEGORIES

TABLE A-III - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO SCHOOL-LIBRARY LEADERS AND PRACTICING
SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

Areas	Leaders Group Mean	Practitioners Group Mean
A	21.552	20.838
B	25.058	24.812
C	42.136	38.994
D	99.877	96.435
E	50.773	51.974
F	21.942	21.760
G	45.974	43.195
H	40.636	39.175
I	22.994	22.188
J	17.234	18.494
K	16.091	15.571
L	22.396	21.201
M	13.831	11.994
N	50.617	47.929
O	30.714	31.942
P	20.636	18.838
Q	32.662	30.617
All Areas	575.123	555.955

TABLE A-IV - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO TERM OF EMPLOYMENT

Area	Group 1 Group Mean	Group 2 Group Mean
A	21.311	21.280
B	25.035	24.760
C	40.852	39.560
D	98.085	99.160
E	51.389	52.960
F	21.976	21.640
G	44.579	45.720
H	40.027	39.280
I	22.599	21.920
J	17.891	17.880
K	15.980	14.440
L	21.856	21.320
M	12.968	12.080
N	49.568	47.000
O	31.529	29.520
P	19.875	18.640
Q	31.984	28.400
All Areas	567.510	555.560

Group 1, librarians employed full-time;
Group 2, librarians employed part-time.

TABLE A-V - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO
REGENCY OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION (DATE
OF LATEST LIBRARY SCIENCE DEGREE)

Areas	1930's & Before, Group Mean	1940's Group Mean	1950's Group Mean	1960's Group Mean
A	20.880	21.892	21.326	20.709
B	23.880	24.714	25.211	25.338
C	40.120	39.357	42.038	40.225
D	97.720	99.642	98.557	99.225
E	50.480	49.857	49.865	51.709
F	21.680	21.107	21.730	21.693
G	44.760	44.964	45.153	45.274
H	39.980	40.714	39.365	42.096
I	21.680	22.642	21.865	23.161
J	16.760	17.785	17.250	17.838
K	15.520	15.392	15.557	16.661
L	20.280	20.285	21.365	22.419
M	12.920	12.642	14.000	13.129
N	49.720	50.357	49.288	49.951
O	31.160	30.535	29.134	32.838
P	19.360	20.500	19.615	20.822
Q	33.240	31.428	32.153	31.548
All Areas	559.960	563.821	563.481	574.645

TABLE A-VI - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL
ATTAINMENT

Area	Pre-5th Year Degree, Group Mean	5th Year Degree, Group Mean	Post-5th Year Degree, Group Mean
A	21.494	21.197	21.607
B	24.941	25.295	24.821
C	40.788	40.825	40.482
D	97.482	99.871	96.392
E	53.317	51.863	48.107
F	22.329	22.007	21.250
G	43.552	45.424	44.250
H	39.117	41.197	38.517
I	22.482	22.818	22.017
J	18.458	17.878	16.696
K	15.600	16.060	15.410
L	22.270	22.068	21.053
M	12.258	13.007	13.732
N	48.694	49.909	49.035
O	31.611	32.037	29.017
P	19.176	20.280	19.910
Q	31.458	32.075	31.017
All Areas	565.035	573.818	553.321

TABLE A-VII - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

Areas	Accredited Group Mean	Non-accredited Group Mean
A	21.398	21.388
B	25.475	24.857
C	41.076	40.357
D	99.293	97.523
E	50.391	52.920
F	21.909	22.103
G	45.405	43.809
H	40.363	39.555
I	22.755	22.460
J	17.202	18.555
K	15.923	15.634
L	21.636	22.349
M	13.818	12.079
N	49.860	48.817
O	30.748	31.992
P	20.517	19.166
Q	32.216	31.007
All Areas	569.993	564.579

TABLE A-VIII - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TOTAL EXPERIENCE

Areas	1-3 Years Group Mean	4-9 Years Group Mean	10-19 Years Group Mean	20 or More Group Mean
A	15.000	20.800	20.962	21.623
B	27.500	24.133	25.137	24.623
C	42.500	41.133	40.212	40.506
D	111.500	89.666	98.937	97.623
E	68.500	50.200	52.487	50.082
F	28.000	20.466	22.987	21.047
G	55.000	42.800	45.975	43.979
H	53.300	36.133	41.325	38.924
I	23.000	20.933	23.325	22.239
J	21.000	15.866	18.100	17.911
K	19.000	15.266	15.912	15.780
L	25.500	19.866	21.837	21.376
M	15.000	12.200	12.787	12.952
N	60.500	48.200	48.875	49.726
O	40.000	29.266	32.387	30.637
P	24.500	19.733	20.012	19.383
Q	43.000	30.866	32.050	31.301
All Areas	672.500	537.533	573.312	559.719

TABLE A-IX - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO YEARS OF SCHOOL LIBRARY EXPERIENCE

Areas	1-3 Years, Group Mean	4-9 Years, Group Mean	10-19 Years, Group Mean	20 or More Years, Group Mean
A	21.265	20.952	22.047	20.703
B	25.140	24.386	25.881	24.555
C	41.875	39.820	41.404	39.925
D	99.562	95.547	100.702	97.666
E	53.578	50.896	51.809	48.851
F	23.109	21.877	21.952	19.444
G	45.218	44.537	45.631	41.370
H	40.218	40.009	40.571	37.555
I	22.328	22.358	23.190	21.861
J	17.937	17.188	18.345	19.370
K	15.640	15.688	16.309	15.703
L	22.515	21.028	22.440	21.148
M	13.140	12.254	14.071	11.111
N	47.843	48.783	51.357	49.222
O	31.546	30.754	32.166	30.925
P	20.578	18.971	20.666	18.444
Q	31.968	31.330	32.071	31.222
All Areas	573.469	556.387	580.619	549.074

TABLE A-X - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO EXPERIENCE IN OTHER TYPES OF LIBRARIES

Areas	Group 1 Group Mean	Group 2 Group Mean
A	21.321	21.282
B	25.257	24.500
C	41.005	40.184
D	98.978	96.532
E	52.300	49.934
F	22.173	21.478
G	44.384	45.293
H	40.684	38.467
I	22.710	22.184
J	18.105	17.445
K	15.794	15.945
L	22.263	20.869
M	12.984	12.695
N	49.226	49.576
O	31.763	30.500
P	19.926	19.434
Q	31.931	31.119
All Areas	570.811	557.446

Group 1, experienced in other types of
libraries; Group 2, inexperienced.

TABLE A-XI - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO EXPERIENCE AS A LIBRARY EDUCATOR OR
SUPERVISOR

Area	Group 1 Group Mean	Group 2 Group Mean
A	21.062	21.626
B	25.176	24.796
C	39.968	41.731
D	97.188	99.463
E	52.584	50.162
F	21.842	22.081
G	43.786	45.837
H	39.528	40.520
I	22.471	22.626
J	18.327	17.325
K	15.578	16.187
L	21.748	21.886
M	12.006	14.032
N	49.100	49.650
O	31.993	30.520
P	19.182	20.520
Q	31.446	31.951
All Areas	562.994	570.919

Group 1, experienced as library educator or supervisor; Group 2, inexperienced.

TABLE A-XII - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROFESSIONAL
LITERATURE

Areas	Contributors Group Mean	Non-contributors Group Mean
A	21.194	21.384
B	24.708	25.213
C	41.460	40.254
D	99.026	97.615
E	50.495	52.218
F	21.823	22.029
G	45.177	44.349
H	40.601	39.532
I	22.371	22.650
J	17.327	18.266
K	15.734	15.917
L	21.699	21.881
M	13.548	12.449
N	50.398	48.633
O	30.513	31.911
P	20.035	19.585
Q	32.327	31.224
All Areas	568.442	565.118

TABLE A-XIII - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO RECEIPT OF PROFESSIONAL HONORS

Areas	Received Honors Group Mean	Not Received Honors, Group Mean
A	21.294	21.321
B	24.698	25.301
C	40.683	40.787
D	97.955	98.390
E	51.419	51.630
F	21.647	22.226
G	45.205	44.191
H	40.742	39.232
I	22.588	22.493
J	18.022	17.767
K	15.963	15.732
L	21.169	22.404
M	12.838	12.938
N	50.595	48.171
O	31.477	31.232
P	20.022	19.527
Q	32.220	31.150
All Areas	568.544	564.500

TABLE A-XIV - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO AGE

Areas	20's Group Mean	30's Group Mean	40's Group Mean	50's Group Mean	60's, 70's Group Mean
A	21.216	21.243	21.363	21.090	21.923
B	26.270	26.146	24.257	24.727	24.615
C	43.378	42.975	39.197	39.626	41.307
D	101.135	97.585	97.757	97.282	99.000
E	55.783	54.902	49.454	50.858	49.153
F	23.594	22.780	21.424	21.171	22.359
G	46.756	46.561	42.909	44.080	45.256
H	42.324	41.048	40.121	39.444	37.615
I	23.783	21.195	22.924	22.303	22.717
J	18.540	16.609	17.621	17.777	19.359
K	16.756	15.073	15.727	15.888	15.871
L	23.351	22.097	21.197	21.484	21.897
M	13.081	13.609	12.803	12.626	12.769
N	47.945	50.300	48.197	50.121	49.512
O	32.432	31.390	31.212	31.525	30.076
P	20.973	20.804	19.045	19.656	19.025
Q	32.297	33.097	30.348	31.757	31.564
All Areas	589.622	577.512	555.561	561.424	564.026

TABLE A-XV - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO SEX

Areas	Male Group Mean	Female Group Mean
A	21.375	21.177
B	25.750	24.940
C	40.200	40.734
D	99.075	97.847
E	52.600	51.773
F	22.375	21.783
G	44.950	44.517
H	38.825	40.635
I	22.625	22.487
J	17.650	17.655
K	15.950	15.817
L	23.100	21.536
M	13.725	12.748
N	46.225	49.921
O	31.700	31.527
P	20.575	19.748
Q	31.050	31.807
All Areas	567.750	566.660

TABLE A-XVI - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING TO MARITAL STATUS

Area	Married Group Mean	Not Married Group Mean
A	21.140	21.520
B	25.140	24.848
C	40.496	41.040
D	97.853	98.592
E	51.420	51.664
F	22.261	21.552
G	44.369	45.072
H	39.636	40.368
I	22.452	22.648
J	18.152	17.560
K	15.789	15.912
L	21.872	21.728
M	12.611	13.240
N	49.611	49.000
O	31.745	30.856
P	19.726	19.816
Q	31.324	32.096
All Areas	565.605	567.512

TABLE A-XVII - MEAN RESPONSES FOR EACH AREA, ACCORDING
TO PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

Areas	Group 1 Group Mean	Group 2 Group Mean	Group 3 Group Mean	Group 4 Group Mean
A	22.161	21.293	20.825	21.500
B	25.580	25.653	25.100	24.463
C	40.290	41.013	40.025	41.243
D	97.000	97.613	98.625	98.926
E	51.903	51.440	52.787	50.122
F	20.774	22.213	22.712	21.134
G	42.548	44.066	45.412	45.341
H	41.032	40.040	40.700	38.719
I	20.096	23.520	22.600	22.512
J	16.871	19.013	17.737	17.304
K	13.935	16.480	15.887	15.939
L	20.483	22.760	22.025	21.219
M	12.000	12.693	12.762	13.524
N	44.387	52.080	48.487	50.219
O	31.516	32.506	31.500	29.743
P	19.032	19.906	19.787	19.902
Q	28.903	32.453	31.012	32.219
All Areas	548.516	574.747	567.987	564.037

Group 1, state organization membership; Group 2,
state organization responsibilities; Group 3,
national organization membership; Group 4,
national organization responsibilities.

TITLE OF THESIS School Librarians' Opinions on Research and
Research Needs in School Librarianship
Full Name Mary Lorraine Woodworth
Place and Date of Birth Richland Center, Wisconsin, June 24, 1926
Elementary and Secondary Education Laboratory School, Wisconsin State
University, La Crosse, Wisconsin, Central High School,
La Crosse, Wisconsin
Colleges and Universities: Years attended and degrees
Wisconsin State University, La Crosse, Wis., 1948-1950
University of Wisconsin, 1950-1952, B.S. (Ed.)
University of Wisconsin, 1956, M.S. (L.S.)
University of Wisconsin, 1964-1967, Ph.D.
Membership in Learned or Honorary Societies
American Library Association, American Association of
Library Schools
Publications "Survey of Secondary School Libraries in Wisconsin";
"Survey of Elementary School Libraries in Wisconsin"; "An
Identification and Examination of Research Needs in School
Librarianship
Major Department Library Science and Education
Minor(s) None

Date Sept 11, 1967

Signed Margaret S. Houder
Professor in charge of thesis