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Three groups of Academic librarians in Louisiana were surveyed to determine what factors other than job performance influenced professional progress (Salary increases, promotion and tenure) for them. Staff development activities were also investigated to determine if they played any significant role in influencing professional progress. Three opinion questions were also asked in this investigation about the feasibility of using an index that was developed to assess quantitatively staff development activities.

The following findings were the results of the study:
(1) There are factors other than job performance that influenced professional progress; (2) staff development activities played a very small role in determining the professional progress of academic librarians in Louisiana; (3) the index model is a useful tool in quantitatively assessing staff development activities. Respondents also provided activities they thought were missing from the index model and suggestions to enhance the formulas used for assessing quality points.

Several statistical methods were used to analyze the data and test the hypotheses. These methods were frequency distributions, chi-square and analysis of variance. The
Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to provide the analyses.

Results indicated that additional studies should be conducted: 1) to determine if Louisiana Libraries are experiencing a shortage in librarians and why; 2) to determine what role service - Institutional, Professional and Community - is playing in the evaluation process; 3) qualitative aspects of staff development activities should be studied; 4) And this study should be conducted using a larger population.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

David W. Kaser states that "there are those who say that a primary requisite to success is a carefully conceived and effectively implemented program of continuing education, professional growth, and staff development both locally and nationally. Such programs can certainly facilitate and expedite the upgrading of the profession; their preparation is very much deserving of the attention of the best minds both within and outside librarianship." The existence, however, of these programs cannot guarantee that anyone will make use of them. Other considerations must precede availability of staff development programs, and these are the recognition by a majority of the librarians in any organization that they as individuals need further development and a willingness on their parts to do the hard work required to obtain fulfillment of their objectives (Stone: Kaser, 1971, p. 8).

Success is often measured in the ability to move from one phase to another. It is very difficult in the library profession, to determine what measures are used in determining personnel advancement from one level to another or as the case might be, from one step to another step.
The factors used for measurement will probably be as diverse as the types of academic institutions in existence. Librarians, like other professionals that must be evaluated periodically to determine if they are going to be promoted or rewarded for the improvement of their performance, have been quite concerned about the fairness in the assessment criteria that are being used to judge their professional mobility.

The study has not dealt greatly with job performance as a criteria for evaluation, however, it is understood that the only way to improve on any job is to improve on weakness and build on strength.

Job performance is the major factor in the evaluative process, although there are other important factors that should be considered. Staff development activities, which activities also include continuing education for this study are essential. Advances in communication and technology place a great demand on libraries for increased action toward staff development for librarians in order to benefit both the individual and the organization. Thus, if academic libraries are to be successful in coping with the constraints of harnessing and storing increased volumes and formats of information and the demand for dissemination and retrieval of the same, it becomes important to know to what degree, or if progress is being made, toward any defined staff de-
velopment goals a library may have, and if librarians are being adequately rewarded with the tangible benefits.

Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., in the book entitled *In Search of Excellence*, discussed in the rational model that some managers believe that when you get the incentives right productivity will follow. If people are given big, straightforward, monetary incentives to do right and work smart, the productivity problem will disappear. Peters and Waterman stated that "over-reward top performers weed out the 30 to 40 percent deadwood who do not want to work." This concept could possibly work as a management model in the field of librarianship.

Staff development activities provide a level of excellence in the workplace. Staff development activities prepare staff members for greater responsibilities when positions open up within a library. A good staff development program will make it more likely that internal candidates will be ready to move up (Wilding, 1989, p. 900).

Herbert S. White states that any self-respecting profession recognizes that learning must be continuous. Just as a profession is changed through research, its practitioners become obsolete and irrelevant without continuing education. White also stated that few of us want to be treated by a doctor who has no knowledge of new developments in medicine in the last 25 years. He also stated that he would not
want to be served by such a librarian, either (White, 1986, p. 59).

Most teacher contracts provide specific financial rewards for additional academic degrees or the completion of additional credit hours. As librarians, we are so committed to the idea of continuing education that we lose sight of how little there really is, and of how few practitioners are touched by it in any significant way. For librarians, continuing education is a totally voluntary process carrying neither salary benefits nor promotion, nor the danger of being fired if we don't participate (White, 1986, p. 59).

A frequent complaint that is heard whenever providers of continuing education are assembled is "we offer a wide array of opportunities, but so few come to participate." One solution to this dilemma would seem to lie in an understanding of what motivates practitioners to engage in continuing education.

First, the provider of continuing education needs to remember that, for the professional, motivation to learn depends increasingly on internal standards and goals. No longer is the individual motivated as he or she was in an academic setting, by the hope of receiving a degree or qualifying for certification. Instead, learning is related to desire to improve performance on the job or to career development needs (Asp:Stone, 1985, p. 67).
Library management have a right to expect their library staff to be committed to maintaining and expanding their own knowledge and abilities. Libraries can provide opportunities, but library staff members need to take advantage of them. This may mean a commitment of time and money (Wilding, 1989, p. 901). Library staff members also expect library management to be sensitive to its commitment by including professional enhancement as a factor in professional development.

Most librarians keep up with developments in their own areas of expertise and interest. Many, however, fail to stay abreast of broader issues and current developments in other areas, promotions, and other opportunities for advancement which frequently entail taking on broader responsibilities; or management functions with which they are less familiar. Staying on top of broad issues can help prepare for future promotional opportunities.

Presently, multiple pressures are on libraries to improve services. Costs for materials, buildings, and personnel continue to rise. Increasingly, library administrators look to staff development to increase the abilities and effectiveness of the library personnel in order to extend expensive resource. Staff members value the possibilities offered through staff development as they seek ways to increase their job satisfaction and benefits, and as they advance and pursue library careers. Thus, more and more library personnel
are interested in staff development—some from the position of learners, some from the viewpoint of library managers, some from the stance of being in a position to help others learn (Conroy, 1978, p. 1).

The evaluation of staff development activities is very important to the success of individuals as well as the library as a whole. The value of experiences and skills obtained from these activities should be evaluated. This study will thus attempt to address a technique to be used as a quantitative measure for staff development activities.

Staff development in librarianship generally deals with orientation programs, on-the-job training, opportunity to attend workshops and institutes, opportunity to prepare for advancement, active encouragement for individual enrichment (e.g., attending courses or pursuing a degree program), brief reassignment to other jobs (e.g., job rotation), assignment to library committees and membership in professional associations (Martell, 1978, p. 153).

The above activities will be examined closely to determine if professional benefits are derived from participation in these activities.

Studies relating to professional growth and development among academic librarians in Louisiana are very limited. In 1980, the Board of Regents of the State of Louisiana commissioned a Task Force on Academic Libraries in Louisiana.
This writer participated on the Subcommittee on Library Staffing and Housing Library Materials and specifically, worked on professional development of Louisiana academic libraries. It was concluded from the study that professional development was needed in academic libraries in Louisiana. In reviewing bibliographies of Louisiana library publications, and the Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, it was concluded that very little information would be obtained that related to staff development in Louisiana academic libraries other than listings of continuing education activities. Therefore, the review of the literature for this study will be general in scope with some specific references to professional growth and development in Louisiana academic libraries.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to identify the role of staff development activities in the evaluation process of librarians for salary increases, promotion, and tenure in Louisiana academic libraries.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study will be to:

1. Identify factors used to determine professional advancement.

2. Assess the relationship between staff development and other factors, such as teaching, research, professional performance, and service--institutional, professional, and community.

3. Develop a staff development index to be used as a criteria of quantitative measures in the evaluation process.

Hypotheses

The investigation included the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis one: Factors other than job performance influence the evaluation process for professional advancement.

Hypothesis two: Staff development activities will play a very small role in determining professional progress.

An additional subordinate study of the feasibility of using an index model as a quantitative measure of staff development activities will be examined.
Significance of Study

Joseph Beckner observed in 1978 that, "...the pace of technological change brought on by developments in computers and communications has increased so rapidly that it is difficult to comprehend, much less measure the potential impact of such change on library services and operations...since libraries are the backbone of the country's information environment today. The more farsighted observer would expect technological change to usher in a whole new era of library development and service."

He further added that, "...librarians have a special responsibility to ensure that technological change is woven into the fabric of society in ways which enable libraries to: 1) broaden and also personalize their information services to the public, 2) strengthen their ability to communicate with other libraries and with users, and 3) increase their internal productivity."

With factors, such as those mentioned above, being the rule rather than the exception, considerable attention has been given to the fact that the advances in communication and technology will place a demand on libraries for staff development and continuing education for librarians in order to benefit both the individual and the organization. Thus, if academic libraries are to be successful in coping with the demands of dissemination and retrieval of information, it is important to know to what degree, or if progress is being made, toward any defined staff development and continuing education goals a library may have.
A review of the literature on studies of library staff development and continuing education revealed that no research done exclusively on the library staff's efforts to develop themselves has shown that these effects have paid off with any significant benefits, such as salary increases, promotion and tenure.

Peggy Sullivan in her inaugural speech entitled "Libraries and the Pursuit of Happiness," at the American Library Association Conference in New York on July 3, 1980, stated that with declining resources, young colleagues do not have the opportunity for advancement which would give them steadily increasing responsibilities and recognition. She stated that as an administrator she often finds herself caught in the dilemma of wanting to urge someone to accept an assignment or to make some effort, such as publishing an article or participating on a task force or committee. Sullivan also stated that it is important to help colleagues find satisfaction and to achieve the most they can in any position and see that there are rewards and opportunities for potential as well as for achievement.

Continuing education must be a major aspect of this kind of career development and recognition. Sullivan also states that somehow continuing education opportunities have become so integrated into institutional reward systems that
their original purposes are not always clearly seen (Sullivan, 1980).

As libraries continue to initiate and implement staff development programs at their institutions to help foster the idea that librarians are basically on a parity with the teaching professionals on campus, it would be of interest to see if incentives are built into the programs for professional advancement.

In a study done in 1982 by a task force on academic libraries in Louisiana that was commissioned by the Board of Regents, it was found that academic libraries in Louisiana were lacking in staff development programs and activities. This study will provide basic information about the progress of staff development activities in Louisiana as well as whether there is any relationship between these activities and other factors in the evaluation of staff professional progress.

This study will be valuable to all professional organizations by developing an index that will provide a quantitative measure of staff development activities.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for this study only.

Incentives - Direct tangibles, such as salary increases, merit pay and travel expenses. Intangible direct benefits are promotion and tenure.

Indexing - The grouping of activities of similar or related value.

Staff Development - Organizational targeted programs intended to ensure that staff will have appropriate knowledge and skills to permit a library to accomplish its goals effectively. (Defined by Thomas Wilding.)

Staff Development Activities - Advanced study, continuing education, on-the-job training, seminars, workshops, attendance at conferences and conventions, publications, and presentations.

Promotion - Advancement in position on the part of a person in employment.

Tenure - Special employment status granted a teacher or professor such that he or she cannot be arbitrarily discharged.

Limitations

This study is being concerned both with tangible and intangible factors of staff development used in determining professional growth and development, such as the tangible factor salary increase and the intangible factors of promotion and tenure. Other factors such as job satisfaction, job performance and the commitment to the organization will be excluded from this study.
This study is subject to all the limitations recognized in collecting data by mailed questionnaires.

Also, this study is to be limited to academic library directors of Louisiana libraries, plus a department chairperson and a staff member from the same library. Private and public academic libraries are included in this study.

Assumptions

An assumption of this study is that staff development/professional development activities are being conducted at surveyed libraries. Another assumption is that these activities are included in the evaluation process.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Academic libraries have been a part of American higher education since its beginning. A letter written in 1638 confirms the presence of a library at what would become Harvard College. The library consisted of books donated by local residents (Moran, 1984, p.1). The academic libraries of the colonial period and up to the last of the nineteenth century offered little service to either the faculty or students. Libraries gained prominence during the period of university growth following the Civil War. With the founding of Johns Hopkins in 1876, a new curricula emphasized electives, and the seminar system required an expansion of academic libraries (Moran, p.1).

Nothing will be as important to the quality of library and information services provided to scholars and students within colleges and universities as the quality of people recruited, retrained, retained, and supported to manage and deliver those services in the next two decades (Abell and Coolman, 1982, p. 71).

If librarians are not content to acquire as much of their professional expertise on the job as in the past, then appropriate agencies may need to expand their continuing education
offerings and library administrators may need to strengthen their staff development programs and support for alternative opportunities. An appropriate variety of educational opportunities will be necessary to meet the increasing needs of librarians in a more complex environment (Powell, 1988, p. 340).


Today's academic librarians are better educated than ever before. More have or are studying for additional degrees, and more are engaged in continuing education, institutes and workshops. Individual librarians' professional development and professional contributions have been emphasized. These developments in the library profession must continue—and expand—to insure that tomorrow's librarians will be able to handle the fundamental and far-reaching changes in providing scholarly information to academic institutions. The quality of the library staff during the next decade will be more important to the future health and vitality of the university than the quality of the instructional and administrative staff (Moran, 1984, p. 2).

Elizabeth Stone stated that until a few years ago, participants in continuing education activities generally received little systematic recognition for their initiative.
There is no universally accepted means of measuring what had been achieved. Some educators believe that lack of recognition has been a cause for a lack of motivation for individuals to participate in continuing education opportunities. She also stated that Herzberg found from his extensive motivation studies that factors that motivate men and women in work situations are achievement, recognition for work achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement (the last not only in terms of promotion, but in terms of opportunities to grow and develop in the present job). She stated that the conclusion can be drawn that the desire and recognition will motivate people to participate in continuing education if there is some type of recognition for participation and for their increased competence. The findings of the 1968 study of professional librarians by Stone on motivating librarians toward continuing education were in accord with those of Herzberg (Asp:Stone, 1985, p. 75).

The academic librarians' struggle for full faculty status has been well documented in the literature. The Jesse-Mitchell study of the mid 1960's and its descendant the Rayman-Goudy report, which appeared in 1980, reflect a growing frustration among college and university librarians. Faced with increasing evaluation by faculty performance measures, academic librarians were not generally provided with faculty-like working conditions and clearly have a long way to travel
before they are provided with equal opportunities to measure up to the new evaluative criteria (Neroda, 1983, p. 156).

Also discussed by Neroda is the institutional evaluation of professional development which is of special importance to librarians in academia. In contrast to colleagues employed by public, special, and school libraries, academic librarians are often expected to meet complex performance criteria beyond elements associated with direct job responsibilities. Within a structure developed, maintained, and modified largely by the administrative and faculty sectors of academia, the performance criteria for librarians tend to be patterned on those of the teaching faculty, especially since "equality" was so eagerly sought with this group through the 1960's and 1970's. Being able to assess realistically one's ability to conform to, if not surpass, a particular academic community's standard of excellence is essential for successful career planning and to optimize professional development. To obtain job security and advancement, as well as maintain marketplace viability, librarians in academia must be able to discern what conditions, if any, exist which augur well for success (Neroda, 1983, p. 156).

In the majority of colleges and universities, faculties are rewarded with job security and promotion through achievement in three areas: teaching, public service, and research. Most institutions take the first two categories as a given.
Therefore, the preponderance of evaluative weight falls upon research. For the purpose of faculty evaluation, most institutions would agree that evidence of significant research confers prestige upon the institution and its personnel and that it serves as a faculty continuing education device (Neroda, 1983, p. 157).

Carolyn Snyder and Nancy Sanders in an article published in 1978, entitled "Continuing Education and Staff Development: Needs Assessment, Comprehensive Program Planning and Evaluation," provided a very detailed and comprehensive look at a staff development program at Indiana University libraries. This type of program will benefit both the organization and staff in terms of evaluation. The focus of this assessment is meeting the established goals of the library. The planning process for staff development and continuing education will mean a continuous conversion of ideas to active programs that will benefit the organization and staff members.

The achievement of the desired position as members of the faculty over the past decade has increased the need of librarians to employ their skills both in the library and wider academic context. The number of articles devoted to advice on increased interactions with other faculty, and especially toward increased research, has grown substantially in the past few years. Notably, however, the articles have been neither consistent over time nor balanced through
the literature (Isaac, 1983, p. 217). David Kaser, in his summation of the history of library publication, noted that "a small segment of the profession at any given moment is the fountainhead of a very large share of the writing in the field" (Kaser, 1976, p. 125).

In a study of travel support policies at ARL libraries, it was concluded that the library management provided monetary support for librarians, administrators, and support staff to attend library and other professional association conferences at national, regional and local levels. Persons designated to officially represent the library receive special consideration when travel money is allocated. All levels of participation are supported, but the level of funding varies with the type of conference and the nature of the participation. The travel money is a line item in the budget and is allocated either by the library director, administrators, or some type of committee. A flat amount is available to each librarian each year, and is awarded as requested until the funds are depleted. The money may be used for transportation, lodging, registration and/or meals (Blomberg, 1989, p. 93).

Business and industry spend an estimated $60 billion a year for approximately 8 million people, clear evidence that investment in human resource development has become fully accepted and widely implemented in the private sector.
Very little library literature that pertains to the amount spent on staff development by academic libraries exist, but it is probably safe to conclude that the sum of money is relatively small, reflecting the differences in scale between the academic and the corporate worlds. Although academic libraries may never be able to spend proportionately substantial funds on training, but the concept of protecting the investment in human resources should be acknowledged as equally valid in both worlds (Varlejs, 1987, p. 360).

Statistics for academic library expenditures do not indicate clearly how much is allocated to staff development, and budgets may scatter these costs under a variety of headings. Some funding is available, however, as evidenced by the large turnout of academic librarians at conferences. Based on the experience of the University of California at Berkeley Library, Martell and Dougherty, in a 1978 publication, have suggested an allocation of 1.7 percent of the total staff budget (about $10,000 for their institution in 1978) is rather small, and yet they speculate that few libraries spend more than 2 percent on staff development (Varlejs, 1987, p. 360).

According to Margaret Stieg, about the time Future Shock was published, the great mass of librarians discovered for themselves the essential truth of its thesis in terms of their profession, namely that the rate of change is accelerating and that little remains the same as it was when we first perceived
it. The profession reacted with excitability. Continuing education became Continuing Education (CE) with capital letters. Articles began to appear in every journal; continuing education achieved the dignity of a subject heading in Library Literature. An organization CLENE (Continuing Library Education Network), was organized and dedicated to continuing education (Stieg, 1980, p. 2547). Continuing education opportunities proliferated with a multitude of courses, workshops, institutes, seminars, and other formal educational experiences offered in the last decade. Stieg also stated that continuing education can provide illustrations of librarianship's worst faults: a mindless borrowing understanding; an eagerness to do something just because it is different; and a tendency to make ends in themselves. But it also illustrates some of the profession's strengths: a concern to do the best job possible and a willingness to examine new ideas and to change (Stieg, 1980, p. 2551).

In the early 1970's a survey was conducted under the auspices of the Council on Library Resources to determine the compensation levels of librarians in institutions of higher education. The study revealed that among librarians, a very small percentage is at the top levels, in sharp contrast to the professors, comprising one major group of the faculty (O'Reilly, 1981, p. 69). In the salary comparison with faculty, academic librarianship did not emerge favorably.
It is just such comparisons that have stimulated librarians to seek faculty status, in the belief that money flows to title. Even after accomplishing rank designation and even within a negotiated contract, librarians are realistically likely to find themselves at the bottom of the range for each academic rank (O'Reilly, 1981, p. 70).

The most common factor to be found in agreement is promotion. Academic promotion at some universities is a hard-won recognition of achievement and promise, and at others a concession that a certain number of years have passed since appointment or the last promotion. In either case, it brings a higher title of rank and a modest addition to base salary, but without affecting the faculty member's duties and responsibilities. At some universities promotion to the rank of assistant or associate professor is prerequisite to tenure (Weatherford, 1988, p. 18). Professional development and educational opportunities can lift an employee out of his or her unit and even out of the organization. Within the unit though, the promotion opportunities that trainees might hope this preparation would open up can prove disappointing. If seniority is treated with substantially greater respect than training or ability in promotion decisions, the value of the development and educational benefits diminishes markedly (Weatherford, 1988, p. 21).
Pat Weaver-Meyer conducted a study of an education model of staff development, the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance Model (RPTIM). Concepts in the model are related to a broad overview of current staff development and continuing education efforts in academic libraries. Results of a survey of staff developers in American Research Libraries suggest that 80% of the model describes practices appropriate to the academic/research library setting. In addition, respondents indicated that existing staff development programs generally did not meet the criteria staff developers agreed should be part of their libraries' program (Weaver-Meyer, 1990, p. 251).

Some of the existing programs in academic libraries detailed in Resource Notebook on Staff Development indicated a climate that provides opportunities for staff development; but little is made of team building or actual staff input into defining beneficial staff development opportunities (Weaver-Meyer, 1990, p. 255).

Continuing education is an important part of academic librarians' responsibilities. To be fully cognizant of the environment in which we operate requires an ongoing learning process, which will be aided partly by the reduction of labor-intensive tasks that the computer is able to perform. Continuing education must also be supported by the institutions we serve (Toy, 1978, p. 129). A major function of a uni-
versity's faculty is instruction. Again, we have strained to equate the reference function with instruction, but analogy is not precise. Formal teaching about efficient use of a complex research collection is becoming an increasingly important aspect of academic librarianship. The variety of publications, formation of interest groups and other evidence of this importance abound in the literature. The process of constant testing, evaluation, and reformulating hypotheses about the interaction of the user with library resources needs to become part of our function. Once more we may believe that this is true, but solid communication will help fund the activity (Toy, 1978, p. 129).

Staff development is not a static process. Staff development must involve meaningful changes and results or it will be rejected by employees, by supervisors, and by the organization. When these two sets of needs are consistent, effective training and development will yield significant benefits to the employees and the organization (Rooks, 1988, p. 112).

In a study by Kreitz and Ogden the authors compared the roles and responsibilities of academic librarians and support staff at the nine-campus library system of the University of California. The authors decided to examine the rewards and responsibilities of librarians and library assistants at the University of California in order to test a thesis by Allan Veaner. He asserts that because librarians and library
assistants often perform tasks demanding the expertise as librarians, library assistants tend to feel resentful. The study found that job dissatisfactions stem not only from inequity in pay, but also in promotional procedures, job development, and general status (Kreitz, 1990, p. 309).

In 1974, Kenneth Plate and Elizabeth Stone analyzed data gathered from 162 United States and 75 Canadian librarians. Plate and Stone conducted their study within the framework of Maslow’s Hierarchy of need and Herzberg’s Theory of Hygiene and Motivation factors. Participants were asked to respond to Herzberg’s two questions concerning a time they felt exceptionally good about their jobs and times they felt exceptionally bad about their jobs.

The result of the Plate and Stone demonstration was that librarians responded positively to the motivational factors that included professional or personal growth.

In a study done in 1981, Russ Davidson, Connie C. Thorson and Margo C. Trumpeter analyzed factors other than faculty status which was the focus of the study. It was concluded in this study that while librarians in the study area have been granted faculty status by their institutions, they are in reality not enjoying certain of the benefits and responsibilities central to such status, notably, the benefit of a nine-month contract and the responsibility of publishing.
Librarians with and without faculty status have differing perceptions of benefits derived from their respective systems. A large percentage of librarians with faculty status considered tenure and salary to be their most important benefits. Librarians without faculty status perceived salary as the main benefit of their system. The findings of this study indicated that a majority of librarians had a preference for a comparable system of academic status different from the traditional faculty status structure, but also one that offers the benefits of job security and advancement (Sharma, 1981, p. 568).

In a study of tenured librarians with faculty status in large university libraries, the criteria for tenure were ranked at the time when librarians were tenured (all previous to 1979—the year of the survey). Not surprisingly, job performance was rated as a top criteria for tenure in 87.1 percent of the cases. Another 13.8 percent ranked research and publication as a top criterion. By 1979, job performance had dropped to 71 percent as a top criterion, research and publication rose to 28.5 percent and university and community service dropped to 5.8 percent (Gamble, 1986, p. 376).

At a time when librarians are still debating the merits and drawbacks of faculty status and research, a new issue—university service—deserves examination and attention. Faculty status has paved the way to a role in university
governance because even without this status, librarians are often allowed to serve in academic senates and on instructional governance committees in the university. Librarians can and should work toward gaining the flexibility in work schedules that permits them to become involved in university service participation. And it is through performance evaluations that librarians may be provided the incentives and rewards to encourage them in this direction (Gamble, p. 347).

In 1971, the Association of College and Research Libraries adopted the "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians." This action helped define the role and function of academic librarians and gain recognition for librarians as faculty members at many institutions. Yet, a final resolution to the status issue has not been achieved as differences in status prevailed from campus to campus (Peterson, 1983, p. 134).

In a study of job satisfaction among library support staff in Alabama Academic Libraries, published in the July, 1990 issue of College and Research Libraries, it was concluded by the survey that the most urgent problems identified were compensation and opportunities for promotion. It was stated that immediate supervisors have little, if any, control over salaries. They can, however, make the department a better place in which to work by keeping these findings in mind. Supervisors can encourage employees who wish to pursue a
degree or complete one, ensuring that they receive time off for such activities (Fitch, 1990, p. 319).

Use of institutional resources needs to be considered in support of research, publishing, and professional service activities. Where librarians are expected to engage in these activities to meet criteria for tenure and promotion, there should be some institutional commitment for postage, photocopying, and use of the telephone. Under these circumstances, the degree to which institutional resources may be used should be clearly understood and the librarian should make clear the distinction between the activities pursued to fulfill institutional expectations and activities undertaken for personal advancement or gain (Peterson, 1983, p. 135).

Recognizing professional accomplishments is important. Within the management framework of higher education, it is often assumed that the rewards system, denoted by salary increases and granting of tenure and promotions satisfies a need to recognize accomplishment. While these rewards are important, they may be subject to guidelines or limitations over which library supervisors, administrators, and colleagues do not have final control. In a deep sense, respect is based upon sensitivity and appreciation for people's intelligence, professional talents and skills, creative spirit and dedication. A thoughtful expression or testi-
monial recognizing an individual's personal worth and position contributions will provide valuable reinforcement for staff morale (Peterson, 1983, p. 136).

Thomas English in a study in 1982 of Librarians' Status in Eighty-Nine U. S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries, found that faculty librarians up for tenure or promotion were characteristically required to meet two distinct sets of performance criteria: one set designed to measure effectiveness in teaching and research and another set to measure competence in librarianship. Moreover, this study uncovered a case in which a "superb reference librarian" had been terminated for failing to meet faculty teaching and publishing requirements (English, 1984, p. 194). After further study, English reported other instances where librarians had been terminated for failing to meet traditional faculty requirements for tenure.

Ronald R. Powell conducted a study of more than three hundred members of the Association of Research Libraries. Librarians were asked where they had acquired their professional knowledge and where they thought it would be best to acquire it. Respondents indicated that library school and on-the-job experience provided most of their professional education and training, but suggested that they would prefer to acquire more of their knowledge from continuing education and staff development programs than is presently the case.
Academic libraries need people with sophisticated knowledge of technology so that they can take responsibility for planning and purchasing enormously expensive new systems. They need people who will articulate the changes to the academic community as knowledgeable advocates of the necessary economic investment. The library directors must be prepared to accept a new breed of graduates and must be ready to recognize internally to allow the degree of professional autonomy necessary to accomplish the great changes that must take place (Daniel, 1986, p. 362).

Directors of university libraries are asking library schools to increase instruction in evaluation, decision making, administration, and automation, but without reductions of traditional components. The author favors curricular enrichment as a vehicle for improving service and quality of work life, but caution directors that the transition will require better salaries, a new management style, and a planned transition (Marchant, 1984; p. 192).

Librarians must take responsibility for positioning themselves in the appropriate groups and situations; they must not sit and wait to be noticed. Key actors with whom research librarians should establish ongoing contact include faculty involved in information research, computer center staff, publishers, information producers and vendors, those involved in telecommunication networks, state and government librarians (Woodsworth, 1989, p. 136).
As library budgets face increased competition for funds to support professional development activities and evaluation criteria do not diminish their importance, library faculty members may wish to undertake greater responsibility for mounting local programs which foster a collegiate approach to professional development (Rockman, 1989, p. 902).

Dorothy Cieslicki did a case study of the Dickinson College Library of Carlisle, Pennsylvania where the library personnel went from a hierarchically organized professional staff to a collegiably organized professional staff. Standards were greatly increased for librarians, but other factors relating to research and tenure also increased (Cieslicki, 1982, p. 79). The structure worked out at Dickinson has been both modeled after and despairs of in library literature. Cieslicki stated that William Axford cautioned, in 1974 about the unpredictable high costs of creating participative governance in the library. Dickinson experienced all of them—stress in eliminating hierarchy, salary adjustment accompanying the abolishment of the salary-status relationship, and difficulty in finding candidates who set their professional sights sufficiently high.

Constance H. Corey in her article entitled "Those precious human resources," stated that at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, they expect of librarians not only outstanding job performance but also continued professional
development and contributions, as well as service, in order to qualify for promotion and continuing appointment status. In order for librarians to actively participate in these areas, a number of support mechanisms were developed. Attendance and participation in conferences and workshops were encouraged. Some travel funds were made available (Corey, 81, p. 128).

Participation by academic librarians in their professional organizations cannot be emphasized too strongly. Conferences provide the perfect time to exchange ideas or to learn about new ones, to observe something or someone that you have read about, to catch up on who has gone where and done whatever, to speak firsthand with an exhibitor, or to inquire about job possibilities. Conferences are also a good place to volunteer for work on committees thereby providing the opportunity to take a more active part in decision and policy making (Foos, 1975, p. 45).

Academic librarians should consider some writing activity as part of their program of continuing education. Writing articles and books, compiling published bibliographies, and reviewing books all constitute an essential part of continuing education which makes us more effective in our day-to-day role as academic librarians. Library administrators who recognize and encourage the development of scholarly potential in the members of their professional staff should make research
funds available to these individuals just as these monies are available to members of the faculty. We will discover that by engaging in scholarly endeavors, we as librarians, will be held in higher regard by our colleagues who have as their primary responsibility the teaching of courses (Foos, 1976, p. 46).

At Arizona State University provisions were made for librarians, upon approval of professional development proposals to be granted time off at the equivalence of four hours per week to pursue research publication, or continuing education activities (Corey, 1988, p. 130).

Much has been written and said about the image and worth of librarians. If anyone does not agree that the critical juncture in terms of our collective professional future has arrived, let her speak now or forever hold her peace. We have a job to do - a very important job - but if we cannot pay a living wage to those who choose to do it, they will move into other professions and rightly so. If we desire respect as professionals, as has been iterated and reported in the literature, is not the first and rightful step to demonstrate that we have respect for ourselves? Salary should not be the only means, but it becomes the most significant when it is so low that it equates with the Maslow hierarchy of needs. Let us eliminate that gnawing essential so that we can move on to the real meaning of self-respect, unhampered by thoughts of rent, food, and other basics (Corey, 1988, p. 130).
Marion T. Reid conducted a study of Professional Salaries in Louisiana Academic Libraries, 1980-81. In this study it was concluded that:

1) Librarians in those libraries with professional or equivalent ranks tend to have higher salaries than librarians with no professional ranks.

2) In libraries with professional ranks, males average salaries are higher than females average salaries except at the instructor level.

3) In all categories, women have more average years of experience than do men (Reid, 1982, p. 82).

A survey of Louisiana Medical Librarians revealed that Louisiana funding (medical schools) for professional meetings is one of the highest in the TALON (Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico) region. The Louisiana Medical Librarians place an emphasis upon attending the regional meeting, but they rank the lowest in attendance to state, national and workshop meetings. (Triplett, 1983, p. 139).

In 1984, Anthony G. Tassin wrote an article on faculty status for librarians that cited a study done by the University of New Orleans that showed that there has been progress in asserting faculty status in Louisiana (Tassin, 1984, p. 86).

In reviewing several sources of Louisiana literature, the sources revealed the following studies that related to professional development. In 1977, Bonnie Jackson conducted a study on the status of academic librarians in Louisiana. Her
survey covered the following topics: professional responsibilities and self-determination, library governance; college and university governance, compensation; tenure, promotion, leaves, and research funds and academic freedom. It is noted that 12 of the 15 responding Louisiana libraries stated that release time during the normal work week is provided for professional endeavors such as committee work for professional associations and 14 of the 15 provided release time for academic responsibilities such as work on university committees and the same number provided release time to attend professional meetings (Jackson, 1977, p. 103).

It was concluded in this study that academic librarians in Louisiana enjoy many of the same privileges and have many of the same responsibilities as the teaching faculty at their institution and librarians are participating in activities other than those directly related to their library position (Jackson, 1977, p. 104).

Summary

Many of the studies in the review of literature focused on the need for staff development, continuing education activities in the academic libraries of the United States of North America. Very few of these studies centered around concrete professional advancements that are actually derived from participation in professional development activities.
Advanced degrees usually provided some monetary benefit. This activity, however, did not provide in most instances an advantage from promotion and tenure in the academic arena. An advanced degree coupled with other criteria often lead to the application for these advances. Other activities such as attendance at professional meetings, workshops, seminars and conferences tend to play a very small part in the evaluative process for professional advancement.

Most studies focused on job performance and job satisfaction as the motivating factors in the participation in staff development activities. Some studies did allude to the fact that when employees take the time and effort for self improvement, some attention should be given in terms of consideration for professional advancement.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will describe the procedures used in obtaining the data necessary to test the proposed hypotheses. It will describe the following: Population, survey instrument, survey pilot, method of data collection, method of analysis and summary.

The Population

The library director, a department head, and a staff member of each of the Louisiana academic libraries constituted the population. The 1990 Louisiana Academic Library Directory listed the names of the institutions and the names of the directors. The total population was 86. Thirty one directors were surveyed, twenty seven department heads and twenty eight staff members. Some small libraries did not have department heads or staff members. The American Library Directory 1989-90 and the Louisiana Library Membership Directory were used to determine the names of department heads and staff members.
The Survey Instrument

Data concerning the personal characteristics such as marital status, sex, age, years of experience, type of institution of employment, job title, highest degree obtained and subject area of the degree and professional rank or classification were obtained by the use of a survey questionnaire in part I. Part II requested responses that were job related and elicited information concerning the factors that are being used in Louisiana academic libraries to determine professional advancement and to what extent participation in staff development activities is being used toward professional advancement. Part III of the instrument included three (3) opinion questions about the index model attached to the questionnaire. The questions requested information about the feasibility of the index and how useful it will be in measuring quantitatively staff development activities.

The Pilot Survey

To help determine the validity and the reliability of the survey instrument, the pilot survey was submitted to six individuals in the academic community of the Southern University-Shreveport Campus. Two were academic librarians not participating in the subsequent survey, three were educators with library credentials working in other disciplines and one was a professor of education with experience and expertise in
instrument design. The professor of education was chosen because of her expertise in the area of questionnaire design.

The pilot survey was submitted in early June, 1990. Each participant was interviewed to determine specific problems in the use of the survey instrument. Suggestions from the returned surveys and the interviews were taken into consideration in the final draft.

Table I

Responses to the Pilot Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Librarians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Educators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of Data Collection

The Louisiana Academic Libraries Directory of library directors and the Louisiana Library Association Directory were used to gather the appropriate names of directors, department heads, and staff members of each academic institution in Louisiana. The cover letter (Appendix A) and questionnaire (Appendix B) were mailed with a return self-addressed stamped
envelope to all directors, specific department heads and staff members. A deadline of July 15, 1990 was given for returning the questionnaires. The questionnaires not returned by the date requested were contacted by phone on two occasions to secure the highest percentage of returns possible. The self-addressed stamped envelopes and questionnaires were coded to the names of directors, department heads and staff members. A record was kept as responses were received.

Table II

Returns of Initial Questionnaires Mailed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One week after the deadline date, a phone call to each of the individuals not responding was made. The results of the first follow-up calls are shown in Table III.
Table III

Returns of the First Follow-up Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Called</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One week after the first follow-up, another phone call was made to the remaining individuals not responding to any of the previous contacts. The results of the second follow-up are listed in Table IV.

Table IV

Returns of the Second Follow-Up Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Called</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final results of the returned questionnaires are listed in Table V.

### Table V

**Final Returns of the Questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of Analysis

Once all of the data had been collected from the questionnaires, the results were placed on a data form (Appendix C) by the following categories: Directors (Group One), Department Heads (Group Two), and Staff Members (Group Three). The data form consisted of the three parts using the design of the questionnaire. The responses were recorded and tabulated by category and by questions. Comments were listed on additional pages (Appendix E).

The responses were tabulated on each data form and a copy of the tabulations were given to the statistician. The statistician used the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), and was able to provide the following types of statistical analyses.
Summary

This chapter discusses the procedures used in gathering the data necessary to support the study. The data was collected to determine if any significant differences existed between staff development and other factors in the professional advancement of academic librarians in Louisiana.

The data collected on the opinion questions related to the use of a staff development index which will also be analyzed statistically. The results of this analysis will be an improved index.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The problem of this study is to identify the role of staff development activities in the evaluation process for salary increases, promotion, and tenure in Louisiana academic libraries. The purposes of this study were (1) to identify factors used to determine professional advancement; (2) to determine if any factors other than job performance may have a major influence in determining professional advancement; (3) to determine to what extent, if any, staff development activities were used in deciding salary increases, promotion, and tenure; (4) to assess the relationship between staff development and other factors, such as teaching, research, professional performance and service, and (5) to develop a staff development index to be used as a criteria of quantitative measure in the evaluation process.

Data for the study were obtained by surveying three groups of librarians. The directors, who make the decisions concerning advancements at the library level; the department heads, who make the recommendations for advancements based on criteria; and staff members, who initiate the request for advancements. Completed questionnaires were received from 24 directors, 18 department heads, and 20 staff members.
Two hypotheses were stated in the study. Hypothesis One states that job performance is the greatest factor in the evaluation process for professional advancement. Hypothesis Two states that staff development activities will play a very small role in determining professional progress.

In addition to these hypotheses, a subordinate study of an index model of staff development activities was attempted. This involved an analysis of librarians' opinions of the index as a quantitative measure of staff development activities.

Data with reference to the personal information obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed. The data showed that 17.74 percent of the respondents were single, 16.12 percent were divorced, 1.61 percent were widowed and the majority of the respondents, 64.56 percent, were married. The summary of the marital status is presented in Table VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data concerning the sex of the respondents showed that 80.65 percent were females and 19.35 percent were males. The resulting statistical data are present in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Figure 2 presents a distribution of the sex of respondents by groups. Library directors represented 38 percent of the females. Department heads represented 34 percent of the females responding and staff members represented 28 percent of the females responding. Of the male respondents, 41.67 percent were directors, 8.33 percent were Department Heads, and 50 percent were staff members.

Figure 1

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX
Figure 2
RESPONDENTS BY SEX AND SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age of the respondents ranged between 22-70 with the majority ranging in ages between 41-60. Of the 62 respondents, 6.45 percent were between the ages 22-30, 22.58 percent were between the ages of 31-40, 30.65 percent were between the ages of 41-50, 32.26 percent were between the ages of 51-60, and 8.06 percent were between the ages of 61-70. Figure 3 summarizes ages of the respondents.
Figure 4 represents the age categories by group. Twenty-five percent of Directors were between the ages of 22-30, there were no Department Heads in that category and 75 percent of the respondents in that category were staff members. Seven point one four percent of the Directors, 42.86 percent Department Heads and 50 percent staff members, respectively fell in the 31-40 age category. Forty-seven point thirty four percent of Directors, 31.58 percent Department Heads and 21.05 percent staff members fell in the age category 41-50. Sixty percent of the Directors, 15 percent Department Heads and 25 percent staff members fell in the age category of 51-60. Twenty percent of Directors, 60
percent Department Heads and 20 percent staff members were in the age category of 61-70. This data is presented in Figure 4.

The work experience of the respondents is presented in Figure 5. A wide range of experience is presented. Of the respondents 9.8 percent were in 0-5 years category, 8.20 percent were in 6-10 years category, 16.39 percent were in the 11-15 years category, 22.95 percent were in the 16-20 years category, 9.8 percent were in the 26-30 years category, 13.11 percent were in the 30 and above years category and 1.64 did not respond at all.
Figure 5

RESPONDENTS BY WORK EXPERIENCE

Figure 6 represents a summary of work experience by subgroup. Three directors (50 percent) had work experience of 0-5 years, no department head (0 percent) had less than five years, and three staff members (50 percent) had 0-5 years respectively. Directors with 6-10 years of experience equal to zero (0), department heads, one for 20 percent and staff members four for 80 percent, respectively. One director (10 percent), five department heads (50 percent), and four staff members (40 percent) respectively, had 11-15 years of experience. Three directors (21 percent), seven department heads (50 percent) and four staff members (29 percent) respectively had 16-20 years of experience.
Figure 6

RESPONDENTS BY WORK EXPERIENCE AND SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPER LEVEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.96%</td>
<td>36.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>59.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>71.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>82.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>93.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data concerning the type of institution of the respondents are presented in Figure 7. Seventy four point nineteen percent were from public institutions and 25.81 percent were from private institutions.

Figure 8 shows that of the responding private institutions, 43.75 percent of the respondents were directors, 25 percent department heads, 31.25 percent staff members, respectively. Of the public institutions, 36.96 percent were directors, 30.43 percent department heads and 32.61 percent staff members.
Figure 7
RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

- Public: 46 (74.19%)
- Private: 16 (25.81%)

Figure 8
RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Group</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>67.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 shows the educational level of the respondents. Of the 62 respondents, 14.52 percent held doctorates, 70.97 percent masters, 11.25 percent bachelors, and 3.23 percent did not respond to questions.

Figure 9

RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Figure 10 shows the respondents by educational level and subgroups. Of the 62 respondents, two directors 29 percent had bachelor degrees, one department head 14 percent, and four staff members 57 percent. Fifteen directors 34 percent had masters degrees, 15 department heads 34 percent and 14 staff members 32 percent. Seven directors 78 percent had doctorates, two department heads 22 percent, and no staff member. Two staff members did not respond to the question.
Figure 10
RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND SUBGROUPS

Figure 11 represents data that show the subject areas of the degrees earned. The majority of the respondents 66.13 percent had degrees in Library Science, 6.45 percent had degrees in Education, 4.84 percent in Media, and 17.74 percent in other areas. These areas are Anthropology (1), Theology (1), English (4), Biology (1), Business (1) and History (1). Four percent did not respond to the question about the educational level.
Figure 11
RESPONDENTS BY SUBJECT AREA OF
DEGREES EARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66.13</td>
<td>72.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>77.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>82.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shown in Figure 12 represents 4 percent of the directors which had degrees in Education. No department heads and no staff members had degrees in Education. Fifteen percent of library directors had library science degrees, 30 percent of department heads and 41 percent staff members, respectively. Two percent of the directors had degrees in Media, 3 percent department heads and 3 percent staff members. Four percent did not respond and 18 percent had degrees in other areas. These areas are shown on page 54.

Data in Figure 13 represent the academic rank of the respondents. Of the respondents, 6.45 percent were professors, 20.97 percent were associate professors, 22.58 percent were
assistant professors, 14.52 percent were instructors, and 35.48 percent did not respond to the question at all.

Figure 14 shows the responses by rank and subgroup. Over one third of the respondents had no response largely because the private institutions which are about a third of the responses are not academically ranked. Of the respondents to the professor category, 75 percent were directors, 25 percent department heads and no staff members, respectively. Of associate professors, 69.23 percent directors, 15.38 percent staff members, respectively. Of associate professors, 21.43 percent were directors, 35.71 percent department heads, 42.86 percent staff members, respectively. Of the instructor category, no director, 44.44 percent department heads, 55.56 staff members.

On Part II of the questionnaire, respondents were given an opportunity to answer questions regarding staff development activities and factors that influence professional advancement in academic libraries in Louisiana. Question One tried to determine if a staff development program existed at the participating library. Thirty five percent said yes and 64.5 percent said no. An analysis of the responses is presented in Table VII.
**Figure 12**

**Respondents by Area of Study and Subgroup**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13**

**Respondents by Academic Rank**

- Associate Prof.: 13 (20.97%)
- Assistant Prof.: 14 (22.58%)
- Instructor: 9 (14.52%)
- Professor: 4 (6.45%)
- No Response: 22 (35.48%)
Figure 14

RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC RANK
AND SUBGROUP

Table VII

RESPONDENTS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF A
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BY SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP FREQUENCY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A statistical analysis using Chi Square distributions to test if any significant differences is shown in the responses of each group. The Chi-Square calculated value is 1.855 with two degrees of freedom. There is no significant difference shown in the responses of each of the subgroups.

Table VIII represents the test of statistical significance between the responses of the subgroups as it relates to monies budgeted for staff development activities. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents stated that monies are budgeted for activities, 23 percent stated that no money is budgeted for staff development activities. There was no significant difference in the responses by the subgroups. The chi-square value was 3.582 at 2 degrees of freedom.

Hypothesis One stated that job performance is the greatest factor in the evaluation process for professional advancement. Questions three, four and five of Part II dealt with other factors that are used for professional advancement. Question three examined incentives used for awarding professional advancement. Forty-seven percent of the 59 respondents to the question stated that incentives were awarded for staff development at their institutions, 53 percent stated that no incentives were awarded for staff development. A chi-square analysis was run to determine if a relation existed between the responses of the subgroups. The data
was tested at .05 level of significance at 2 degrees of value of 1.389. The table value is 5.991 which showed no significant difference in response by subgroups. Table IX will present the data.

In view of the responses to Question Three, the probability of factors other than job performance playing a major role in the professional advancement of academic librarians in Louisiana is unlikely.

Table VIII
RESPONDENTS OF MONIES BUDGETED FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>44.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>18.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>79.66</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In question four, specific factors were asked to be identified. Seventy nine percent stated that teaching, research, publication, professional performance and service were used for professional advancement, 17.7 percent stated that these factors were not used for professional advancement, 3.2 percent did not respond. Of the specific factors, professional performance and service were both 71.1 percent, teaching 57.6 percent, research 67.7 percent and publication 74.5 percent.
Question five tried to determine if special emphasis was placed on any one of the factors. Of the 41 responses to this question, 46 percent stated that special emphasis is placed on professional performance, 29 percent stated teaching, 36.8 percent research, 39 percent publication and 29.2 percent service.

The overall conclusion after analysis of the three questions of Part II, is that no significant difference was shown between job performance and other factors in the evaluation process for professional advancement. Therefore, Hypothesis One was rejected.

Hypothesis Two states that staff development activities will play a very small role in determining professional progress. Question Six, nine and ten examined this statement to analyze if staff development activities played any significant role in determining professional progress.

Questionnaire participants were asked in question six if staff development activities compared equally with other factors in awarding incentives. Twenty nine percent of the 59 respondents stated yes, 58 percent stated no, 14 percent had no response. Over half of the respondents stated that staff development activities play a lesser role when compared to other factors in awarding incentives.

Question nine examined if staff development compared equally with other factors in the evaluation for promotion
and tenure. Of the 62 respondents to the question, 12.9 percent stated that staff development did compare equally with other factors in determining promotion and tenure, 75.8 percent stated it did not compare equally. The majority stated that it comprised less than one fourth of the evaluation.

Question ten examined if staff development was used in evaluation criteria at all. Forty three percent stated that staff development was used in the evaluation criteria, 46.6 percent stated it was not used, and 1.0 percent did not respond at all.

Question seven and eight examined the criteria used for evaluating promotions and tenure. Sixty one percent stated that the same criteria used for the teaching faculty is also used to evaluate librarians for promotion and tenure, 32.2 percent stated that they were not evaluated using the same criteria, 6.7 percent percent did not respond. Question eight asked if doctoral work, scholarly publication, research and service were prequisites for obtaining tenure. Five percent of the 59 respondents stated that doctoral work is a prerequisite, 42.3 percent stated publication, 38.9 percent stated research, 67.7 percent stated service and 23.7 percent did not respond. Percentages are more than one hundred because respondents responded to more than one activity. However, service was the overriding activity in determining tenure.
An overall analysis was done on Part II to test Hypothesis Two. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the relationship between the responses of the subgroups to test if any significant differences existed. The analysis was achieved by calculating the F-ratio and comparing it to the tabled F. The calculated F value was 0.228097 and the tabled value was 3.00 at the .05 level of significance. There were no significant differences, therefore Hypothesis two was accepted. A summary of that data is found in Table X.

Table X

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Means Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1278.606</td>
<td>639.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16535.297</td>
<td>280.27622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17814.903</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III of the questionnaire is related to a subordinate study of an index model of staff development activities. The data analyzed in this section relate to Louisiana Academic Librarians' opinions of the index as a quantitative
measure of staff development activities.

Question One examined the usefulness of the index as an evaluative tool. A majority of the librarians, 62.2 percent, stated that the index was useful, 24.5 percent stated it was not useful, and 13.1 percent did not respond. Table XI is a table of responses by subgroups to the question, the non-responses were omitted, therefore \( N = 53 \). In examining Table XI, 53.3 percent of the not useful responses were from directors, it appears that department heads and staff members find the index more useful than directors.

Table XI

RESPONDENTS OF THE USEFULNESS OF INDEX BY SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>28.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>71.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Two asked participants to indicate if known staff development activities were missing from the index. Twenty seven percent of the respondents stated that there were missing activities (Appendix D), 49.1 percent stated that there were no missing activities, and 22.9 percent did not respond. Of the 47 responding yes or no to the question, Table XII will represent a distribution of responses to questions by subgroups. Of 24 directors, 17 responded to the question for 70.8 percent, 18 department heads 16 responded for 88.8 percent; 20 staff members 14 responded for 70.0 percent.

### Table XII

**Respondents to Missing Activity by Subgroup**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.83</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question three examined the formula used in the index model. Forty-six percent of the respondents stated that they agreed with the formula, 32.7 percent disagreed, 21.3 percent did not respond. Table XIII is a distribution of the yes and no responses by subgroups, comments about the formula are located in (Appendix E).

### Table XIII

RESPONDENTS TO THE AGREEMENT WITH THE FORMULAS BY SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In this chapter the study is summarized, the conclusions are presented, and recommendations are made for the improvement of this study and further research. The purposes of this study were to: (1) identify factors used to determine professional advancements; (2) assess the relationship between staff development and other factors, such as teaching, research, professional performance and service; (3) determine the feasibility of developing a staff development index to be used as a criteria of quantitative measures in the evaluation process.

There were two hypotheses to be tested. Hypothesis One stated that job performance is the greatest factor in the evaluation process for professional advancement. Hypothesis Two stated that staff development activities will play a very small role in determining professional progress. An additional subordinate study of the feasibility of using an index model as a quantitative measure of staff development activities was examined.
A population of 86 academic librarians was surveyed to provide the necessary data to be analyzed and for hypotheses testing. The population was divided into three subgroups on the basis of job title. These titles were directors, department heads and staff members. The data were gathered over several weeks and transferred to a data form. These data were processed by a statistician. A chi-square distribution was used to test Hypothesis One. The statistical technique used to test Hypothesis Two was the analysis of variance. The .05 level of significance was selected as the level of rejection for both hypotheses. Frequency distributions were also used in analyzing the data gathered. The data collected on the opinion questions relating to the use of a staff development index were also analyzed statistically.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn from the data that was analyzed:

1. Louisiana academic librarians showed that factors other than job performance play a significant role in determining professional advancement. Because all of the questions related to Hypotheses One were tested at the .05 level of probability and the chi-square calculated values 1.855, 1.389, 3.582 were less than the tabled value at 2 de-
degrees of freedom which was 5.991, Hypothesis One was rejected.

2. Louisiana academic librarians showed that staff development activities play a very small role in determining professional progress in Louisiana libraries. Using the statistical procedure Analysis of Variance to determine if staff development activities played a significant role, the F value was calculated for each question related to the hypothesis. The calculated value for the question was F=0.0134 and the Table Value was 3.00 at .05 level of significance with degrees of freedom at 2 and 59, Hypothesis Two was retained.

3. Of the 62 responding librarians, 22 stated that staff development programs existed. In sixty-five percent of Louisiana academic libraries, formal staff development programs are not available. However, some staff development activities are available in 90 percent of the responding libraries.

4. Incentives such as salary increase, promotion, and reassignment are not awarded for staff development activities in 50 percent of the responding libraries.

5. Monies are budgeted for some staff development activities in 68 percent of the responding libraries; registration fees in 65 percent; meals and lodging, 61 percent; course work, 19 percent; professional dues paid 11 percent.
6. The majority of the respondents to the index model's usefulness as a tool in measuring quantitatively staff development activities were department heads and staff members. Overall, all groups stated that the index had some usefulness.

7. Valuable input was provided when librarians evaluated the index in terms of missing activities (see Appendix D).

8. Only 45 percent of the librarians stated that they agreed with the formula for assessing the quality points. However, of those answering yes or no to the question, 58 percent stated they agreed with the formula, 42 percent did not agree and 23 percent did not answer the question.

9. The majority of Louisiana academic librarians are married, 65 percent, 18 percent single, 16 percent divorced, 1.6 percent widowed.

10. The majority of academic librarians are women, 81 percent, 19 percent men. Seventy-nine percent of library directors are women, 21 percent men.

11. Over seventy-one percent of Louisiana academic librarians are between the ages of 41-70. Only 29 percent are between the ages of 22-40.

12. The majority of the Louisiana academic librarians have 10 or more years of experience, 79 percent, 18 percent with ten years or less experience, 3 percent did not respond.
13. The majority of the academic librarians in Louisiana have Master's degrees, 80 percent, 11 percent Bachelor's, 15 percent doctorates.

14. The majority of the degrees were in Library Science 66 percent, 6.5 percent education, 4.8 media, 16 percent in other areas.

15. The majority of Louisiana academic librarians have academic rank. Sixty-five percent hold the following ranks: Instructor 14.5 percent, Assistant Professor 22.5 percent, Associate Professor 20.9 percent and Professor 6.4 percent.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the results of this study:

1. Because the majority of the surveyed population were in the age range of 41 years or above, it is recommended that a study be conducted over the next two years to determine if Louisiana is experiencing a shortage of young progressive individuals entering the field or are librarians leaving the state for better opportunities.

2. Because some differences were shown in factors other than job performance--especially service--it is recommended that a study be conducted to determine what special role this factor is now playing in the evaluation process for professional advancement.
3. A study of this nature should be conducted again in the near future because several librarians were just implementing staff development programs and this study may have heightened the interest in other libraries based on several comments during the follow-up calls.

4. This study investigated the feasibility of using an index model to assess quantitatively staff development activities, it is recommended that a study be conducted to assess the qualitative aspects of staff development activities.

5. This study was conducted with a small population in Louisiana librarianship, it is recommended that the study be conducted on a larger scale with a larger population to draw from.

6. Because the investigation was conducted during the summer months, it is recommended that studies of this nature be conducted during the academic year (September-May) because the summer appears to be a time of transition for Louisiana librarians. The summer is a time for retirement, job changes and the end of month contracts.

7. Because the study showed that a very small percent of academic librarians in Louisiana were men, it is recommended that a study be conducted to determine why the numbers are small, especially in directorship which is quite different from twenty years ago.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER
June 27, 1990

Dear Louisiana Academic Librarians:

I am Orella Ramsey Brazile, Librarian at Southern UniversityShreveport, and a doctoral student in the School of Library and Information Sciences at the University of North Texas. I am currently conducting a survey on factors related to the professional progress of academic librarians in Louisiana. Specifically, I am trying to determine if staff development plays any significant role in the professional advancement of librarians in Louisiana.

Section III of the enclosed questionnaire includes three opinion questions about an index model. The index model is an attempt to quantify professional development activities, especially if they are to be used as an evaluation measure in determining professional advancement. Your input in this section will be invaluable, and your assistance in this research is needed to make this study a success.

Please complete and return the questionnaire by July 15, 1990. Your responses will be confidential and no use will be made of the information except as summative data.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Orella R. Brazile

Enclosure
I. Personal

Name ____________________________________________________________

Nirital Status: Single _____ Divorced _____ Married _____ Widowed _____

Sex: Female _____ Male _____

Age Category: 22-30 _____ 51-60 _____

31-40 _____ 61-70 _____

41-50 _____

Total Number of Years Experience ______________________

Public Library _____ Private _____

Present Title __________________________________________

Highest Degree Obtained ______________________ Subject Area ______________________

Rank/Classification ______________________________________

II. Job Related

1. Is a staff development program available at your library? ____ Yes ____ No

2. Are monies budgeted for participation in professional activities? ____ Yes ____ No

   if yes, which activities?

   ____ travel

   ____ additional courses

   ____ professional dues

   ____ meals/lodging

   ____ registration fees

   ____ others Explain ______________________

3. Are any incentives awarded for staff development? ____ Yes ____ No

   If the answer is yes, which incentives?

   ____ salary increases

   ____ opportunities for promotion

   ____ opportunities for reassignment

   ____ others Explain ______________________
4. Are any of the following factors used for professional advancement at your institution? 
   ____ Yes ____ No. If yes, identify the factors.
   _____ teaching
   _____ research
   _____ publication
   _____ professional performance
   _____ service
   _____ institutional service
   _____ professional service
   _____ community service
   _____ Other (Specify)

5. Is special emphasis placed on any of the factors above? If yes, which factors?

6. Are staff development activities equally compared with other factors in awarding incentives? ____ Yes ____ No. If no, what is the difference? Explain____

7. Are librarians evaluated for promotion and tenure by the same criteria as the teaching faculty? ____ Yes ____ No. If no, what criteria are used

8. Are the following prerequisites for obtaining tenure? Check as many as apply.
   _____ Doctoral Work
   _____ Scholarly Publication
   _____ Research
   _____ Service

9. Is staff development equally compared with teaching, research, publication and service in the evaluation for promotion/tenure? ____ Yes ____ No. If not equally, can you determine what weight is applied?

   Is it 1/4 ____?
   Is it 1/3 ____?
   Is it 1/2 ____?
   Is it 3/4 ____?

10. Is staff development included in the evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure at your institution? ____ Yes ____ No.
III. Please give your assessment of the attached index model.

Do you think that the staff development index will be a useful tool in measuring quantitatively staff development activities?   _____Yes  _____No.

Comment

Are activities missing that should be included in the index?   _____Yes  _____No. If yes, please list.

Do you agree with the formulas for assessing the quality points?   _____Yes  _____No. If no, state your input.
INDEX MODEL

Rating of activities is determined by the complexity of the activity.

5 - educational attainment
4 - advanced study
3 - publication and research
2 - attendance at professional meeting (national, regional or state level)
1 - Other meeting attendance

Formula I: Quality points = Rated Activity $\times$ Number of Activities $\quad QP = RA \times NA$

Formula II: Quality points = Rated Activity $\times$ Weighted Activity $\quad QP = RA \times WA$

I. Educational Attainment - Formula $QP = RA \times NA$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
<th>Quality Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree in Library Field</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Example) (Above the MLS; PhD or DLS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree in Related Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Above the Master; PhD or EdD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree in Library and Information Science Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree in related field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification in Library field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Advanced Study - Formula $QP = RA \times WA$

Additional Courses in Library Field

- 3-6 hours = .5
- 6-12 hours = .6
- 12-24 hours = .7
- 24-36 hours = .8
- Above 36 = .9

Additional Courses in a Related Field

- 3-6 hours = .5
- 6-12 hours = .6
- 12-24 hours = .7
- 24-36 hours = .8
- Above 36 = .9

Continuing Education Units

- 1-2 units = .5
- 3-4 units = .6
- 5-6 units = .7
- 7-8 units = .8
- 9-10 units = .9
APPENDIX C

DATA FORM FOR COLLECTING
DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE
RESPONDENTS
DATA FORM

PART I

QUESTION 1 - MARITAL STATUS
1. Single________________________
2. Married_______________________
3. Divorced_______________________
4. Widowed_______________________
5. NO RESPONSE___________________

QUESTION 2 - SEX
1. Female________________________
2. Married_______________________
3. NO RESPONSE___________________

QUESTION 3 - AGE
1. 22-30________________________
2. 31-40________________________
3. 41-50________________________
4. 51-60________________________
5. 61-70________________________
6. NO RESPONSE___________________

QUESTION 4 - EXPERIENCE
1. 0-5___________________________
2. 6-10__________________________
3. 11-15________________________
4. 16-20________________________
5. 21-25________________________
6. 26-30________________________
7. ABOVE 30_____________________
8. NO RESPONSE___________________

QUESTION 5 - TYPE OF INSTITUTION
1. PUBLIC_______________________
2. PRIVATE_______________________
3. NO RESPONSE___________________
QUESTION 3 - JOB TITLE
1. DIRECTOR
2. DEPARTMENT HEAD
3. STAFF
4. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 7 - HIGHEST DEGREE
1. BACHELOR
2. MASTERS
3. DOCTORATE
4. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 8 - SUBJECT AREA
1. LIBRARY SCIENCE
2. EDUCATION
3. MEDIA
4. OTHER
5. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 9 - RANK
1. INSTRUCTOR
2. ASST. PROFESSOR
3. ASSOC. PROFESSOR
4. PROFESSOR
5. NO RESPONSE

PART II

QUESTION 1 - AVAILABLE SD PROGRAM
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 2 - MONIES BUDGETED FOR SD
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE
YES
1. TRAVEL
2. COURSES
3. PROFESSIONAL DUES
4. MEALS/LODGING
5. REGISTRATION FEES
6. OTHERS
7. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 3 - INCENTIVES FOR SD
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

YES
1. SALARY INCREASES
2. PROMOTION
3. REASSIGNMENT
4. OTHERS
5. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 4 - FACTORS USED FOR PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

YES
1. TEACHING
2. RESEARCH
3. PUBLICATION
4. PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE
5. SERVICE

QUESTION 5 - SPECIAL EMPHASIS
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE
YES  1. TEACHING
2. PUBLICATION
3. RESEARCH

WHICH FACTOR?

QUESTION 6 - EQUALLY COMPARED FACTORS
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

NO. WHICH

QUESTION 7 - EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 8 - PREREQUISITES FOR TENURE
1. DOCTORAL WORK
2. PUBLICATION
3. RESEARCH
4. SERVICE
5. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 9 - EQUALLY COMPARED W/TEACHING
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE

1. 1/4
2. 1/5
3. 1/2
4. 3/4
5. NO RESPONSE

QUESTION 10 - EVALUATION CRITERIA
1. YES
2. NO
3. NO RESPONSE
PART III

QUESTION 1 - USEFULNESS OF INDEX
1. YES__________________________
2. NO__________________________
3. NO RESPONSE_________________

QUESTION 2 - MISSING ACTIVITIES
1. YES__________________________
2. NO__________________________
3. NO RESPONSE_________________

QUESTION 3 - AGREEMENT WITH FORMULAS
1. YES__________________________
2. NO__________________________
3. NO RESPONSE_________________
APPENDIX D

A LIST OF COMMENTS CONCERNING MISSING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE INDEX MODEL
APPENDIX D

A list of comments concerning staff development activities that are missing from the index model.

1. Committee participation (on campus).

2. Nothing is mentioned about quality of service to patrons. Too much emphasis on education achievement, research, etc. A main problem with librarians is that they don't deal well with the patrons.

3. Creative endeavors other than publishing such as computerized files.

4. What about university and community services?

5. Holding office in a professional organization which can be most time consuming and is always a learning experience.

6. Are activities in non-library field to be included? Professional activities, of course.

7. An evaluation should be made of how well we perform our daily duties as librarians.

8. I don't feel any evaluation can be totally quantifiable. There should be some consideration of professional development in evaluations, however, some staff read enough professional literature to keep up with their field and ahead of those.

9. University committee assignments and internal publications.

10. University committee work, community service work, awards and other forms of recognition.

11. Research/publication/teaching may not be library related. Especially teaching under Louisiana law, such subject teaching would be unjust and not wanted toward merit or promotion.
12. Articles presented for publication in journals should also get credit.

13. I feel that university services, i.e., faculty committee, faculty senate membership deserve consideration. I also feel that professional irrelevance in associations (office and major committee positions) deserve consideration.

14. Some consideration should be given to years in the profession.

15. Evaluation of everyday duties are left out. This is the most important area of the library field. How a librarian functions in the library, after all the workshops, the degrees, the research, etc. Don't leave this out.

16. Community service, library committees, university committees bibliographies, indexes.

17. Staff/student relationship.

18. Creative work such as computerization of statistics, indexes, etc. Displays bibliographies.

19. College committee work or in-house committee work, creative work performed or displayed in-house.

20. Service to university community.

21. How about library, university and community service?
APPENDIX E

A LIST OF COMMENTS CONCERNING
THE INPUT INTO THE FORMULA
FOR THE INDEX MODEL
APPENDIX E

A list of comments concerning input into the improvement of the formula for the Index Model.

1. Advanced degrees above the MLS is not relevant.

2. In the advanced study section the number of courses (or credit hours) doesn't seem to count for much.

3. Why should staying at a meeting more days rate more quality points?

4. It is not so much the formulas as the rankings. I would suggest six.
   6 - Research and publication
   5 - Educational attainment
   4 - Advanced study
   3 - Office holding and professional organization
   2 - Attendance at professional meeting
   1 - Attendance at other meetings

5. If I'm understanding your formula, I think published material should rank higher than one percent.

6. Your formula is interesting but completely irrelevant for our library.

7. More importance should be given to on-going activities which keep us current in our field.

8. Who attends conferences?

9. What formulas? Yours or what each school mandates? There is no related field to MLS/PhD in Library Science. Advanced degrees should be equal except MLS. A second Master's should be highly rated. No advanced points should be given for a non-completed degree. No separation should be made between journal fields, or if so, library rules should rate lower. Unpublished research should not count. Non-funded grants should not count. National meetings should weigh much higher--meetings should not count if only attended--committee work required. List of several categories should not all be equal.
10. I like the section of unpublished research and non-funded grants. The work may be same, but not selected. All included take research and valuable time and a great opportunity to grow professionally.

11. (1) I think more points should be given when an individual is involved with a meeting at the national level. (2) A maximum number of points should be established in each category. Some people may establish all points in only one or two areas.

12. I feel that educational attainment is rated too high. To perform as a librarian, a PhD or DLS is not a requirement. To teach library science they should be a requirement. Most librarians do not teach library science.

13. Very hard to understand. They should be used for some actual cases before being made final. Do you really think a local presenter should get the same amount of points as a national presenter? What does weight of activity mean?
APPENDIX F

VITA
ORELILLA RAMSEY BRAZILE was born in Leesville, Louisiana on May 23, 1945. She is a product of Avoyelles Parish Parish School System. She graduated from Paul Lawrence Dunbar High School in 1963.

In 1963, she attended Grambling State University, where she majored in Social Science Education and minored in Library Science and graduated in December of 1967, and the degree was conferred in May 1968. In the summer of 1971, she enrolled in the Master's program at East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, and received a Masters of Science in Library Science the summer of 1973. In 1974, she enrolled in the Masters of Education program at Southern University-Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and received the Masters of Education in 1976. In 1978 she enrolled at the North Texas State University and received a Master of Library and Information Sciences in August, 1982. In September, 1982, she enrolled in the doctoral program in Library and Information Sciences at the University of North Texas at Denton, Texas.

Orella's professional experiences include Elementary Librarian in Caddo Parish from January, 1968-May, 1968, Circulation Librarian at Southern University-Shreveport from August 1968 - February, 1978, Library Director from February, 1978 to the present at Southern University-Shreveport.

Her professional affiliations include the American Library Association, Louisiana Library Association, the
Louisiana Academic Library Council, the Louisiana Academic Research Libraries and the Green/Gold System (Cooperative Sharing network of Northwest Louisiana Libraries). She is involved in many religious, civic and social organizations.
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