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This study investigated relationships between the extent to which elementary classroom teachers tend to choose school library media specialists for cooperation on instructional problems and several school climate and faculty related characteristics including the general academic effectiveness of the school, the overall cohesion and cooperativeness of the teaching faculty on instructional matters, and the propensity of the group and individual faculty to seek cooperation to solve instructional problems. The instructional choice status of the school library media specialist was also studied in relation to various individual personality factors, as measured by *Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire*, as well as school media specialist status variables including degree or non-degree status, total years of experience as a school library media specialist, years of experience on campus as a school library media specialist, and total number of years of experience in the field of education. The instructional status of the school library media specialist was also examined in relation to the size of the school served.

The study included 1,079 elementary classroom teachers and thirty-nine school library media specialists from thirty-nine Texas elementary schools similar in important wealth, size, and student demographic characteristics. Twenty of the schools ranked in the bottom 25% of all schools in the state as to how well their students performed on the 1988 Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) test. Nineteen schools ranked among the top 25% of all schools in the state
in academic effectiveness.

As compared to the low academic schools, the high academic schools were found to be significantly more instructionally cohesive, and classroom teachers in those schools were significantly more disposed to choose the school library media specialist to cooperate with them on instructional problems. No significant relationships were discovered between the instructional choice status of the school media specialist and his or her measured personality characteristics.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

During recent years school library media specialists have become increas-
ingly concerned about the degree to which their library media centers contribute to
the central instructional mission of the school. In spite of predictions such as the
one by Jetter in 1972 that: “The school library media specialist of the future will
function as an instructional development specialist.” (1), school media centers,
generally speaking, are still not perceived, especially by teachers, as playing a key
role in support of instruction.

Almost all of the available evidence indicates that school library media
centers continue to be on the fringes of the instructional life of the school, perhaps
relied on for information and materials, usually after teaching has already begun,
but playing little if any role in the actual design and implementation of instruction.
In this regard, Olson painted perhaps the most dismal picture of this situation to
date when, for an audience of fellow librarians, he wrote:

“I urge you to pull circulation cards for a single day and call in a
sample of students to see what relationship exists between materials
they have chosen and what they are studying in their classes. ... corralled by the textbook, students found little need to use the library.
The staggering potential of the library contrasted with the low com-
mmitment to its use would test the faith of a saint.” (2)

Yet, a rich potential does exist for the school media specialist to contribute
to the instructional program, especially in the context of on-going national and state
efforts to reform American education. In response to societal changes that were becoming pronounced by 1972, one early voice for such educational reform was James Coleman. He observed that present-day schools were designed to serve an information poor society where a few books and a teacher were practically the only sources of information for students. Noting that we have become an information rich society with multiple information sources, Coleman urged that schools concentrate on teaching general strategies for learning and provide students with the knowledge and skills to usefully "employ the information sources of the complex social environment." (3) Of course, it is not stretching a point to state that libraries would be very important to the success of such an undertaking.

Other writers have also noted the increased importance of the school library related to students' needs for information, as well as the skills necessary to interpret and apply the information sources at their disposal. Doll, after spending several years asking students what they wanted from their schools, summed up the student responses with these words: "Give us opportunities and materials in schools to help us inquire, discover, and probe meaning." (4) More explicitly, in their response to A Nation at Risk, school library media specialists, while recognizing that much confusion exists among teachers and administrators as to the proper role of the school library, declared: "Our children must learn how to draw confidently on the school library media center's resources and transfer these skills to other sources of information. By knowing how to find, analyze, and use information today, they certify their readiness to become reasoning, thoughtful adults tomorrow as citizens of the Information Age." (5) Similarly, Liesener noted recently that school libraries are critical for bringing about the life-long learning called for in A Nation at Risk, along with the requisite higher order thinking and information handling skills that make such learning possible. (6)
Of course, as an instructional materials center, the library/media center is extremely important to the classroom teacher. Komoski has observed that:

"In choosing curricular materials, the school gives literal and tangible form to the curriculum decisions it has made. The most surprising feature of classroom instruction is the major role played by materials—particularly commercially published materials—in providing both structure and moment-to-moment teaching/learning activities within the classroom." (7)

Reinforcing his observation as to the importance of instructional materials, Komoski, as executive director of the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (EPIE), noted that according to a survey of over 12,000 classrooms conducted by his organization, instructional materials are used during 90 to 95% of all classroom instruction. (8)

By making a strong case for what he calls a "wholesome pluralism" in teaching (and by extension the need for materials and services to support such pluralism), Hyman further underscores the increasing potential importance of library media centers in the school setting. He notes the fact, too often overlooked, that students differ greatly in learning styles that include such variables as time, grouping (in isolation, small group, large group), and mode and materials of instruction (visual versus auditory), creating an urgent need on the part of the classroom teacher for varied materials to meet the even more varied educational needs of today's students. Nevertheless, Hyman also points out that today the all-too-prevalent mode of instruction is recitation with too heavy an emphasis on the textbook to the exclusion of more varied materials. (9)

Besides possessing a valuable collection of materials important to students and teachers, school libraries also possess talented personnel ready to contribute to the teaching-learning process. As Oberg commented:
"The teacher—librarian is ideally positioned.... as a member of a large or small curriculum planning team. First, as a regular member of the school staff, the teacher-librarian has first-hand, intimate knowledge of the school setting—school curriculum policies; principal expectations; teacher predilections, interests and non-interests; parent sentiments; and available facilities and materials. Second, the teacher-librarian has expert knowledge of prescribed curriculum and of available print and non-print resource materials. When knowledge of the curriculum planning process is added to this already substantial body of expertise, the teacher-librarian is in a position not only to respond to teacher requests for help in curriculum planning, but also to go beyond teacher requests and make suggestions that can improve the curriculum planning process." (10)

Even with these assets, however, it is still well documented that school libraries continue to be isolated within the school. Also, research fails to offer a convincing explanation of why this is so. A major area of inquiry, logically, has been to try and discover some connection between the educational levels, work experience, and personality characteristics of media specialists and the extent to which school media programs contribute to instruction. Most such studies have been unable to date to establish a verifiable connection between such variables and various measures of media center contribution to school instructional programs.

One of the most comprehensive studies of this type was the one performed by Daniel in 1974. She hypothesized that "school librarians/media specialists in schools where the library is highly integrated into the school will exhibit significantly different communication patterns and personality characteristics from school librarians/media specialists in schools where the library is relatively isolated from the central functioning of the school." (11)

Daniel surveyed 138 teachers to ascertain the degree of responsibility in various areas that they assigned to the library staff. She studied degrees and
patterns of communication within the school, and she administered Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire to each media specialist.

Daniel was disappointed that none of the media centers she studied seemed to be particularly well integrated into the total functioning of the school. Her study could find no important differences in the communication patterns of librarians based on degrees or certification status. Relatively speaking, there were some differences in the extent to which the library media centers were perceived by teachers to be integrated into the school program; however, as far as the personality characteristics of librarians were concerned, the researcher was surprised to discover that:

"Librarians from schools with a high Index of Integration were significantly more humble, accommodating, and submissive than were librarians from schools with a low Index of Integration. Librarians from schools with a low Index of Integration were significantly more independent, radical, and projective than were librarians from schools with a high Index of Integration. The latter group tended toward passivity, non-aggression, and a subdued approach to life."

(12)

Stressing that the results of her study should not be considered as a model for media specialists to follow to improve the functioning of their libraries, the author speculated that characteristics of the organization may impede acceptance of greater responsibility for the school librarian, leading her to theorize that:

"Perhaps the schools with a higher Index of Integration have developed a different organizational structure than the lower group. The schools with a low Index of Integration may be more authoritarian; the schools with a high Index of Integration more democratic. The librarian in the authoritarian type of school organization may find his personal style incompatible with that organizational framework. In a more congenial and democratic organizational climate, the same librarian might be accepted and welcomed." (13)
Is it true, as the weight of available research indicates, that the personality and training of the librarian are unrelated to how he/she is able to cooperate with teachers on instructional matters in schools? Or, could it be that there exist other considerations related to how schools are organized and how teachers teach that are so powerful that they tend to overpower the differences one might be led to attribute to the preparation, enthusiasm, drive, cooperativeness, friendliness, and other factors that could be associated with a dedicated school library media specialist?

Statement of the Problem

The major area of inquiry of this study will concern itself with comparing the extent of the involvement in instruction of elementary school library media specialists serving academically effective schools with those of school media specialists associated with academically ineffective schools, to determine if relationships exist between the overall cooperative climate of the school, selected characteristics of school library media specialists, and the extent to which school media specialists work cooperatively with classroom teachers on instructional tasks. This major area of inquiry will be explored on two qualitative levels, first with regard to cooperation on low-level, strictly information-oriented instructional problems, and, second, with regard to more complex problem situations of an instructional design nature.

An effort will also be made to determine if the faculty of academically effective elementary schools are more collegial and cooperative than those serving in less effective schools. And, if so, does such cooperativeness have any significant correlation with relationships between elementary school library media specialists and elementary classroom teachers?
To date, researchers in the field of school librarianship have almost totally ignored school climate in studies related to the school library media specialist's cooperation with teachers and involvement in instruction. Indeed, they have focused on status variables related to both schools and school library media specialists in an attempt to explain any measured differences in these areas. Such status variables have included school size, numbers of paraprofessional library assistants employed, per-pupil expenditures and library materials budgets, as well as the education, length of service, age, and previous occupations of school media professionals before entering the field of school librarianship. In addition, quite a bit of work has been done trying to relate personality factors of school librarians to the extent that they are able to form cooperative relationships with teachers. As already noted, to date relatively little research supports the idea that measured librarian personality characteristics and librarian and school status variables can have a significant impact on cooperative relationships between classroom teachers and school librarians in the area of instruction.

It is not surprising that studies of the school library media center out of its organizational context sometimes yield inconclusive and even illogical results. Public schools are extremely complex entities subject to the interplay of subtle political, psychological, and interpersonal interactions. Some have been organized into highly effective, cooperative, goal-oriented institutions, while others remain loosely coupled systems composed of largely autonomous classrooms. With reference to the work of Ron Edmonds, Astuto and Clark define organizational coupling as: “the relation or interaction that exists between and/or among organizational elements, those ‘things’ (constants or variables) that comprise the organization”, and they note that, according to the literature pertaining to the instructionally effective school movement, tight linkages among school depart-
ments, functions, resources, and people tend to distinguish highly effective from less effective school organizations. (14) Along these same lines, Hathaway noted: “A school is a community with beliefs, rules, practices, and relationships that interdependently affect the behavior of everyone in the school and ultimately influence the progress of each student in learning. Good schools are places of purposeful caring, sharing, learning, and growing.” (15) In this regard, an important area of inquiry of this study will be to measure the number of cooperative linkages between classroom teachers themselves, and the relationship of such linkages to how they in turn choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems.

While not denying the ultimate importance of the personal characteristics of school library media specialists, it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that the characteristics of the institution itself can have a more profound determination on the extent to which the library is able to contribute to instruction than the qualifications of one single person, the librarian. Within the sphere of school effectiveness research, a body of evidence exists indicating that a school-wide climate characterized by cooperation, collaborative planning, and collegial relationships among staff is one of the important factors that differentiates academically effective from less effective schools. Again, it is not unreasonable to suppose that school organizational climates characteristic of academically effective schools could have a far different relationship to the extent to which the school library actually contributes to instruction than climates characteristic of much less effective institutions where communication and cooperation between staff in general are not the order of the day.
General Methodology

As an investigation into the instructional role of the elementary school library media specialist, this study is very different from its predecessors because of its focus on important characteristics of the school as an organization, rather than the personal characteristics of school media specialists. However, this inquiry will also include measures of school librarian personality characteristics to determine if any correspondence exists between these and measures of teacher and librarian cooperation on instructional problems. In accord with the existing research on this subject, such correspondences are not expected.

The study will also measure the extent to which individual elementary teachers and teaching faculties tend to freely choose their classroom colleagues for cooperation on instructional tasks. These measures will be correlated with the extent to which the school library media specialist is chosen to cooperate with classroom teachers on instructional problems.

An interesting aspect of this research effort is that it obtains a measure of the extent that every faculty member, including the school library media specialist, is chosen by his or her peers for cooperation on instructional problems in the school. This is important because it will allow the researcher to determine if the instructional cooperation status of classroom teachers, as determined by their classroom colleagues, is related in any way to the extent that they themselves choose to call on the school library media specialist for help in solving common school problems related to instruction. In other words, it could be very important to our profession to learn that there is a relationship between the extent to which an individual teacher is considered by his or her peers to be an instructional "superstar", and the tendency of the individual teacher to cooperate with the school library media specialist.
This investigation is also quite different from previous research efforts in this area in that it employs a sociometric method as its basic research technique. Simply stated by Bonney and Hampleman, "Sociometry is concerned with the measurement of interpersonal preferences among members of a group with reference to a stated criterion." (16) In the case of this study, the two criteria of interest are cooperation in the resolution of low-level, strictly information-oriented instructional problems, and cooperation in the resolution of more complex instructional design problems.

By means of a questionnaire, classroom teachers participating in the study were presented with several different problem statements describing typical instructional situations, or problems, familiar to most elementary school teachers. On the basis of the information contained in the problem description, respondents were asked to choose other members of the faculty to help them resolve the situation. Half of the active problem statements describe situations where only specific items of information are needed to resolve the problem. The remaining problem statements, in addition to asking for specific items of information, require that the respondent choose colleagues for cooperation who can not only supply information, but who can also be of help in applying the information to resolve all or part of the problem situation as described. Thus, the sociometric questionnaire describes instructional problem situations representing either one of two criteria: (1) the need for help in resolving low-level, strictly information-oriented instructional problem situations, or (2) the need for help in resolving more complex instructional problems that would require the application of information to the design or re-design of all or a part of the on-going instructional program. It is also important to note that, because choices are cast in the form of a familiar instructional activity rather than in the form of a traditional job description item, the
nature of the questionnaire brings the respondent, in this case the classroom teacher, closer to the reality of the day-to-day school situation. Also equally important in the view of this researcher is the fact that teacher respondents were asked to select individuals for cooperation by name without recourse to position designations, and, thus, base their choices on their knowledge of and previous association with the individual, rather than on a stereotypical view of what a particular position or job should or should not entail.

This research effort also differs from earlier studies in the area in its general approach to data collection. In all of the school library role studies familiar to this researcher, all of the respondents were aware that school libraries or school library media specialists were the subject of the investigation. In this study, teacher respondents were not aware that the role of the school library media specialist in instruction was the focus of the inquiry. The teacher respondents were simply informed that the purpose of the questionnaire was to gather data reflecting how they chose to cooperate in general with their school colleagues. True as far as it went, this statement allowed the researcher to avoid various 'halo' effects based on stereotypical responses as have been described by Bailey. (17) Finally, this study is unique in that, unlike its predecessors, it studies instructional cooperation with the school library media specialist in the context of on-going cooperation between classroom teachers themselves.

**Population Studied**

This investigation attempted to include all classroom teachers, school media specialists, and other selected professional personnel associated with thirty-nine elementary schools chosen from public school districts throughout the state of Texas. All of the schools studied belong to a comparison group of twenty-eight
school districts grouped by the Texas Education Agency according to similarity on important demographic and economic characteristics. All of the districts are below average in taxable wealth to support education; they are all relatively small districts, enrolling from 3,000 to 9,999 students; and the percentage of students attending these districts from poverty-level households is 40% or greater. With the exception of one small school with a predominately Anglo student body, all of the schools had a minority student enrollment of at least 43%.

Nineteen of the schools were ranked by the state education agency within the top 25% of all Texas elementary schools on the 1988 administration of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) test. Twenty schools performing within the bottom 25% of elementary schools in the state were also randomly chosen from the comparison group to participate in the study. In all, 1,079 teachers and thirty-nine school media specialists participated.

**Significance of the Study**

This study focuses on school climate factors and selected personal characteristics of school library media specialists as related to a measure of instructional cooperation between school library media specialists and teachers. It is hoped that the study will reveal conditions in which school library media centers could be expected to make a more direct contribution to the central instructional mission of the school. In this age of accountability, such information is vital to the future of school library media centers. In effect, given the fact that almost three decades of research fail to show that significant cooperative instructional relationships exist between elementary school teachers and media specialists, the major thrust of this study is to investigate whether a general class of schools exist, that is, instructionally effective schools, where school library media specialists are more involved in the
central instructional mission of the schools. Such information regarding school library contribution to the curriculum of the school has important implications for the profession that are obvious.

Indeed the curriculum of the school is the vehicle through which the tremendous potential of the school library media center can be actualized not only for the benefit of the school as a whole, but also for the benefit of the media program and staff. Greater participation in instruction can 'energize' the media program, and, as Naumer has observed, move "the media center from its traditional support role into the mainstream of instruction" and provide "creative lateral growth for media specialists". (18)

During the last few years, there has been a revolution in school administrative research and practices that is directly related to the accountability issue. Researchers in the field, controlling for socioeconomic and other relevant factors, have compared highly effective with highly ineffective schools, and have noted the functional characteristics of each. School administrators have for some time now been applying the results of school effectiveness research to restructure schools. Therefore, it is important that the field of school librarianship also begin to study the possible effects of such restructuring and reorganization on the instructional role of the school library media specialist.

**Basic Assumptions**

This study assumes that there are important differences in school climate between academically effective and ineffective elementary schools which are similar on other important variables including school district size, wealth, and the percentage of children attending from low income households. If these factors are very similar, then large differences in academic effectiveness among the schools
cannot logically be attributed to family background, other student demographic characteristics, or factors associated with school district size or wealth. The differences in achievement must be attributed to differing processes and characteristics (climates) between the schools.

Indeed, there exists a considerable body of research to indicate that the school organization and climate associated with academically effective schools is much different from that associated with academically ineffective schools. In his review of effective schools research, Austin pointed out that effective schools, as opposed to less effective schools, are generally similar in certain important ways including strong direction and leadership on the part of the principal, high expectations for student achievement, and opportunities for teachers to associate with their colleagues to try more varied approaches to teaching in response to the varied educational needs of children. (19) School climates that promote innovation in such a manner may be more conducive to cooperation between teachers and school media specialists.

A further assumption is made that whatever the organizational and school climate differences that do exist between academically effective and ineffective schools, these can have an effect on the extent to which the school librarian is able to form cooperative relationships with classroom teachers.

**Generalization of Findings**

It should be possible to generalize and apply the findings resulting from this investigation to other schools nationwide that are similar to the elementary schools included in this study. Such schools would have to be rural, rather than urban, predominately of a low socioeconomic minority student population, and low in district wealth available to support education.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The isolation of the library media center within the school program has, more than any other single issue, captured the attention of school media specialists and other library professionals during the 60s, 70s, and 80s. From the latter half of the 1960s on, given impetus by heavy federal subsidies for materials of all sorts, school librarians' expectations for the future of their programs grew almost as fast as their book and non-print collections. Writing of the desirability of teachers and school librarians planning together, Davies, typical of this revolutionary and expansionist view of the school librarian’s role in the instructional program, noted, “...a quality, optimum education mandates the planned and integrated use of instructional media so that each student will be able to build his house of intellect with a broad and deep foundation of fundamental knowledge, with a rooftree of wisdom supported by pillars of reason, equipped with windows so the mind can look out, with doors so truth can come in, and above all, a skylight, so that the soul may look up and see the face of God.” (20) Less poetic, but almost equally optimistic, was this view of the instructional role of the school librarian offered by Vandergrift:

The building-level media specialist participates at many stages of the preactive teaching process. Regardless of the level at which preactive decisions are made, the school media specialist has input at various stages of the process. In order to select resources wisely, the media specialist must be knowledgeable and fully informed about the work of the decision-makers. Also, such knowledge can be used to bring teachers together, to articulate one curriculum area or teacher to another. (21)
Also optimistic regarding an instructional role for the school librarian were the results of several Delphi studies conducted during the seventies predicting the future course of school librarianship. Respondents in a Delphi study conducted by Davis forecasted that by 1985 the school library media director would be a curriculum developer and planner. (22) Likewise, Kingsbury's panel of experts predicted that it was highly likely that school librarians of the near future "will be trained as both media specialists and curriculum consultants prepared to work with teachers in instructional planning and design." (23) Jetter also predicted that in the future the school librarian would become an instructional development specialist and assume a major role in instructional team activities where he/she would help integrate the use of media into the instructional program, help teachers improve teaching skills and techniques, and evaluate the appropriateness of instructional materials to student learning needs. (24)

Although in 1975 Ely predicted that in the future media professionals would function as facilitators of learning by concentrating on instructional design and applying "theory to the operational processes of teaching and learning", (25) Chisholm later noted that traditional librarian involvement in instructional design continues to be, for the most part, passive in nature. She pointed out that library media specialists must, as teachers and school professionals, become actively involved in the design of instruction if they are to survive in the school setting. She observed:

For many years we have talked about the three R's— getting the right material to the right place at the right time. We must now add a fourth R— to help the teacher and learner to use the media in the right way...in order to justify a professional position, it is incumbent upon library media professionals to use the talents which they have to become active members of the instructional team. (26)
However, predictions and well intended speculations in the professional literature aside, researchers soon began to report that the school library was, instructionally speaking, far from being the center of the school. In an early investigation of Missouri secondary schools, Mullen identified a number of factors mitigating against involvement of the school library in instruction that would again and again be cited in the professional literature during the next three decades. He observed that the principals in his study rated as inadequate the contribution of the school librarian to the instructional program, and few, only seven out of thirty principals, had involved the librarian in curriculum planning. As factors in the non-involvement of the library in instruction, principals cited a lack of training for both librarians and teachers, teaching methods that do not lend themselves to library utilization, and an over-dependence by teachers on the textbook as a medium of instruction. (27) He concluded, "with few exceptions principals, librarians, and teachers are making no more than moderate use of practices recommended in the professional literature for implementing the library in instruction." (28)

**Role Perception Studies**

If the sixties and early seventies were a time of incipient optimism regarding the future of school libraries, that view, as expressed in the realm of library literature, soon gave way to a period of intense self-examination by the profession, with the editorial pages of major library journals urging school library media specialists to improve their inter-personal communications skills, convince the public of the need for professionally directed programs, and to become familiar with the major concepts of the disciplines offered in schools to facilitate working with teachers in instruction. (29)
As this level of professional uncertainty rose, we began to see in the literature more perception studies to define the role of the school library media specialist and to see how superintendents, principals, teachers, and school librarians themselves agreed or disagreed on what the proper role of the school library and librarian should be. While in agreement on some issues, these studies, almost without exception, showed that classroom teachers and school librarians diverged greatly on their perception of the degree to which the library should be involved in instructional matters. In her review of the literature, Grazier noted: "The single generalization that may be drawn from these role perception studies is that school faculty, administrators and media staff disagree on the work media specialists now do and might do in the future." (30)

In a fairly early study, Kerr noted the complex nature of role and role perceptions in an organization. Unfortunately, many of his important observations were not explored further by later perception studies. He observed that role perceptions have both formal, authority-based origins and informal, incumbent/peer fashioned origins within the organization. Defining role as "a set of expectations [evaluation standards] applied to an incumbent of a particular position [location in a system of social relationships], Kerr observed that a degree of role consensus between and among individuals is not enough in itself to ensure organizational functioning. In addition, professionals who interact with each other need to be aware of the extent of agreement or disagreement of their perceptions of each other's role. Kerr labeled such lack of knowledge on the part of an incumbent of his or her associates' perception of his role as 'second order discensus' and identified it as a major source of friction in organizations. (31)

Kerr also surveyed 450 randomly selected elementary, junior high and senior high teachers, administrators and learning resources specialists in the state of
Washington, and found that all three groups rated the information-providing function as most important for the role of the librarian. The library media specialists rated information-providing more highly and had an even higher consensus for that function than either teachers or administrators, while the principals evidenced greater consensus for the instructional development role of the school library media specialist than did either teachers or school library media specialists. (32)

In addition, Kerr noted significant second order discensus between teachers and media specialists in the area of instructional development, with teachers perceiving the media specialist to be less positive for that role than the media specialists actually were. Kerr concluded by observing that teachers, whose positions are threatened somewhat by an expanded role for the school library media specialist in matters of instruction, are less in favor of such a role change than are administrators who are not so threatened. He also noted that a "lack of first order consensus among media specialists themselves appears to be the major stumbling block in the path toward a broader role for the learning resources specialist." (33)

While Grazier concluded that some respondents (principals and teachers) would "restrict the media specialist to the production workroom or the reference and circulation desk while others would assign a broad range of duties to the media specialist, including curriculum design and revision" (34), other investigators have not been as optimistic in their conclusions regarding either the present or future involvement of the school librarian in instruction.

One of the most comprehensive of the role perception studies was completed by Daniel in 1974. Her major hypothesis was that "school librarians/media specialists in schools where the library is highly integrated into the school will exhibit significantly different communication patterns and personality characteris-
tics from school librarians/media specialists in schools where the library is relatively isolated from the central functioning of the school.” (35) Daniel expected to see from school to school a wide range of librarian involvement in the curriculum, but to her surprise and dismay she discovered that in all of the schools surveyed, “The library staff is not perceived to be an active agent in curriculum matters, nor in other areas that affect the school as a whole.” (36)

While no significant differences in the integration of the library into the school program could be discerned among the schools, the author reported that librarians associated with schools enjoying a relatively higher Index of Integration were significantly more humble, accommodating and submissive than were librarians from schools with a low Index of Integration. Likewise, the high index librarians were also more conscientious, responsible and persevering than were librarians from schools where the library was less integrated. (37)

As regards communication patterns, the author could find no significant differences between librarians with master’s degrees in library science and those without the master’s. Nor were differences discerned between master’s degreeed librarians and library personnel without the undergraduate degree. (38)

In his role perception study of Canadian elementary school librarians, principals, and teachers, Hambleton noted that variance scores within the three groups evidenced little agreement, even among the librarians themselves, as to the role of the school librarian in seven major areas: materials specialist, curriculum developer, teacher, technical services, administration, extra-mural activities, and sub-professional. Teachers, while in agreement that the librarian should teach classes when possible, “did not see the librarian as being involved in overall curriculum development.” Also, while agreeing that librarians should be involved in instructional matters, principals reported that their librarians rarely or almost
never performed the following functions related to instruction: team teaching, planning and carrying out workshops, participation in staff meetings, acting as an information source for teachers, and providing innovative instructional help for teachers. (39) Canarie reported that librarians and principals tended to agree on the overall effectiveness of the school library program; however, she noted that "despite favorable attitudes, secondary school administrators are reluctant to consider librarians as part of the administrative team which may result in less effective programming." (40)

In a study of secondary school superintendents, principals, teachers, and librarians, Bucher found that teachers and school library media specialists differed greatly in their expectations of the role of the librarian, especially as regards the librarian as administrator, library media professional, and, especially, instructional designer. She concluded, "It is ironic that teachers, who should work closest to the school library media specialist in the educational setting, hold the most conflicting expectations from those of the library media specialist." (41)

In a similar study, Pemberton and Smith, surveying role expectations for the library media specialist in two Georgia school districts, also found that teachers and media specialists did not agree on the role of the school library media specialist. Areas of greatest disagreement with teachers, but not with principals, included the role of the media specialist in cooperative instructional planning with teachers and helping students and teachers select and use materials. Also, the authors noted that many elementary teachers admitted that they were unable to effectively use the library media center, and that there existed little coordination between teachers and librarians even in the teaching of library skills. (42)

Ishikawa, studying elementary teacher attitudes toward school libraries, noticed that teachers served by a library offering extensive services were signifi-
cantly more positive toward the role of the school librarian than teachers served by a library offering many fewer services. However, the investigator noted, and was concerned about, the fact that the attitudes of both groups of teachers converged and were more nearly alike in the areas of mutual teacher/librarian cooperation and the role of the librarian in instruction. The investigator could find no relationship between teacher characteristics and attitude toward the library, except that teachers who used the school library in their student teaching were significantly more positive toward the library than those who did not. (43)

Johnson, in a study of Atlanta public school teachers, media specialists and principals, came to similar conclusions regarding the role of the library media specialist in curriculum evaluation, design and revision, and in the area of providing in-service for teachers. Even though Atlanta school media specialists were required to formally serve on school curriculum committees, still only 74.7% of teachers surveyed said that such a role was one the media specialist should perform, while 96.8% of the principals and 85.3% of the media specialists favored such a role for the school librarian. Likewise, in the area of providing in-service experiences for school staff, 96.8% of principals and school librarians, as opposed to only 85.8% of teachers, favored this role for the school library media specialist. (44) Similarly, Hortin, in a study of 546 Kansas principals and teachers, discovered that principals were significantly more positive toward the role of the library in instruction than were classroom teachers; however, library staffs were viewed as more positive toward teachers as estimated by teachers than by principals. (45)

Julien also concluded that few library media specialists were performing tasks related to participation in curriculum development and revision, conducting in-service sessions for teachers, and working with teachers on instructional innovations. (46)
Mohajerin and Smith also found evidence to support the view that the perceptions held by principals and school librarians themselves for the role of the school library media specialist are not in conflict. Their study also included the perceptions held by media educators for the role of the school library media specialist, as well as the perceptions of teachers, principals, and school library media specialists themselves. They found that the media educators, those individuals directly responsible for the professional training of school librarians, viewed the "personal professional" role of the media specialist much more negatively than did the school librarians. As defined in the study, this aspect of the role includes such instructionally related functions as providing leadership for the school materials selection policy, promoting the varied interests of students in the instructional program, and working as a team member with teachers on selecting materials. (47)

Cantor studied the perceptions of high school media specialists, administrators, and teachers, determining that media specialists had significantly higher expectations for themselves as compared to the other respondents in the areas of: providing materials for the instructional program, teaching students in the school library media center, teaming with teachers to plan learning experiences with children, participating in curriculum development and revision, and conducting workshops for teachers in the use of materials. (48)

Stroud, in a study of Indiana middle school library programs, discovered a positive relationship between number of years of teaching experience and the extent to which teachers utilized media center services. But, she found it disappointing that only about one-third of the librarians were taking an active role in instructional planning. (49)

In 1977, Pfister and Alexander surveyed 814 Texas public school superintendents, principals and teachers with a questionnaire based on then current certifica-
tion requirements for school library media specialists. On 114 items, or responsibility statements, they asked respondents to estimate the actual and then the ideal amount of involvement of the school library media specialist. Compared to the librarians, administrators gave significantly higher actual rankings to two instructional items: applying instructional design principles to locally produced materials and participating on curriculum planning committees. At the same time, librarians rated their ideal amount of involvement significantly higher than did administrators in the area of participating on curriculum committees. The researchers found uniformly high actual rankings by principals and librarians for responsibility statements dealing with traditional library functions: formulating objectives, circulating materials, maintaining the card catalog, maintaining financial records, and supervising library staff, but gave low ratings to statements dealing with areas of curriculum and instruction. The researchers concluded that the "librarian is not viewed as a true colleague of the classroom teacher" in areas that related to the central instructional mission of the school. (50)

More recently, Jong found stronger support for librarian involvement in the curriculum among 214 principals, teachers, and media specialists in Tennessee. Her findings indicated that a majority of respondents strongly supported integration of the library media program into the school curriculum. Her research, which tested the relationship between an individual's philosophy of instruction and the degree of acceptance of the curricular integration of the school library, found that educators espousing individualized instruction and an open, humanistic approach to education significantly supported a more expanded curricular role for the school librarian than did more traditionally oriented educators. (51)

The researcher also discovered that more experienced educators and educators holding more advanced degrees were more in favor of greater involvement in
the curriculum on the part of the school librarian than their less experienced and less educated colleagues. Also, science and math teachers were more in favor of library curriculum integration than were language arts teachers. (52)

Another interesting finding of the Jong study was that “a majority of the middle and high school teachers and administrators strongly supported integrated library and study skills instruction, while only one-fourth of their elementary counterparts did.” Furthermore, more high school personnel than elementary and middle school educators strongly rejected the traditional enrichment role for the library media center, while strongly supporting its integration into classroom instruction. (53)

Still, Jong found that librarians and administrators supported integrating the school media center more closely with instruction than did the classroom teachers. About one-half of the teachers agreed that the library was an enrichment component of classroom instruction, while fully two-thirds of administrators and librarians rejected that concept. (54)

Even while in favor of more curriculum involvement for school library media specialists, principals and school librarians still rate the school library low as to actual degree of integration into the school program. Principals participating in a study by Naylor estimated that only 19% of their librarians were participating at a professional level on school curriculum committees, and described the school library as a “place where materials were stored and where teachers sent students on pre-determined schedules.” The study also concluded that principals evidenced very little knowledge of the full range of services provided by their school libraries. (55)

Studying elementary school teachers and librarians in the schools of Montgomery County, Maryland, Bias found that, as compared to teachers, school
library media specialists felt that they should have been more involved than they were in the planning, development, and implementation of instruction. Slightly over 50% of the library media specialists reported involvement in instruction with only 25% of their teachers. (56)

Turner investigated the attitudes of 300 Alabama school library media specialists and discovered that the activities most frequently performed by school librarians are those associated with the more traditional areas of library service: acquiring, maintaining, and providing selection aids for finding new materials; instructing students in the use of equipment and materials; verbally suggesting titles of instructional materials to teachers; developing and providing for teachers print and non-print lists of instructional materials; and maintaining a professional collection for teachers. On the other hand, Turner found that the least frequently performed activities “more convincingly define the domain of instructional development”, and included: producing instructional materials designed by teachers; designing and producing instructional materials to meet instructional objectives and learner characteristics; participating in curriculum development and revision; observing classroom work to coordinate media center activities with instructional programs; participating on instructional teams to design instructional programs; participating in team teaching activities; and conducting workshops for teachers in evaluation and selection of materials. (57)

Coleman performed a survey of 145 Virginia school library media specialists to determine their perceptions of what he termed ‘guiding principles’ found in Media Programs: District and School. Respondents, who were to report a value rating and a perceived actual implementation rating for each of several component areas, rated the instructional component, both as a value and as actually implemented, significantly lower than any of the other component areas. (58)
Bocachica-Mills conducted a study of public and non-public secondary school libraries in the U.S. Virgin Islands, including twenty-four media specialists, thirty-six principals, and two hundred and eighty-six 7th through 12th grade English, science and social studies teachers. The media specialists surveyed indicated that they should have been involved in 78.6% of the curriculum tasks listed in the questionnaire, but were only then involved in 17.9% of the tasks. However, teachers and principals estimated that the media specialist should be involved in 92.9% of the curriculum oriented tasks, indicating that the media specialist was currently actually involved in about 84% of the curriculum tasks. Thus, as the author notes, this finding as to the actual involvement of the library media specialist is in line with previous studies: teachers and principals tend to view the librarian as more involved in curriculum matters than do the librarians themselves. (59)

Also, the author discovered that of the twenty-eight curriculum tasks listed in the questionnaire, more than 50% of the media specialists indicated that sometimes, seldom, or never did they do fourteen of them. Tasks seldom performed by librarians in this study included preparing bibliographies for subjects in the curriculum, becoming involved in the actual planning of curriculum, including items from textbook bibliographies in the media center collection, and reflecting courses of study in the contents of the vertical file and card catalog. (60)

In a recent study, Edwards found further evidence that principals and school library media specialists disagree on the extent to which school librarians actually perform various tasks in the school. Her survey of 467 Arizona principals and school library media specialists documented that principals rank materials selection as the most important task of the media specialist, with involvement in curriculum planning rated next to last out of the ten basic tasks examined. Elementary principals estimated that their media specialists devoted about 10% of their time to
cooperating with teachers in curriculum planning, while the media specialists generally agreed with them, estimating that they actually spent about 7% of their school time in that activity; however, the elementary principals also estimated that school librarians only spent 35% of their time on instruction (teaching library skills), while the school librarians estimated that they actually spent more than 50% of their time instructing students. (61) Likewise, in his study of seventy-five Utah high school library media specialists, Larsen determined that over 50% of his respondents never held informative meetings or workshops for teachers. (62)

Didier completed a study examining relationships between the reading and study skills achievement of Michigan elementary students and the following important aspects of the school library media program: school district wealth, ratio of professional personnel per building, student access to the media center, the education of the library/media personnel, and the curricular role of the school library media specialist. She discovered that seventh graders in schools with professional library/media personnel achieved significantly higher in reading and in study skills than did students attending schools without such personnel. There was no significant difference in achievement between the two types of schools at the fourth grade level. (63)

However, Didier discovered an inverse relationship between the education of the media specialist and student reading and skills achievement at the fourth grade level, with no correlation at the seventh grade level. Also, she reported a weak negative correlation between the education level of the media specialist and student access to the media center at both fourth and seventh grade levels. (64)

Didier measured the curriculum involvement of the school library media specialists by having each district indicate on a questionnaire the extent to which media specialists were involved in: curriculum committees, textbook selection
committees, selection of materials, and consultation with teachers. The researcher did not indicate if the school principal or some other school official, perhaps one less knowledgeable of the work of the campus media specialist, was the one who supplied the information. Inspection of the questionnaire suggests to this writer that someone other than the principal may have supplied the information. Didier did report several difficulties with the coding of the responses related to the curriculum involvement of the school library media specialist; however, in general the data indicated the following: the curricular involvement of professional personnel at each grade level studied was very similar; library/media professional personnel performed about 70%, or three of the four curricular roles; and the media specialists were least involved in curriculum and textbook selection committees. (65)

As regards the relationship of the curricular involvement of the school library media specialist with reading and skill achievement and access to the library media center, the researcher discovered a weak to moderate positive relationship between curricular involvement and reading and study skills achievement at the fourth grade level. No relationship between these factors was noted at the seventh grade level. Nor could Didier find any relationship between access to the library media center and the curricular involvement of the school library media specialist. (66)

In line with numerous other studies of the curricular role of the school librarian, Leung in 1983 surveyed sixty-four New York state school library media specialists and twenty school curriculum planners, and concluded that the media specialists were only minimally involved in curriculum planning processes, and had no involvement in building and district curriculum committees. The media specialists were found to still occupy a passive role in instructional matters. Also, the school curriculum planners were found to be uninformed as to the work of the school library media specialists in their schools. (67)
A more recent study by Fitzgerald reported findings opposite to those of the vast majority of investigations into the curricular involvement of the school library media specialist. She studied the role of the school librarian as perceived by principals and school librarians in ninety-eight Michigan high schools. Teachers, who, the majority of studies have shown, give little support to an instructional role for the school library media specialist, were not included in the investigation. Again, as in previous studies, the principal’s expectation for the involvement in curriculum for the school librarian was higher than the actual involvement reported by the school librarians. However, in contrast to the vast majority of similar studies, 46% of the school librarians in Fitzgerald’s sample “reported close cooperation and planned, systematic support of instruction up to and including formal instructional design activities.” (68)

From the foregoing studies, one can justifiably conclude that school librarians, as a group, are only marginally involved in instruction in schools. Ken Haycock, then acting manager of elementary-secondary education for the Vancouver, British Columbia school board and past president of the Canadian School Library Association, made one of the strongest statements on the status of school libraries to date in his 1984 keynote address to the conference of the International Association of School Librarianship:

“There have been a number of studies that show that the concept of the library as part of an instructional system responding to teacher and student needs is perceived by relatively few school librarians, and only dimly by most teachers and administrators. We are left with the fact that our school library resource centers are ‘beauty spots on the body politic...’” (69)
Facilitators and Impediments to an Expanded Instructional Role For the School Library Media Specialist

Some evidence does exist to indicate that school characteristics can indeed influence how libraries are used and the extent to which librarians can be involved in instructional matters. Valentine observed fifteen British schools and found that those that provided for independent, resource-based learning placed a greater value on the school library than did schools with formal, classroom based instruction. However, the majority of the British school media specialists felt that communications and their lack of knowledge of the contents of course syllabi limited their ability to adequately support the curriculum. (70)

Also, some research supports the idea that in more academically successful elementary schools, school librarians, and classroom teachers can achieve a greater degree of mutual cooperation. Loertscher studied 209 public elementary schools included on a 1986 U.S. Department of Education list of exemplary public and private elementary schools and discovered that 47% of the school library media specialists regularly consulted with their teachers in advance of unit presentations, and that fully 61% of the librarians helped in the formulation of instructional objectives. Also, by analyzing comments of the librarians surveyed, the researchers noticed differences in responses between full time professional school library media specialists with clerical help and librarians either part-time aides or without clerical help. In general, full time professionals with full time clerical help were more enthusiastic, confident, and positive than their part-time colleagues, or colleagues without clerical help. They noted that 31% of full time media specialists with full time clerical help rated instructional development as their most important program feature, as compared to only 7% of the librarians without full staffing. Similarly, 25% of the fully staffed librarians declared that their support for the curriculum was
something they were very proud of, as compared to only 9% of the school librarians with less staff. The evidence led the researchers to conclude that, "there is a threshold in library media staffing below which the effectiveness of programs cannot be maintained." (71)

Chisholm has mentioned several factors necessary for the school library media specialist to assume a more active role in the instructional process including a commitment to the role on the part of the school administration, a spirit of cooperation and positive interpersonal relations, coordination and cooperative planning among school staff members, and appropriate skills on the part of the librarian (72).

However, evidence exists to indicate that impediments to the involvement of the school librarian in the curriculum have multiple sources, from the personality characteristics, attitudes, and preparation of school library media specialists, to the very nature of how schools are organized and how teachers really teach.

One of the first areas investigated was, logically, the personality and other characteristics of school librarians, and in this area the evidence is thin, with rather contradictory messages. In an early study of library school students, Douglass employed the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, as well as four other standard instruments, to determine the degree to which librarian candidates did or did not differ in important personality traits from the population in general. He discovered that, in comparison to the general population, the library students were less innovative and more orderly, neat, compulsive, conforming, and introverted. He also noted strong support for his hypothesis that the male library students were more feminine in their interests than men in general. The researcher did not find evidence that the prospective librarians differed from the general population in terms of submissiveness, respect for authority, self-confidence, and anxiety. (73)
However, a study by Clayton painted a disappointing picture of library students as rather conservative individuals who were "something other than forceful, progressive, and resourceful." (74) Similarly, McMahon's study of thirty non-school Tasmanian librarians revealed a personality profile indicative of a lack of forcefulness and leadership potential and a generally socially withdrawn, insecure outlook toward life. (75) Likewise, in an early study of 320 practicing librarians, Segal, employing Cattell's 16PF, discovered the librarians to be more humble, docile, dependent, anxious, and conforming, and less assertive and experimental than a comparison group of journalists and counselors. (76) Sladen, comparing the scores of a small sample of British librarians on Cattell's 16PF to British educators attending a professional meeting, also found librarians to be somewhat introverted in comparison to the other professionals. (77)

Schulzetenberge (78) and Madaus (79) both found that school librarians tending toward extroversion seem to be more successfully involved in curriculum work with teachers. However, close inspection of Schulzetenberge's study reveals that his data do not support a statistically significant finding identifying extroversion as a basic personality trait that differentiates school librarians that work closely with teachers in instruction from those that do not. Schulzetenberge studied 114 Minnesota high school head librarians serving in schools accredited by the North Central Association during the 1969-70 school year.

He used the Strong Vocational Interest Blank to measure both the basic and the vocational interests of librarians in his sample. He also modified the Task Analysis Survey Instrument of the School Library Manpower Project, developed by the American Association of School Librarians during the middle and late 1960s, using it as a checklist of duties that the school principals in his study used to estimate the degree to which their librarians worked with teachers on instruction. Teachers
were not asked to provide any information on how they did or did not cooperate with the librarian.

Data from the principals were used to divide the librarians into two groups, one above the mean group and one below the mean group, according to how the principals viewed their degree of involvement in instruction. Using a sub-scale of the SVIB, Schulzetenberge obtained a measure of introversion/extroversion for his librarian participants who scored above and below the mean on the principals' rating scale. A score of 40 indicated extroversion, while a score of 60 denoted introversion. Schulzetenberge reported that the males rated above the mean on the criterion scored 41 on the introversion/extroversion scale, while the below the mean males scored 46. Above the mean females scored 48; below the mean female librarians scored 51. (80)

While the author did report a tendency toward extroversion for both male and female librarians who were rated higher by principals in cooperating with teachers on instructional matters, he made no attempt to test his data in any way. Given the small range of differences involved, and given the fact that he did not employ an instrument designed specifically to measure personality traits, it is, in the opinion of this writer, unlikely that such statistically valid results would have been indicated. Nevertheless, Schultzetenberge's comments regarding librarians and extroversion have been widely quoted in other research. In contrast, both Daniel (81) and Corr (82), who employed instruments specifically designed to measure human personality traits, concluded that low keyed, non-aggressive, non-threatening school media specialists were more likely to form cooperative relationships in instruction with their teacher colleagues.

Fortin surveyed 513 predominantly female secondary librarians and observed that more experienced librarians, as opposed to novices, had more favorable
attitudes toward planning library services to promote objectives of the school, and that teachers holding graduate degrees were more in favor of assisting teachers in the use of library resources. (83) Also, the author noted that school library media specialists with less training were more satisfied with administrative, as opposed to service, aspects of their positions than were their more highly trained colleagues. (84)

In another early study, Adams could find no relationships between provision of public services by selected California secondary school librarians and librarian personality traits, except that distrustful and suspicious librarians tended to spend more time on circulation tasks. Such traits as cautiousness, original thinking, vigor, ascendency (assertiveness), responsibility, emotional stability, and sociability were not found to be related to time spent by the school library media specialist on instructional matters. (85)

Kenney and Kenney, employing Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, studied public school librarians and teachers, and discovered in their sample of school librarians various personality traits they hypothesized might mitigate against successful cooperation with teachers. Librarians were found to be less rule-bound, more casual, and less likely to put forth effort for participation in group activities than were the teachers studied. Also, librarians were discovered to be, as compared to the teachers, “more tender-minded, dependent,.. fastidious, impatient, impractical.. tending to slow up group performance” and in general less group oriented. (86)

In another study employing Cattell’s 16PF Questionnaire, Herrin and fellow researchers examined the personality and inter-personal communications skills of a small group of model school library media specialists, as nominated by peers and professional and state library agencies. They found the individuals in their sample,
as tested, to be introverted, somewhat shy, and reserved; however, the on-site observations of the researchers did not confirm introversion or reserved behavior by media specialists in the library setting. (87)

In the area of communications, Herrin and associates found that the large majority of model librarians felt good about their abilities to communicate, considering themselves to be highly aware of themselves and of how others react to them. In all, most of the subjects spent about three-quarters of their time communicating. They were willing to reveal feelings to and share ideas with colleagues, but felt uncomfortable dealing with disagreements, as well as evaluating and accepting feedback. Significantly, the researchers also determined that those media specialists whose 16PF profiles deemed them to be cool and detached, actually made more extensive use of attention getting techniques such as smiles, encouraging expressions, use of faculty and student names, eye contact, and active listening and touching than did those media specialists who tested warm and outgoing on the 16PF. (88)

An early study by Kittilson found, as other researchers would subsequently discover, that school librarians themselves are unsure of their role in instruction. He studied 200 Minnesota audio-visual specialists and librarians, finding that 76% of the librarians described their role as that of a materials resource person, and only 2.1% described themselves as instructional systems designers. As a group, the librarians were unsure if they should be more involved in the implementation as opposed to being involved cooperatively with teachers in the planning of instruction. (89)

Teagarden surveyed 355 Alabama library media specialists, one-third of the total in the state, and found that, although they clearly preferred to be more involved in actual instruction, they made little contribution to curricular decision-making
processes in the schools they served. For each of the twenty decision-making tasks making up the researcher's survey instrument, there were significant differences between the actual involvement and desired involvement in the tasks as indicated by the school library media specialists. Also, Teagarden found that the library media specialists considered school district and principal policies and practices to be the greatest barrier preventing them from assuming a larger role in instruction. Less than fifteen percent of the library media specialists indicated lack of curriculum development skills as a barrier for them in this area. (90)

Staples, in a major study of 224 Texas school library media specialists representing approximately 10% of the professional media personnel in the state, asked school librarians to rate themselves on various competencies adopted by the Texas Education Agency in 1976 for the state's professional certificate endorsement program for the learning resources specialist. The respondents were asked to rate themselves both in actual expertise and in the degree to which they valued each competency. The investigator noted that the school library media specialists rated themselves lowest in actual expertise in competencies related to consultation with teachers, involvement in the instructional program, and learning resources program development. Fifty percent of the consultation/instruction competencies were ranked as to expertise in the bottom third of the sixty total competencies. For instance the competency statement, "assist and guide teachers and students in the design and development of instructional programs, including validation in relation to learner needs, teacher strategies, and learning environments", was ranked the 17th lowest overall in actual expertise, with a value ranking of forty-four out of sixty. Also, Staples noted that none of these competencies on which the librarians rated themselves lowest in expertise were in turn rated high in terms of value. (91)
Henry, on the other hand, in an earlier study of 248 elementary and secondary Texas media specialists concluded that over 43% of his sample rated their skills ‘good’ to ‘very good’ in the area of “application of principles of design to instructional materials...”. Over 60% of the school library media specialists rated their skills equally as well in the area of “application of principles of curriculum development as a member of an educational team”. (92) However, Henry also noted that in his sample over 48% of the media specialists were not participating in curriculum planning. (93)

In a similar study involving 225 school library media specialists in the states of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, Royal found that, while they valued competencies related to instructional design, few respondents actually performed such functions, favoring instead tasks indicative of the traditional service responsibilities of school librarians. However, the author noted that respondents with more graduate preparation, versus those with only undergraduate training, seemed to give greater emphasis to performing tasks in the area of instructional design. In terms of value, respondents assigned greater value to job competencies closely identified with the traditional role of the school library media specialists than they did to more instructionally related competencies. (94)

Loertscher also identified school librarians themselves as an obstacle to more integration of the school library and instructional program. He noted that many school library media specialists tend to remain silent while students and teachers use non-print materials for entertainment, thus casting the library in the role of an enrichment program rather than as a basis for learning. He also criticized school librarians for giving higher priority to administrative tasks over service to students and teachers. (95)
In addition to the need for more staff and organizational patterns to facilitate teacher-librarian cooperation, Aaron pointed to both school library media specialists and teachers as contributing to the restricted role of the librarian in instruction. She noted the lack of agreement among school library media specialists themselves as to what their proper role should be, as well as negative teacher attitudes toward an expanded instructional role for the school library.

Aaron also noted the short time-line many teachers employ to plan their lessons. She stated, "In order for the media specialist to make a meaningful contribution to the teaching team, the team must plan far enough in advance to allow time for selecting, locating, designing, developing, and analyzing appropriate learning alternatives to meet individual student learning needs." (96) Along these same lines, Stroud, declaring that school librarians can no longer "afford the luxury of serving only those who seek us out", listed a number of reasons why teachers are perhaps reluctant to cooperate more fully with the school library media specialist: a desire to protect one's turf and autonomy; feelings of unease with having other professional adults in the classroom; and a belief that by accepting assistance in instruction they are admitting to incompetence. (97)

Glidewell and his associates, in a study of the programs of ten Chicago elementary schools, also documented a reluctance on the part of teachers to accept help from colleagues. Help-seeking behavior implied a loss of status by the teacher, while help-giving behaviors signified an increase in status among colleagues. Teachers regarded their autonomy as somewhat of a moral imperative and had a tendency not to offer suggestions to each other even in the most mundane matters. (98)

Echoing Stroud's view that the attitudes of non-librarians were restricting the instructional role of the school librarian, Craver identified an additional im-
pediment: the self-sufficient classroom with its own collection of materials. (99) And in that classroom, as Taylor has commented, teacher planning appears to be unsystematic and general in nature. (100)

Reinforcing this view, Shavelson noted that teachers tend not to plan, as they have been taught, by specifying objectives and then selecting materials and activities to meet the varying needs of students. Rather, they tend to examine content first with a view toward selecting activities to engage students during class time. Hence, activities and then content seem to be the focus of instruction. (101)

Earlier, Shavelson also shed some light on a possible explanation of why it is that some teachers seem to employ more varied teaching strategies and materials than others and, thus, be more in need of and open to cooperation with the library. He noted that some teachers seem content to base their teaching decisions on a narrow range of information and options, while others search out and invent alternative strategies in order to optimize student learning. As an explanation of this, he speculated that teachers may vary in their ability to assess student needs in the learning environment and to use the information to generate and consider alternative teaching strategies. Shavelson also speculated that this varying ability of teachers to consider and formulate instructional alternatives can be improved and that teachers can be trained to consider and design a richer and greater number of teaching options. (102) Such training might have important implications for the school library media center. Obviously, more inventive and creative teachers attending to a wider range of student learning styles by means of richer, more varied classroom strategies could not help but have an enormous impact on the utility and operations of the school library media center.

Doyle also found that in most classrooms the reward structure tends to drive the task system, that is, tasks or learning objectives tend to become subordinate to
activities due to a perceived need to keep students engaged and attend to such
matters as behavior control, peer relations, and social interaction during the lesson.
(103) Thus, student engagement, content, activities and materials tend to be
emphasized over planning instruction to help particular kinds of students master
particular kinds of objectives.

In an earlier study of 194 teachers of varying subject areas and grade levels,
Zahorik also found teacher planning practices to be erratic and at odds with formal
planning models. He found that three-quarters of the teachers focus on content,
making this decision first more often than any other decision, and he also discovered
that planning decisions involving diagnosis, organization, and evaluation of in-
struction were made by a third or less of the teachers studied. (104)

Clark and Yinger also discovered that in general elementary teachers do not
begin their planning with learning objectives, rather preferring to focus on student
characteristics and classroom activities. They also tend to depend on immediately
available resources such as suggestions from fellow teachers, teacher editions of
textbooks, magazine articles, and films. In their survey of 300 elementary teachers
enrolled in graduate courses at Michigan State University, the authors also found
that, while most teacher planning is done mentally and never set down on paper, in
team-teaching environments planning is more explicit and involves longer lead
times than does planning by isolated teachers. (105)

Likewise, Joyce focused on teaching styles overly based on exposition and
drill as impediments to more effective school library utilization. The author also
observed that school librarians have, erroneously, tried to improve library utiliza-
tion without confronting the current nature of classroom teaching. (106)

McCutcheon, in a Ford Foundation supported study of a small sample of
Virginia school librarians, observed that teachers relied almost exclusively on the
textbook and for the most part planned instruction and taught alone. (107) And, in
the opinion of Lieberman and Miller, in one-to-one interactions most teachers, in an
attempt to preserve classroom autonomy, tend to eschew serious talk about the
business of schooling and do not as a rule work collectively. (108)

Added to these realities of how most teachers plan for instruction in too many
schools, is the fact that, as a group, teachers seem to be uninformed or misinformed
about the potential school libraries and librarians have to participate more fully in
instruction. In a study of secondary and elementary school teacher preparation
programs in Kentucky, Saddler observed that, of the twenty-five teacher prepara-
tion texts in use in the various programs, there was no coverage at all of the school
library in eight of the texts; eleven texts mentioned and then dismissed the presence
of the library in the school; only two texts provided what the author termed
extensive coverage of the school library; and only six texts presented the school
library in a positive light. All in all, the texts offered little instruction on how the
classroom teacher might utilize the services of the school library, while presenting
it as a "shabby, insignificant place where teachers might find some supplementary
books". Saddler also observed that at the time of her study only four teacher training
institutions in the state offered a unit on the library. (109).

Mohajerin and Smith have reported that in the view of various leaders in the
school library field, library media educators and leaders of national and state
professional organizations, the profession has witnessed "a massive shift in the role
of the school library media specialist" resulting from major changes in school
philosophy and organization characterized by a transition from a teacher-centered
perspective to a student-centered one. (110) However, has such a change largely
occurred, or does it, along with the centrality of the library in instruction, still exist
mainly in the realm of the professional school library literature?
Of course, schools and teachers can radically change their teaching structures, and the library can become integrated into the instructional program, as happened at the Los Alamitos school, selected as an exemplary school library media program in 1977. The instructional program was changed from traditional to continuous progress with emphasis on individualization of instruction, and, as the changes took effect, materials usage dramatically increased as teachers moved away from the textbook and began selecting from a wide variety of instructional materials. (111)

Similarly, Pillon, in a study of twenty-nine matched pairs of graded, traditional elementary schools and non-graded, flexible, continuous progress elementary schools, found that in non-graded schools collections were more accessible and principals and teachers were more aware of the importance of the school library. (112)

Hodges has documented that teacher-librarian cooperation can indeed make a positive contribution to the teaching learning process. He studied 377 Florida eighth graders to see if teacher-librarian cooperation in the area of designing instruction to provide for varying student learning styles could affect how the children esteemed themselves as learners. He found significant differences in his data related to inferred self concept as a learner in favor of the experimental group in which teachers and media specialists had been active in designing instruction with careful attention to the learning styles of the students. (113)

Isolated instances aside, Olson forcefully argues that libraries and librarians are little used in instruction because teachers, by and large, teach mainly from the textbook. (114) Again, Haycock reinforces Olson's view, stating, "The very nature of the role of the teacher-librarian is that of initiator and change agent. We talk of getting teachers to use the library when this is not the issue at all. What we are talking
about is getting teachers to change the way that they teach and to adopt team teaching, resource-based techniques.” (115)

Other researchers have focused on the professional preparation of school library media specialists as an obstacle to more involvement on the part of the librarian in instruction. Defining instructional design as “the application of the systems method to the process of matching students to the most effective mode of instruction”, Turner, in a study of professional preparation programs for school librarians at accredited library schools throughout the United States, concluded “after a decade in which the inclusion of instructional design in the role of the school library/media specialist has been pervasive in the school library literature, it can be seen that preparation for these competencies is only nominally available for students enrolled in accredited library schools.” (116)

If, as late as 1982, library schools were not preparing school librarians for the expanded instructional role that the professional literature was urging, there is conflicting evidence as to how school librarians perceive the extent to which they need preparation for a larger role in instruction. Graff, through her study of 140 Utah public elementary and secondary media specialists, degreed and non-degreed, found that just slightly more than 50% of the degreed school librarians, and just 39% of the non-degreed media personnel ranked membership on the school curriculum committee as very important. Only 44% of the professional school librarians and 19% of the non-professionals were actually serving on curriculum committees. (117) At the same time, only 11.1% of the degreed elementary school librarians indicated that curriculum development work with teachers was a weak area in their preparation. (118)

Ball, on the other hand, a decade earlier asked 495 school media specialists throughout the United States to rate professional preparation courses on their
contribution to the school media program. He found that the respondents listed ‘planning and implementing instruction’ among five major themes as having the greatest significance to elementary and secondary school media programs. (119)

In his address to the International Association of School Librarianship, Haycock, in reference to the professional preparation of school library media specialists, noted:

“Teacher-librarians are coming out of these programs having been convinced that every component of the resource center, from curricular leadership to cataloging, is equally important. They have not been provided with a context of cooperative program planning and teaching, and they have not been provided with the important, specialized skills to set priorities within that context, or to advocate strong support for the program...... Prospective teacher-librarians must have opportunities to learn the skills necessary to plan with colleagues and team teach, and to provide leadership in program advocacy” (120)

**Characteristics of Effective Versus Ineffective Schools**

Using a case study approach, Kyle recently described a school whose climate could not but mitigate against the effective use of the school library. She noted a philosophy which deemed the textbook the center of the instructional program, and which, through administrative regulation, severely restricted the use of other relevant instructional materials in the school. Teachers were not permitted to share materials with one another and remained isolated from each another for most of the school day. They felt over controlled and increasingly frustrated. (121)

To the extent that school climates such as these proliferate, school librarians will continue to encounter difficulty in integrating the media program into the instructional program of the school. However, a good deal of evidence exists indicating that school climates associated with highly effective schools could be a good deal more conducive to the acceptance of closer cooperation between teachers
and school library media specialists in the instructional program.

Much effective schools research has been carried out in inner-city schools of predominantly Black and Hispanic student composition, comparing schools that are effective (usually on the basis of reading scores) with less effective schools. Levine and associates discovered that effective inner-city elementary schools provide coordinated instruction within and across grade levels, and they identified as prerequisites to improving instruction: 1. provision of at least one instructional resource person to work with every fifteen to twenty teachers on a full-time basis, 2. adequate staff development, and 3. collegial planning time regularly provided as part of the school day. (122)

Bishop studied the mutual relationships present among the staffs of twenty-four California elementary schools and found that exchange of work-related viewpoints between the teachers of cooperatively arranged schools was less threatening to those involved than among the instructional staffs of traditionally structured institutions where teachers worked in isolation from colleagues. He discovered that the mutual associations of teachers in cooperative schools combined all three areas of interest to teachers—discipline, instruction, and social friendship, while many fewer teachers in the self-contained, isolated schools participated in such overlapping relationships. Bishop noticed that in traditionally organized schools, teachers had a tendency not to become heavily involved with co-workers in discussions of work-related issues or on any other basis, valuing their isolation from colleagues and forming mutual associations characterized by superficial social relationships. (123)

An important aspect of Bishop’s research concerned the work orientations of teachers. He concluded that teachers in cooperatively structured schools were more flexible and non-traditional in their view of classroom processes than the more self-
contained teachers who, working in isolation from colleagues, concentrated more on 'predictability', or control, in the classroom. (124)

Reitzug performed an in-depth case study in one instructionally effective school and in one significantly less effective school that were otherwise closely matched on other important variables including wealth and student characteristics. He noted a far greater degree of social/personal interactions among staff in the instructionally effective as compared to the ordinary school, and concluded that, "The development and maintenance of a culture that breaks down isolation by creating social and personal bonds between members may well give that organization an edge in effectiveness. (125)

Gall and Gall have noted that increased cooperation and staff cohesiveness in schools can indeed impact effectiveness. When group norms control, rather than isolated, individual outlooks, group members have a stronger sense of belonging; they tend to be more persistent in working at group sanctioned goals and tasks; and communication between group members tends to increase. (126)

Hallinger, in an analysis of high achieving versus low achieving schools, noted that in effective schools responsibilities for instruction were shared cooperatively with high levels of program coordination between classrooms within and between grade levels. (127) Along these same lines, Rosenholtz observed that in contrast to ineffective schools, in effective schools there is a closer congruence between the values, norms, and behaviors of principals and teachers with both groups working closer to bring about school improvement. (128)

Rosenholtz also discovered that as a result of isolation from each other, teachers' goals were strikingly individualistic, and that teacher communication rarely dealt with teaching in the school. Teachers eschewed instructionally related informal interaction during the school day, preferring to center talk around disci-
pline matters as a way to avoid even implied judgements as to the instructional competence of their colleagues. Rosenholtz speculated that such behavior, readily apparent in urban schools where control is emphasized over instruction, may be a classic case of what theorists call ‘goal displacement’ where colleagues gain their support and recognition through endeavors other than those related to the major focus of the organization. In contrast Rosenholtz noted that “effective urban schools are far less likely to be isolated work settings for teachers. Instead, they are usually places of intellectual sharing, collaborative planning, and collegial work. When compared to teachers in less successful schools, teachers in effective schools interacted to a greater extent on the basis of professional concerns than of social chatter, and did so with greater frequency and with a greater number of colleagues.” (129)

Purkey and Smith, after an extensive review of effective schools research, view schools as complex functioning social systems, and argue that effective schools, as opposed to less effective schools, are distinguished by a particular culture, or set of values, that “channel staff students in the direction of successful teaching and learning.” The data they analyzed from numerous studies indicate the successful school climate as characterized by “collaborative planning, collegial work, and a school atmosphere conducive to experimentation and evaluation”. (130)

In their case study analysis of a mastery learning reading program in Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago elementary schools, Levine and Stark found certain climatic factors common to effective schools: assured availability of instructional materials and resources and instructional arrangements that encouraged communication and collaborative planning among grade level teachers and teachers from other grade levels. (131)
Wellisch and his associates identified instructional program coordination as a key factor differentiating effective from non-effective schools. They studied twenty-six elementary schools participating in the third year of a study to evaluate the impact of the Emergency School Aid Act and found that schools were significantly better able to raise student achievement if they had in place extensive instructional program coordination throughout the grades in the areas of content, sequencing, objectives, and use of instructional materials. Schools that left to the classroom teacher the autonomy to plan and conduct instruction in isolation were found to be significantly less successful in terms of student achievement than schools employing extensive instructional program coordination, but still allowing teachers input into school decision making. (132) Wellisch and his fellow researchers concluded by observing, "the relevance of active administrative involvement to school success may be that it represents a general intervention strategy, facilitating a coordinated, school-wide program in which the capabilities of the staff are supported and strengthened." (133)

Little conducted a focused, ethnographic study of elementary and middle schools and discovered that the effective school climate was one that supported "extensive discussion of classroom practice, mutual observation and critique, shared efforts to design and prepare curriculum, and shared participation in the business of instructional improvement." She observed that in effective schools, "Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching. In the most adaptable schools, most staff, at one time or another, on some topic or task, are permitted and encouraged to play the role of instructor for others. In this way, the school makes maximum use of its own resources. (134)
Along the same lines, Madaus concluded:

Overall then the processes, press, and atmosphere of schools and classrooms seems to be more highly related to variation in pupils' measured achievement than does the physical presence of particular types resources and facilities, or the status characteristics of teachers. It is what people do in schools and classrooms - how they reinforce, interact, and spend their time, and pursue common goals - which seems to influence performance on specific achievement measures. (135)

As Hawley has noted, effective schools, by their very natures, must be adaptive institutions that continually assess their internal and external environments to promote aggressive, pro-active problem solving that effectively marshalls human and material resources. Adaptiveness requires a never-ending search for and receptiveness to new ideas, and flexibility in individual behavior, which, as the author notes, can be brought about by: 1. helping individual staff perceive the gaps between performance and desired goals, 2. minimization of the costs and consequences of adaptiveness, and 3. increasing the individual rewards for adaptability, including material rewards, status, teacher self-esteem, and social rewards. (136)

Hawley also points out that a climate conducive to high peer interaction, and the discussion of teaching problems and successes as a professional responsibility is an obvious necessity for an adaptive organization, and he concludes by stating, "It follows from these conclusions and from research on the traits of effective teachers that adaptive schools should be organized collegially." (137)

What the author did not state, and what is obvious from other research and practical experience with elementary schools is that the principal is the only person in the school who has the overview, power, and authority to arrange the factors noted here for the creation of adaptive, effective school climates.
Effective schools do not just happen by chance. Most authorities are in agreement that in effective schools it is the leadership of a principal that determines climate and the interactions of individuals within the school. In this regard, Podemski noted that an instructional development role for the school library media specialist requires a much higher level of participation with faculty, impossible under traditional arrangements where each classroom teacher individually defined the extent to which he or she would utilize the library. The principal can affect school processes and climate and the utilization of the school library through: staff selection, allocation, and orientation; evaluation both of personnel and instructional programs; scheduling and allocation of time, especially for joint teacher/librarian planning; inservice activities; allocation of funds, space, and equipment; and the direct supervision of the implementation of instruction. The author commented, "Without the support of the principal, the efforts of the library media specialist will continue to be confined to isolated pockets of teacher interest, and will be unable to affect the total organization or enrich the total curriculum." (138)
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CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Research Methodology

The major area of inquiry of this research effort was to measure the amount of instructional involvement with teachers of two groups of school library media specialists: those serving academically highly effective elementary schools, and those associated with much less academically effective elementary schools, and then to relate the degree of cooperation between teachers and school media specialists to the overall organizational climates of the schools involved in the study. Instructional involvement, or cooperation between school library media specialists and classroom teachers, was measured on two levels: cooperation with teachers on low level strictly information oriented school instructional problem situations, and cooperation on problems that require the classroom teacher and school media specialist to apply information to design instruction in some way.

The study includes measurements of three aspects of faculty cooperativeness in instructional matters as important components of overall school climate: group instructional cohesiveness, or the strength of mutual association on instructional matters within the group; positive expansiveness of the individual, or the strength of the desire of the individual to cooperate with colleagues in instruction; and group positive expansiveness, or the strength of the desire of the group as a whole to cooperate with one another on school instructional matters. All of these terms, measures, and their means of calculation, to be presented later, are the standard techniques and approaches characteristic of sociometric research.
The researcher chose to adopt a sociometric approach to data collection and analysis for this study, guided by the realization that cooperation between the school library media specialist and the classroom teacher is impacted not only by the teacher's perception of the expertise of the school librarian, but also by how the teacher and media specialist relate interpersonally. That overall school organization and climate can in turn have an impact on interpersonal relations among school colleagues is one of the major assumptions of this study.

Gronlund has noted that "regardless of variations in the sociometric test, it is basically a method of evaluating the feelings of the group members toward each other with respect to a common criterion." (139) Bonney and Hampleman add to Gronlund's definition of the sociometric test, stating, "The purpose of sociometric methods is to measure each individual's social stimulus value, or in other words, his social worth or personal value as viewed by his group associates." (140)

Keeping in mind that sociometric methods measure relationships among group members related to specific criteria, one must also note, as Kerlinger does (141), that sociometric choice criteria can include almost any specific situation. That is, sociometric methods can measure not only how individuals feel about each other in general social situations, but also in specific work-oriented environments such as schools and school library media centers.

This study, realizing that interpersonal preferences figure greatly in work relationships, employs a questionnaire that states typical problems encountered in elementary schools to elicit responses as to which other colleagues an individual would turn to for help and cooperation to deal with the stated problem. The problems state either one of two criteria: help with low level instructional problems (i.e.: simple requests for specific information) or help with high level instructional problems (i.e.: requests for cooperation in the design and implementation of
instruction involving more than one step in the instructional design process).

**Dependent and Independent Variables**

This study employs several sociometric indices, one of three basic forms of sociometric analysis noted by Kerlinger (142) and others, to summarize the data gathered by the *Sociometric Choice Questionnaire*, to be described later. The measures derived from these standard sociometric indices represent the dependent and independent variables chosen for inclusion in this study. These measures are referred to as dependent and independent variables only in the sense that it is theoretically assumed that the extent to which a school library media specialist might be chosen to cooperate with teachers on instructional problems could be affected by such individual and group characteristics as one's desire to cooperate with colleagues and the extent of mutual associations, or linkages, between group members relative to instructional problems. However, because the basic approach of this study is correlational rather than experimental, no attempt here is made to impute a causal relationship between the variables studied.

As shown following, the four variables of interest to this study illustrate the two basic types of measures, relational and structural, characteristic of sociometric research. As described by Bailey, structural measures such as cohesion and cliquishness, computed from data about the relations among group members, represent properties of the group as a whole. On the other hand, relational measures, also derived from information based on relationships among group members, apply to particular individuals. A favorite relational measure in sociometric research is the choice status of an individual. (143)
Choice Status of the Individual, or the average number of times an individual is chosen by group members relative to a criterion as given by the formula below where CS\(_j\) = the choice status of the person \(j\); \(\Sigma c_j\) = the sum of choices in column \(j\); and \(n\) = the number of individuals in the group. (144)

\[
CS_j = \frac{\Sigma c_j}{n-1}
\]

In this study, the choice statuses of interest are the instructional choice statuses of both school library media specialists and classroom teachers. These represent the dependent variables chosen for inclusion in the study. The Overall Instructional Choice Status is calculated based on choices related to all of the instructional problems set forth in the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire; the Low Level Instructional Choice Status (LLICS) is based on choice data related to only the low level instructional problems; and the high level instructional choice status (HLICS) is based on the high level instructional problems.

The three measures of classroom teacher instructional choice status are used as three of the several independent variables of the study. Three other independent variables employed in the study include the positive expansiveness of the individual (PE\(i\)), the positive expansiveness of the group (E), and the degree of group cohesiveness in instructional matters (Co). In standard sociometric terminology, a school media specialist or a classroom teacher who receives more choices on a sociometric test than can be explained by chance alone is referred to as a ‘star’, while those who receive no choices are termed ‘isolates’. (145)
Positive Expansiveness of the individual, defined as a measure of an individual's desire to associate with other persons (with respect to a stated criterion) is given by the formula shown below where \( PE_i \) = the positive expansiveness of the individual and \( N \) = the number of people in the group. (146)

\[
PE_i = \frac{\text{Number of choices } i \text{ makes}}{N-1}
\]

Group Cohesiveness is based on the ratio of observed mutual choices in a group to the possible number of mutual choices, in this case where an unlimited number of choices is permitted as shown by the formula below where \( Co \) = the cohesion of the group and \( \sum (i \leftrightarrow j) \) = the sum of mutual choices made by members of the group. (147)

\[
Co = \frac{\sum (i \leftrightarrow j)}{n(n-1)/2}
\]

In the case of this study, the Instructional Cohesion of an elementary faculty is one measure of the extent to which the faculty is unified in instructional matters and is, thus, one measure of the extent of cooperativeness of the group.

Group Positive Expansiveness, defined as a measure of the desire of group members to associate with one another with respect to a stated criterion, is given by the formula below where \( E \) = the positive expansiveness of the group and \( N \) = the total number of group members. (148)
Thus, expansiveness, like cohesion, is also a measure of the cooperativeness of a group.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were identified and tested in this study:

$E = \frac{\text{Total number of choices made by the group}}{N}$

$H_1$: There is no significant difference between the average Overall Instructional Choice Status (ICS) for school library media specialists serving academically effective schools and those serving academically ineffective schools.

$H_2$: There is no significant difference between the average High Level Instructional Choice Status (HLICS) for school library media specialists serving academically effective schools and those serving academically ineffective schools.

$H_3$: There is no significant difference between the average Low Level Instructional Choice Status (LLICS) for school library media specialists serving academically effective schools and those serving academically ineffective schools.

$H_4$: There is no relationship between the Overall ICS of the school library media specialist and the various scores on Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

$H_5$: There is no relationship between the HLICS of the school library media specialist and the various scores on Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.
$H_0$: There is no relationship between the LLICS of the school library media specialist and the various scores on Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

$H_1$: There is no significant difference between average Faculty Instructional Cohesion (FIC) for academically effective schools and academically ineffective schools.

$H_2$: There is no significant difference between average Group Expansiveness for academically effective schools and academically ineffective schools.

$H_3$: There is no relationship between Faculty Instructional Cohesion and the overall Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_4$: There is no relationship between Faculty Instructional Cohesion and the Low Level Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_5$: There is no relationship between Faculty Instructional Cohesion and the High Level Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_6$: There is no relationship between Group Expansiveness and the Overall Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_7$: There is no relationship between Group Expansiveness and the Low Level Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_8$: There is no relationship between Group Expansiveness and the High Level Instructional Choice Status of the school library media specialist.

$H_9$: There is no relationship between the Overall Instructional Choice Status of individual faculty and the total number of times individual faculty choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems.
H$_{16}$: There is no relationship between the High Level Instructional Choice Status of individual faculty and the total number of times individual faculty choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems.

H$_{17}$: There is no relationship between the Low Level Instructional Choice Status of individual faculty and the total number of times individual faculty choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems.

H$_{18}$: There is no relationship between the Positive Expansiveness of individual faculty and the number of times individual faculty choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems.

**Data Collection Instruments**

This study employed three instruments to collect data: a *Sociometric Choice Questionnaire* completed by each classroom teacher involved in the study, a *Media Center Questionnaire*, completed by each school library media specialist, and *Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*, also completed by each school librarian involved in the study. Copies of these three instruments are included in Appendices A, B, and C.

The *Sociometric Choice Questionnaire* presented each respondent with fifteen school-related problems and asked the respondent to identify, using an enclosed list of all professional colleagues in the school, the individuals he/she would go to for help and cooperation in solving the problem. Respondents were invited to choose as many colleagues as they wanted, but to choose only those individuals that they felt would have the needed expertise and with whom the respondent would feel comfortable working. Five of the problem statements relate to needs for specific information. For the purposes of this study those
problems are termed ‘low level instructional problems’ and are as follows: (The numerals in parentheses indicate the position of the problem statement in the questionnaire.)

(1.) Your school has just begun a sustained silent reading program in which all students, administrators, and faculty stop what they are doing every day at a designated time to read for pleasure. You would like to subscribe to some low difficulty/ high interest sports magazines for some of the boys in your class, but you are not aware of sufficient titles, or of how to subscribe.

(3.) As a Thanksgiving Day Observance, your class is arranging an international “feast” that will feature a typical dish from each of the major immigrant groups to the United States. Each student, with help from home, will be responsible for an item. You have neither a sufficient number nor variety of recipes available.

(6.) Your principal has asked you to write and prioritize a set of instructional goals for part of one of the subjects you teach. You need to know what types of information are usually included in goal statements, as well as the style or format the document should take.

(11.) Class is about to start and the lamp burned out in the slide projector you need for a presentation. You have a replacement lamp, but you do not know how it goes in. You do not have time to learn. You need help.

(13.) Your school has just instituted a Spanish as a foreign language program for the elementary grades. You have a minor in Spanish, and so you have been assigned to teach the course, even though you have not actually taught in your minor before. No one else on the faculty has ever taught a foreign language before either. You have been given $500.00 to buy instructional materials (workbooks, tapes, filmstrips, realia, etc.). You feel you need some advice in order to make the best possible use of the money.
These 'low level' instructional problems simply require the media specialist to provide information (usually concerning availability of materials), but without further cooperation between the school library media specialist and the classroom teacher. Loertscher would classify such activities between levels two and four of his eleven level taxonomy (149), while Turner would categorize them as what he calls the "Reaction Level" (the next-to-the-lowest level) of the instructional design process: "... materials, facilities, and equipment are provided; their provision is the result of the teacher asking, at some point for assistance." (150)

Another five problem statements represent "high level instructional problems" :

(4.) For the past two weeks you have been teaching a complicated concept to your class, and all but one of your students have now mastered the objectives involved. The student in question is neither physically nor learning disabled. After two attempts to re-teach the student, you realize that he/she just does not learn the same way as the majority of students. You feel that the problem lies in either your approach or the materials you are using (or both). You need some help in analyzing your approach to teaching the concept, the suitability of your materials, and the possibility of alternative materials in order to arrive at a more promising way to help this particular student.

(5.) For language arts, your students have chosen to create a television news show covering actual school events. You need to work with other faculty to help with set design, copy preparation, make-up, and equipment operation.

(8.) You are the grade-level chairperson for your grade at your school. While reviewing TEAMS scores, you notice that a large number of students scored low in the use of dictionaries, indexes, atlases, and other references. You and your principal agree that your program should be redesigned to improve student performance. It is up to you to work with fellow faculty members to solve this problem.
(9.) You are part of a committee set up to write a departmental or grade level test to test student mastery of a particular set of objectives. The objectives are properly stated, but your committee is not skilled in deriving good test items from objectives. In this area you are the most knowledgeable member of the team; so you have been tapped to conduct an inservice for the other team members. You need help with planning the session, with materials (especially sample objectives and test items), and with the logistics of holding the session, including space and equipment.

(14.) You have been teaching your American history unit the same way (mainly lecture) for the last several years. You are bored by it, and you feel that the students you are now getting are also turning off to your approach. You want to come up with new approaches and activities that not only are suitable for your objectives, but also allow students to use information and concepts from other subject areas. You want the new activities to be exciting for the students and to be varied enough so that differences in learning styles can be accommodated. You feel the need to consult with other members of the staff for help in this matter.

These "high level instructional problems", corresponding to the highest level of Turner’s taxonomy, the “Action/Education” level, involve more than one step of the instructional design process (needs assessment, learner analysis, specification of objectives, test design, selection of instructional materials, development of activities, implementation of instruction, and evaluation of instruction), and require the involvement of the media specialist to cooperate in some way with the teacher to design instruction. (151) With reference to Loertscher’s eleven-level taxonomy, these activities would be classified from levels five through eleven, with most of them at level seven and above. (152)

In addition to the five “high” and five “low” instructional problem statements, the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire also contains five distractor items similar to the following:
The central office has asked each school to offer suggestions for changes in the discipline management plan. The person who was originally appointed to select and head a school team to study needed changes has become ill, and you have been appointed to take her place. Whom among your faculty would you choose to help you revise the plan?

The five distractor items, items 2, 7, 10, 12, and 15 of the fifteen-item questionnaire, while representing problems that do indeed arise in elementary schools, have nothing to do with instruction. They were included to lessen the chance that respondents might discern that instruction and the role of the librarian are the concerns of the questionnaire.

With respect to the validity of the type of sociometric measures derived from the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire constructed by the researcher for the purposes of this study, Bonney and Hampleman examine the view of much opinion in the field to the effect that sociometric choices in general have inherent "face validity". That is, they are direct measures of the phenomenon under investigation. If, for example, respondent 'A' says that he or she would desire to cooperate with person 'X' under a specified set of circumstances, then that indication is a valid measure of that person's wish at that time and in that situation. (153)

Nevertheless, the researcher was concerned about two questions: (1) to what extent is each of the questionnaire items, or problem descriptions, representative of instructional problems common to elementary schools, and (2) to what extent are the two groups of questions, low level problem descriptions and high level problem descriptions, similar or dissimilar to the traditional types of problems on which school library media specialists have cooperated in the past. Therefore, the ten active items, or problem descriptions, on the questionnaire were submitted to a panel of professionals with considerable experience in the field of elemen-
tary education who rated each item. Each item was rated on a scale from zero to three as to similarity to problems the typical Texas elementary classroom teacher might face sometime during the normal school year. A rating of zero indicated no similarity, while a rating of three meant that the description was very similar to typical classroom problems. Table 1 summarizes data indicating that, according to the raters, the items on the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire are indeed similar to typical classroom or school problems familiar to teachers at the elementary level. As summarized in the table, ratings for the ten active questionnaire items ranged from a low of 2 to a high of 2.857. With the exception of item 1, the low and high level problem descriptions had remarkably similar ratings.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEM ON QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM</th>
<th>AVERAGE VALIDATION RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>2.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>2.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>2.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>2.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>2.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>2.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the results of a Mann-Whitney U test to determine if the two groups of problems were considered by the rating panel to differ in degree of similarity to traditional types of problems on which school media specialists have cooperated in the past. As indicated in the table, the low level instructional problem descriptions were found to be significantly more similar than the high level problems to traditional library service areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Level Problems</th>
<th>High Level Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number: 35</td>
<td>Number: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: 1421</td>
<td>Rank: 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank: 40.6</td>
<td>Mean Rank: 30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Media Center Questionnaire gathered simple background information relative to the school librarian and his/her work situation, including length of service and certification status, as well as estimates of the length of time school library media specialists devote to various tasks in the school library media center. These data, corresponding to the status variables included in many previous studies, were gathered in replication of past work in order to determine if the standard librarian status variables might be correlated in some way to the measure of cooperation between elementary classroom teachers and elementary school
library media specialists employed in this study.

Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, in use since 1949 and continuously improved since then, measures sixteen unitary, psychologically significant source traits as summarized in Tables 3 & 4. (154) For each source trait, or factor, the 16 PF yields a standard score ranging from one to ten. Cattell notes that one or a combination of factor scores for a particular individual will not completely predict behavior because other characteristics of the person relating to ability and motivation, as well as situational factors will always impact specific behavior. (155)

Originally developed by Raymond Cattell using factor analysis of forced choice test items, it is a standard psychological test instrument in use since 1949. The version of the 16 PF used in this study, the 1967-68 Form A with norms updated to 1978, comes provided with separate validity scales that allow the researcher to adjust results either up or down depending on the extent to which the test taker has attempted to "fake" or distort his/her responses to the test items. In general, the 16 PF is a valuable and reliable measure of basic personality traits of the general population where "assessment of 'normal range' personality traits is important." (156)

The researcher chose to gather and analyze data on the personality traits of the school library media specialists included in this study for two basic reasons. Even though librarian personality traits as measured have in the past not been found to be related to the extent of cooperation between school media specialists and teachers, it was thought that because the present study measured such instructional cooperation in terms of realistic school problems, rather than job description items, a relationship might be detected. Secondly, a personality compo-
### TABLE 3
#### 16 PF SOURCE TRAITS - FACTORS A - I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Low Sten Score Description [1 - 3]</th>
<th>High Sten Score Description [8 - 10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reserved, detached, critical, cool, impersonal</td>
<td>Warmhearted, outgoing, participating, easy-going interested in people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Less intelligent, concrete-thinking</td>
<td>More intelligent, abstract-thinking, bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset, changeable</td>
<td>Emotionally stable, mature, calm, patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Humble, mild, accommodating, easily led, conforming</td>
<td>Assertive, aggressive, authoritative, competitive, stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sober, prudent, serious, taciturn</td>
<td>Happy-go-lucky, impulsively lively, heedless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Expedient, disregards rules, feels few obligations</td>
<td>Conscientious, persevering, proper, moralistic, rule-bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shy, restrained, threat-sensitive, timid</td>
<td>Venturesome, socially bold, uninhibited, spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tough-minded, self-reliant, realistic</td>
<td>Tender-minded, intuitive, unrealistic, sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 16PF was included in replication of past studies as a further check, simply because the idea of a connection between the variables involved is so logically persuasive. The 16PF was chosen because it has been widely used in past librarian personality studies.

**Population Studied and Procedures for Data Collection**

For statistical reporting purposes, Texas divides its 1,000 plus school districts into sixteen comparison groups on the basis of district size (total district enrollment), overall district wealth, and the percentage of students attending from low income families. This study investigated twenty-eight school districts, members of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Low Sten Score Description [1 - 3]</th>
<th>High Sten Score Description [8 - 10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trusting, adaptable, free of jealousy, easy to get along with</td>
<td>Suspicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool, skeptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Practical, careful, conventional, regulated by external realities</td>
<td>Imaginative, careless of practical matters, absent-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Forthright, natural, unpretentious</td>
<td>Shrewd, calculating, socially alert, insightful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Unperturbed, self-assured, confident, secure, self-satisfied</td>
<td>Apprehensive, self-reproaching, worrying, troubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_1</td>
<td>Conservative, respecting established ideas</td>
<td>Experimenting, analytical, likes innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_2</td>
<td>Group oriented, a “joiner” and sound follower</td>
<td>Self-sufficient, prefers own decisions, resourceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_3</td>
<td>Undisciplined self-conflict, careless of protocol, follows own urges</td>
<td>Controlled, socially precise, compulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_4</td>
<td>Relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated</td>
<td>Tense, frustrated, driven, restless, overwrought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the comparison group characterized as: enrollment - 3,000 to 9,999; wealth below average; percentage of students from low income families over 40%. There were seventy-five elementary schools in the sampling frame of the highest scoring and lowest scoring elementary schools on TEAMS.

According to computer printouts provided by the Texas Education Agency, on the 1988 administration of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills Test (T.E.A.M.S.) twenty-two of the elementary schools in the comparison group scored among the top twenty-five percent of all schools in Texas on percentages of students passing the TEAMS test. These schools constitute the high academic or
instructionally effective schools. Also, according to state education agency records, fifty-three of the elementary schools in the comparison group fell in the bottom quartile of all schools across the state on percentages of students passing T.E.A.M.S. From those schools, the researcher randomly selected another twenty-two schools to represent the low academic or instructionally ineffective schools. The researcher then contacted the superintendents of those districts by mail and by phone to elicit their district's cooperation in the study.

In all, nineteen high academic and twenty low academic elementary schools from the comparison group consented to cooperate in the study. However, toward the end of the study one of the librarians from a low academic school failed to return the 16PF and the Media Center Questionnaire; therefore, only nineteen high academic schools and nineteen low academic schools are included in the study on the hypotheses that require data about the school library media specialist. For the purposes of this investigation a librarian was defined as anyone who had full-time responsibility for the operation of a school library media center. Twenty-seven of the school library media specialists were degreed professional educators, while eleven were non-degreed paraprofessionals. In all, the school library media specialists had a mean of 13.73 years in the field of education with a range of from 1 to thirty-five years. They had an average of 7.62 years as school library media specialists, ranging from one to twenty-six years, and they averaged four years' experience on the campus assigned, with a range of from one to fifteen years.

All of the campuses, except one, had a minority student population greater than 43%. All were members of low wealth districts with high percentages of students from poverty-level families. All, with the exception of two small districts, one in the San Antonio area and another in the Dallas area, were rural or semi-rural school districts. All are relatively small school districts with enrollments from 3,999
to 9,999 students. Also, the campuses ranged in size from two schools employing
less than ten professional faculty members to schools with over sixty teachers. The
average faculty size for the elementary schools participating in the study was
twenty-nine teachers. The comparison group of schools studied included schools
from each major geographical region of the state of Texas.

The study attempted to include all of the classroom teachers in the thirty-nine
participating elementary schools, and 1,079 teachers, 94.9% of all teachers contacted,
returned usable questionnaires. This is important because sociometric investiga-
tions require a high percentage of return for the results to be valid. One measure in
particular, the instructional cohesiveness of the faculty (Co), is very sensitive in this
regard because it is based on a measure of the number of mutual choices among
faculty. Large numbers of non-participating faculty would render such a measure
largely invalid. As it was, however, no campus had a response rate lower than 85%.

Data collection began in January of 1989, and was conducted in two phases.
First, the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire was mailed to all schools participating
in the study where they were distributed to all classroom teachers. The teachers
completed the questionnaires and returned them to their principal who then
returned them to the researcher in a box. Data collection was complete by mid-June
of 1989.

Librarians received their 16PF and Media Center Questionnaire only after
their school's teacher questionnaires had been received by the researcher, thus
neither principals nor librarians were aware that the role of the school library in
instruction was the focus of the study.


142. Ibid., 502.


151. Ibid., p. 55.


155. Ibid., 18.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

A close inspection of the information yielded by the teacher questionnaires revealed a set of highly skewed data deviating so grossly from normal distribution that it was deemed not appropriate to use parametric procedures for statistical analysis. This non-normally distributed nature of sociometric choice data has been mentioned by other researchers. (157)

Therefore, hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 were analyzed with the Mann-Whitney U, the non-parametric equivalent of the t-Test for non-correlated samples. The remaining hypotheses were tested by means of Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation technique, the non-parametric substitute for the Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

**Hypotheses 1 - 3 (Structural Differences Between Groups)**

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 tested the degree to which faculties of the high academic elementary schools differed from those of low academic schools in the extent to which they tended to choose to cooperate with the school library media specialist on instructional problems. Null hypothesis 1 tested the choice status of the school librarian with regard to all of the active problem descriptions contained on the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire returned by the 1,079 teachers who cooperated in this study. As indicated in Table 5, the data collected and analyzed in this study do indicate a significant difference ($\rho < .01$) between two groups in favor of the academically more effective schools; therefore, null hypothesis 1 is rejected.
TABLE 5

HYPOTHESES 1 - 3 Instructional Choice Status of School Media Specialists and School Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Σ Number: Rank</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>H3</th>
<th>Mean Rank: H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>H3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Academic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>487.5</td>
<td>480.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>292.5</td>
<td>299.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>H3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-prime</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>297.5</td>
<td>290.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.894 (p &lt; .01)</td>
<td>-3.021 (p &lt; .01)</td>
<td>-2.825 (p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* tied groups: 2

Null hypothesis 2 tested the choice status of the school librarian with regard to only the high level problem descriptions contained on the Sociometric Choice Questionnaire, and was also rejected at the .01 level of significance. Likewise, null hypothesis 3 which predicted no difference between the groups with regard to the choice status of the school media specialists based on the low level tasks was also rejected, p < .01.

These are very interesting findings in that the data represented here were provided by thirty-nine schools similar in important factors including student demographic characteristics and school wealth from throughout the state of Texas. The size of the sample, 1,079 classroom teachers, and the percent of questionnaires returned, over 94%, lend further authority to the results determined here. Furthermore, the fact that the low academic schools were chosen at random from the state determined comparison group of schools, and the fact that teachers responded to the sociometric questionnaire unaware that the school library media specialist was the focus of the study both lend additional support to the validity of the findings.
Hypotheses 7 and 8 (Structural Differences Between Groups)

Hypotheses 7 and 8 tested between groups differences with regard to two important group characteristics: group cohesion and group expansiveness. Again, differences were expected in favor of the academically more effective elementary schools. As shown in Table 6, significant differences were indicated between the groups. With a mean rank of 24.1, the high academic elementary schools included in this study were found to be significantly more cohesive than the less effective elementary schools (p < .05). Therefore, null hypothesis #7 was rejected.

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESES 7 &amp; 8 -- Group Cohesion &amp; Expansiveness and School Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number: Rank: Mann-Whitney U Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding, of course, is in line with the general literature pertaining to instructionally effective schools which strongly supports the idea that there are important structural differences between relatively effective and relatively ineffective schools. Keeping in mind that the cohesiveness measure employed in this study is a standard sociometric index based on the observed number of mutual choices among a faculty divided by the theoretically possible number of such choices, it means that the high academic, instructionally effective schools had a significantly higher proportion of mutual linkages between faculty with regard to avowed cooperation on instructional problems than did the similar but less
effective elementary schools. While this result does not indicate a relationship between instructional cohesion and cooperation with the school media specialist, it does lend support to the concept that the climates of effective and less effective schools can be quite different.

No significant difference in group expansiveness was detected between the groups, and Null hypothesis 8, therefore, could not be rejected. However, with reference to Table 6 it is worthy to note that in absolute terms the mean ranking of the low academic schools with regard to group positive expansiveness was quite a bit higher than the high academic schools. Given that group positive expansiveness is simply a measure of the desire of group members to cooperate with each other relative to a particular task, this was an outcome contrary to what the researcher had expected to find. Also, it is important to note that this hypothesis was on the borderline of significance at the .05 level. This may suggest that elementary school faculties of less effective schools, less cohesive (cooperative) than those of more effective schools, may, perhaps, be less familiar with the strengths of their colleagues with reference, particularly, to the high level instructional problems. Such unfamiliarity may give them a tendency to choose more colleagues for cooperation, resulting in higher group positive expansiveness measures.

**Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 (Relational Measures)**

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 related three levels of the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist to each of Cattell's sixteen personality factors. The 16PF summary data presented in Table 7 indicate that, as a group, the thirty-eight elementary school library media specialists who responded to the personality questionnaire differ very little from the general population on any of the measured
### TABLE 7

**16 PERSONALITY FACTORS: SUMMARY OF DATA PERTAINING TO 38 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEV.</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.868</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.395</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>3.867</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6.737</td>
<td>1.589</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.211</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.495</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6.263</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.579</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>5.763</td>
<td>1.909</td>
<td>3.645</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>4.816</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>7.368</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>6.368</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₄</td>
<td>6.237</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.429</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traits. 16PF sten scores of 5 through 6 are considered well within the population norm, while scores of 1-3 and 8-10 are considered to indicate a significant difference in the trait. (158)

As a group, the school library media specialists scored slightly below general population norms on factors F, M, and Q, indicating that they are slightly more prudent and serious, careful and practical, and conservative (less fond of innovation) than the general population. At the same time, as a group they scored slightly higher than the norm on factors B, G, I, L, N, Q, Q, and Q. They are slightly more intelligent, persevering, sensitive, and skeptical than the norm. They were also slightly more shrewd, resourceful, compulsive, and tense than the general run of people.

With regard to extreme individual scores, however, eight of the thirty-eight media specialists, approximately 25% of the total, did score conspicuously low (sten 1-3) on the assertiveness factor, factor E, which has been mentioned in the literature as a recommended trait for school library media specialists interested in working closely with teachers in instruction. At the same time, seven media specialists scored significantly above the general population norm (sten 8-10) on factor E. In the area of enthusiasm, factor F, eleven respondents received sten scores of three or lower, while only five scored significantly higher than the general population. Likewise, nine respondents were rated significantly higher in the areas of inhibition and shyness than the general population, while six scored significantly higher than the norm in the areas of spontaneity and social boldness. It is perhaps in their lack of tolerance for innovation that the school library media specialists deviated most from people in general. Twelve media specialists, almost one-third of the sample, scored significantly low in this area, while only four scored high.
Of particular interest to this study, however, was to determine if this variability in media specialist personality traits could be associated with the degree to which the school librarians tended to be chosen by teachers for cooperation on instructional problems. Spearman rank order correlations were performed to see if any relationships existed between the overall instructional choice status of the media specialist and factors A - Q, the high level instructional choice status and each factor; and the low level ICS and each factor. Tables 8 and 9 present the results of the correlations. As indicated by Table 8, factors C, F, and I all had apparent weak-to-moderate correlations to the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist. However, given that a two-tailed test of significance is appropriate in this case, and where df = 36, none of the apparent correlations were significant at the .05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypotheses 4, 5, &amp; 6 - ICS of the School Library Media Specialist Correlated to Personality Factors A - I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 9, none of the remaining 16PF personality traits were significantly correlated with the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist. Using a two-tailed test and the .05 level of significance, with df = 36, none of the factors obtained the minimum r value of .31 necessary for significant correlation.
TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICS</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>-038</td>
<td>-088</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>-083</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLICS</td>
<td>-099</td>
<td>-066</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>-025</td>
<td>-003</td>
<td>-044</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLICS</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-058</td>
<td>-076</td>
<td>-009</td>
<td>-097</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, this finding regarding personality traits of school media specialists is well within the boundaries of the significant findings of previous research in the area. Also, this body of findings may suggest that, because organizations require their members to conform to group expectations, essential personality characteristics are unable to account for differences in degrees of cooperation between classroom teachers and school library media specialists.

Hypotheses 9, 10, and 11 (Relational Measures Correlated to Structural Measures)

Hypotheses 9, 10, and 11 test the relationships of three levels of the school library media specialist instructional choice status, overall, low, and high, to a measure of the extent of instructional cohesion among elementary faculty. As defined in this study, instructional cohesion is a measure of mutual association and cooperation among teachers on a faculty.

A measure of instructional cohesion was calculated for each of the thirty-nine elementary schools participating in the study. The instructional choice data from each school was inspected and the number of mutual choices, one faculty member
choosing another and then in turn being also chosen by that same person, was counted. The total number of actual mutual choices was then divided by the mathematically determined number of possible mutual choices to arrive at a number, approaching but less than unity, indicating the degree of instructional cohesion for that faculty or campus.

Actually, throughout all campuses there were relatively few mutual choices as compared to the number of possible mutual choices, and the instructional cohesion measure was correspondingly low for all schools. Even so, there was quite a range of instructional cohesion scores. The highest cohesion score recorded was .173 and pertained to a high academic school with a high (4.33) school librarian overall ICS, while and the lowest recorded was .0062, corresponding to a low academic school with a relatively low (1.72) overall ICS for the school library media specialist.

As indicated in Table 10, null hypotheses 9, 10, and 11 cannot be rejected. The rhos of .17 and .17 for the overall and low level instructional choice statuses, and the rho of .19 for the high level instructional choice status of the school library media specialists were not significant at the .05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTHESES 9, 10, &amp; 11 -- ICS Of the School Media Specialist and Faculty Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL ICS &amp; COHESION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; COHESION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; COHESION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This, of course, is a somewhat disappointing finding. As already established from hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, within the group of schools included in this investigation, the high academic schools, as determined by the Texas Educational Assess-
ment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) test, are significantly more instructionally cohesive than the low academic, or instructionally less effective schools. Thus, from these data it is not possible to observe a direct relationship between one important school climate factor, cohesion, and cooperation between school library media specialists and teachers.

Hypotheses 12, 13, and 14 (Relational Measures Correlated to Structural Measures)

Hypotheses 12, 13, and 14 explored possible relationships between the three levels of the school librarian instructional choice status and the positive expansiveness (GE) of the group, or in this case, faculty. Group positive expansiveness is a measure derived by dividing the total number of choices made by a group by the number of group members.

As shown in Table 11, apparent inverse relationships were found between the overall school librarian ICS and positive group expansiveness (rho = -.14) and the low level ICS and positive group expansiveness (rho = -.23); however, these apparent relationships were not statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYPOTHESES 12, 13, &amp; 14 -- ICS Of the School Media Specialist and Group Expansiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL ICS &amp; GROUP EXPANSIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; GROUP EXPANSIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; GROUP EXPANSIVENESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses 15, 16, and 17 (Relational Measures Correlated to Relational Measures)

Hypotheses 15, 16, and 17 relate the instructional choice status of the individual faculty member to the number of times each faculty indicated that he or she would cooperate with the school library media specialist. Because respondents in the study freely chose teachers as well as school library media specialists to help them solve instructionally related problems, teachers have a corresponding measure of how they rate among their peers as regards instruction. At the same time, each of the 1,079 teachers who participated in this study had the option to choose the school library media specialist from zero to a maximum of ten times for cooperation on instructional problems.

Table 12 indicates that there were no relationships found between any of the three levels of faculty instructional choice status and the extent that faculty in general opted to cooperatively work with school library media specialists to solve instructional problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Instructional Choice Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Σd²</th>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY OVERALL ICS &amp; CHOICE OF MEDIA SPECIALIST</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>189926352</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; CHOICE OF MEDIA SPECIALIST</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>187756381</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; CHOICE OF MEDIA SPECIALIST</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>199262237.5</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was also a finding contrary to what the researcher had expected and hoped to find. One can indeed support logically the idea that individual classroom teachers enjoying a higher peer-determined instructional choice status might tend to cooperate more with the school library media specialist. However, the data pertaining to hypotheses 15, 16, and 17 do not support such a belief.
Hypothesis 18 (Relational Measures Correlated to Relational Measures)

Hypothesis 18, the last formal research question of interest in this study, relates the positive expansiveness of the individual teacher, defined here as a measure of the individual’s desire to cooperate with others on particular instructional problems, to the number of times individual classroom teachers actually chose the school library media specialist to help them solve instructionally related problems. Defined mathematically, individual positive expansiveness (PEi) is derived by counting the total number of choices an individual made across all of the instructionally related problem statements, and then dividing that total by the total number of individuals available to be chosen, minus one. This was done for each of the 1,079 classroom teachers participating in this study, and the results of the Spearman Rank Order Correlation of PEi with the number of times each faculty member chose the school library media specialist is shown in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYPOTHESIS 18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Positive Expansiveness and Choice of School Library Media Specialist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma D^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rho corrected for ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z corrected for ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#X tied groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Y tied groups:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, a weak to moderate, statistically significant positive correlation ($\rho = .26, p < .01$) was observed between individual teacher expansiveness and the number of times the librarian was chosen for collaboration on instructional problems.
Ancillary Research Questions

The data provided by the Media Center Questionnaire returned by thirty-eight of the thirty-nine school library media specialists who participated in this study also make it possible to address a number of other important questions that were not originally stated as formal hypotheses. One such question would relate to possible relationships between the size of a school, as indicated by the size of the teaching faculty, and the three levels of the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist. As shown in Table 14, the data indicated no statistically significant relationships between school size and the levels of the school library media specialist instructional choice status.

| Table 14 |
|---|---|---|
| LEVELS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST INSTRUCTIONAL CHOICE STATUS RELATED TO SCHOOL SIZE |
| N | $\sum D^2$ | Rho |
| OVERALL ICS & SCHOOL SIZE | 38 | 1140.5 | -22 ($p > .05$) |
| LOW LEVEL ICS & SCHOOL SIZE | 38 | 11268 | -23 ($p > .05$) |
| HIGH LEVEL ICS & SCHOOL SIZE | 38 | 11598.5 | -27 ($p > .05$) |

School size has been a factor mentioned in the literature as a possible determiner of cooperation between school librarians and teachers in the sense that within the more intimate setting of a smaller schools might be found climates more supportive of cooperative relationships between teachers and librarians, especially in light of the fact that, in a smaller school, on the average school librarians might have a lesser workload and, thus, be in a position to concentrate more on cultivating relationships with classroom teachers. Again, the results of this study do not seem to give any support to this traditional supposition.
Another factor that could possibly be related to the degree to which school librarians work with teachers in instruction is the total number of years of experience as a school library media specialist. Table 15 summarizes the results of correlations of the three levels of the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist with the number of years reported as a school library media specialist. Total years of experience as a school library media specialist ranged from a low of one year to a high of twenty-six years; however, the average number of years of experience for the elementary school media specialists in the sample was a rather low 7.6 years. As indicated by the table, no relationships were found between the ICS levels and years of experience as a school library media specialist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST</th>
<th>OVERALL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma D^2$</td>
<td>8039.5</td>
<td>8235.5</td>
<td>7793.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another, perhaps more important question might be, "Do years of experience as a school media specialist on a particular campus correlate with the extent to which teachers tend to choose the school library media specialist for help on instructional problems?" The range of on-campus experience as media specialists for this sample of elementary school library media specialists was from one to fifteen years. With a mean of four years, the media specialists represented in this study have, as a group, relatively little experience on the campuses where they were
employed at the time of the study.

Table 16 summarizes the relationships between experience as a school library media specialist on a particular campus and the degree to which teaching colleagues pick the SLMS for cooperative work on instructional problems.

### Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\Sigma D^2)</th>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE ON CAMPUS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6904</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE ON CAMPUS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6938</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; EXPERIENCE ON CAMPUS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7005.5</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, again no statistically significant relationships were found between on-campus experience as a school library media specialist and all three levels of the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist.

The school library media specialists ranged from one to thirty-five total years of experience in education, with a mean of 13.7 years of experience. As presented in Table 17, the data of this study also indicate no statistically significant relationships between the instructional choice status of the school librarian and total experience in education.

### Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\Sigma D^2)</th>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL ICS &amp; YRS. IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6947</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW LEVEL ICS &amp; YRS. IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7247.5</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH LEVEL ICS &amp; YRS. IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7408</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another very important question relates to any possible differences in instructional choice status between groups of degreed (professional) and non-degreed (paraprofessional) elementary school library media specialists. In all, eleven out of the thirty-eight media specialists who returned questionnaires were non-degreed paraprofessionals. Table 18 summarizes the results of the Mann-Whitney U tests performed to determine if the degreed librarians scored significantly higher than the paraprofessionals in terms of the three levels of the media specialist instructional choice status. While the degreed professionals did, as a group, obtain a mean rank slightly higher at each level of the instructional choice status, none of the differences were statistically significant. The high level instructional choice status of the school library media specialist is based on the average number of times a faculty indicates that it would choose to cooperate with the school librarian on problems of an instructional design nature. The researcher hoped to find evidence that elementary school teachers would be more disposed to choose fully certified, degreed professionals for cooperation on these types of problems as opposed to choosing paraprofessionals who have not been educated and trained in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>ICS ALL</th>
<th>HLICS</th>
<th>LLICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Media Specialist</strong></td>
<td>Number: Rank:</td>
<td>27: 20.13</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>19.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraprof. Media Specialist</strong></td>
<td>11: 17.96</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICS ALL</th>
<th>HLICS</th>
<th>LLICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U</strong></td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-prime</strong></td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>-.547 (p &gt; .05)</td>
<td>-.483 (p &gt; .05)</td>
<td>-.37 (p &gt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># tied groups</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instructional design. However, the data provided by this study do not support the idea that classroom teachers tend to choose degreeed over non-degreeed library personnel for cooperation on instructional problems at any level. Thus, this investigation seems to be in line with most previous research indicating that school and librarian status variables, including the size of the school, number of years of experience of the school library media specialist, and the educational status of school library personnel are not related to cooperation between school media specialists and teachers in the area of instruction.

Another important facet of this investigation was to study levels of cooperation between teachers and school media specialists against a background of the total amount of cooperation present in the school. Previous investigations in this area would develop criteria of involvement for the librarian based, usually, on the literature, expert opinion, or both, and then have school personnel rate the library media specialist accordingly. This is well and good, and the approach certainly sheds light on the status of the profession vis-à-vis a desired goal or standard. However, such approaches do not tell us how the school librarian stands in relation to the current, accepted level of cooperation between non-library professionals, especially teachers themselves, on a particular campus.

As summarized in Table 19, based on the measures developed in this study teachers tended to involve the school library media specialist at least equal to, and, in many cases, more than they chose each other for cooperation on instructional problems. By counting the instances where teachers chose each other, and where they chose the school library media specialist for various types of problems, the observed frequencies were determined for two groups, librarians and non-librarians. The non-librarians on the faculty were overwhelmingly the teachers themselves. By determining mathematically the proportion of all choices for each
category that should have gone to the two groups if both categories were being chosen equally, or proportionately, the expected frequencies for each group were determined. Then, a Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit was employed for each campus to determine if differences in the observed and expected frequencies were statistically significant.

All of the school library media specialists participating in this study were chosen at least proportionately equal to the teachers, and for all of the problems taken together, thirty-six out of thirty-nine media specialists were chosen proportionately more than were the teachers. Nine library media specialists serving in high academic schools and seven serving in low academic schools were chosen proportionately more than the teachers chose themselves for the high level instructional problems. Again, thirty-three out of thirty-nine media specialists were chosen proportionately more by teachers for the low level instructional problems than the teachers chose fellow teachers. This is an important finding because it casts the involvement of the school media specialist in instruction against the total background of on-going instructional cooperation in schools. Keeping in mind that the measures employed by this study have already shown that mutual cooperative linkages between teachers was low for all of the schools studied, it is still vital to note that,
as regards cooperation in the implementation of instruction, the elementary school library media specialists who participated in this investigation compare very well indeed to their classroom colleagues. As a profession we need to keep in mind that, while comparisons to accepted professional standards help us continually improve our programs, still, in all fairness, to accurately gauge our relationships with our classroom colleagues we must examine such relationships in the context of ongoing cooperation in schools between the teachers themselves.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Results

The focus of this study was to test the overall proposition that school and faculty characteristics have a more decided effect on the extent to which classroom teachers and elementary school library media specialists cooperate in instruction than do the personality characteristics and status variables associated with the media specialists themselves.

Traditionally, research related to the role of the school librarian in instruction has used a straight-forward survey approach to measure the perception of the school library media specialist's role from the viewpoint of three professional groups: principals, teachers, and school librarians. This traditional approach has its obvious weaknesses. Principals are loath to admit that their expensive media centers are under-used, and the literature is replete with indications that many school administrators, and teachers too, are not as familiar as they need to be with the purpose, function, and potential of the school library media center. Likewise, teachers are reluctant to admit to the anti-intellectual notion that they do not make full use of their school library media centers.

In any case, what three decades of research into the role of the library in instruction say to us is that, while in general school libraries are not employed in instruction to anywhere near their potential, school administrators are much more supportive of an instructional role for the school librarian than are classroom teachers. The research literature also fails to provide consistent support for the idea
that the extent of the school librarian's involvement in the instructional life of the school can be related to his/her personal characteristics, including measured personality traits, education, and type and length of service.

The approach taken in this research effort was to investigate any possible relationships that may exist between the instructional status of the school library media specialist and several school and faculty related characteristics including overall school academic effectiveness, the general cohesion of the teaching faculty on instructional matters, and the desire or propensity of the group and individual faculty to seek cooperation to solve instructional problems. The study also included instruments to obtain measures of media specialist personality traits and status variables such as the degreeed or non-degreeed status of the school library media specialist, total years of experience as a school library media specialist, years of experience as a media specialist on the campus involved, and total number of years of experience of the school library media specialist in the field of education. Also, the measure of the instructional status of the school librarian was also related to the size of the school served.

Important differences distinguishing this from earlier investigations in the area was the general approach of the study and the major data collection instrument used. This study used a sociometric choice approach where respondents to the questionnaire read descriptions of instructional problems typical of public elementary schools, and then were asked to pick from a list of their colleagues those individuals with whom they would feel comfortable working and whom they believed would have the requisite skills, knowledge, and expertise to help solve the problem. Respondents were free to pick as many individuals as they wanted from the colleague list that included all teachers as well as vice-principals, counselors, librarians, speech therapists, and school nurses. The names of indi-
viduals, without position designations, were mixed randomly on the colleague lists. By casting the choices in terms of instructional activities rather than job responsibility statements, confusion with respect to terminology was avoided, and the choice item was brought closer to the reality of the school situation. In addition, by listing individuals by name without position designations, it was felt that respondents were better able to make their choices on their prior experience and view of the attributes of the person involved, rather than on stereotypical responses to a particular position. Principals and teachers were simply told that the purpose of the study was to investigate various interactions among school staff. No particular mention was made of the school librarian, and as far as this researcher can determine, teacher respondents, 1,079 in all from thirty-nine Texas public elementary schools, were never aware that the role of the school library media specialist in instruction was the focus of the study.

A sample of thirty-nine Texas public elementary schools was selected from a comparison grouping of schools supplied by the Texas Education Agency. All of these schools were in low wealth, medium size districts (3,000 to 9,999 student enrollment) with over 40% of the student body from low income families. With the exception of one small school with a 92.6% Anglo enrollment, all of the schools had at least a 43% minority Black and Hispanic enrollment.

Of the final sample of schools that agreed to cooperate in the study, nineteen schools ranked in the top 25% of all Texas elementary schools on how well their students performed on the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills Test (TEAMS). These schools composed the high academic group of schools. Also, twenty schools were chosen randomly from the same comparison group of schools performing in the bottom 25% of all Texas elementary schools on the TEAMS test. These then represented the low academic campuses.
The most important measure of interest to this study was the average number of times teachers on a school faculty chose their librarian to cooperate with them on the instructional problems described on the sociometric questionnaire. This type of measure is a choice status index typical of sociometric research. The average number of times the school library media specialist on a particular campus was chosen for all ten of the described problems yielded his or her overall instructional choice status (ICS), while the averages of the low level problems and high level problems, respectively, yielded low level ICS (LLICS) and high level ICS (HLICS). The low level, mainly information oriented problems were characteristic of the types of school problems on which librarians and classroom teachers have traditionally cooperated, while the high level problems represent items of an instructional design nature.

One of the most important questions posed by this investigation was whether, as a group, librarians serving in the high academic (effective) elementary schools would have a significantly higher instructional choice status than those working in the less effective group of schools. Mann-Whitney U tests were employed to assess differences in school library media specialist instructional choice status between the two groups of schools for each of the three ICS levels. Statistically significant differences (p<.01) were found in favor of the media specialists serving high academic schools for each ICS level. The data analyzed in this research do support a finding that, as regards the schools participating in this study, school media specialists serving in highly effective elementary schools do enjoy a significantly higher instructional choice status than their colleagues employed in the less effective group of schools.

Another measure utilized in the study was one of the extent of mutual
choice among teachers on a faculty. The idea here is that a school climate characteristic of multiple mutual linkages and cooperation among faculty would be more conducive to the involvement of the school library media specialist in instruction than would be a school atmosphere in which little cooperation among teachers was already taking place.

A standard sociometric technique was used to measure faculty cooperation. A count was made of the number of mutual choices (one faculty member choosing another and then in return being chosen by that same person for the same instructional problem) made by the faculty. This count was then divided by the mathematically determined number of possible mutual choices, and the resulting index was termed 'faculty instructional cohesion' which represents a measure of group cooperativeness in instructional matters. This measure of group instructional cohesion and cooperation is particularly important in light of the literature of effective schools research which supports the view that academically effective schools, perhaps because of their organization and leadership, are demonstrably more collegial and cooperative than less effective schools. And, it is perhaps in part due to these cooperative relationships among staff that such schools owe a degree of their academic effectiveness.

Thus, another question important to his study was whether the high academic schools and low academic schools would differ significantly on the instructional cohesion/cooperation measure. Differences in instructional cohesion in favor of the high academic schools were found at the .05 level of significance. This suggests that, in accord with the general thrust of effective schools research, the classroom teachers in high academic schools in the present sample are significantly more cohesive and cooperative in instructional matters than those serving in the low academic schools. This also suggests that such a cooperative climate may
contribute to the higher instructional choice status enjoyed by the school library media specialists employed in the high academic schools in this sample.

One of the perhaps puzzling results of this investigation deals with a second group measure, that of the positive expansiveness of the faculty as a whole. Group positive expansiveness, defined as a measure of the desire of group members to associate with one another with respect to a stated criterion, is mathematically derived by dividing the total number of choices a group makes by the total number of group members available to be chosen. As revealed by the statistical test, there was not a significant difference in this measure between the two groups of schools (p>.05); however, the researcher had expected to indeed find a significant difference in favor of the high academic schools. Complicating the matter was the fact that the results of the Mann-Whitney U test employed were on the borderline of significance in favor of the low academic schools which were higher on this measure in an absolute sense than the more effective schools.

One possible explanation for this turn of events might be that teachers in the low academic schools, relatively inexperienced with each other in cooperation on instructional problems, might be unsure as to the various levels and kinds of expertise among their colleagues. Such a level of uncertainty might lead them to choose more of their co-workers in order to be sure of obtaining the required expertise to meet the problem as presented. On the other hand, faculties more experienced in working cooperatively with one another and more fully aware of the expertise represented in the school, might make relatively fewer choices, secure in the knowledge that those individuals they did choose would be capable of resolving the situation as described.

A final measure of interest to this research effort was one of the positive
expansiveness of individual faculty members. Like the positive expansiveness of the group, the positive expansiveness of the individual (PEi) is defined as a measure of an individual's desire to associate with other persons with respect to a stated criterion. It is mathematically derived by dividing the number of choices the individual makes by the total number of colleagues available to be chosen.

Once these measures were determined, tests were made to discover which, if any, relationships exist between the three levels of the school library media specialist instructional choice status and the following: the various scores by school librarians on Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, group positive expansiveness, and group instructional cohesion. Tests were also made to discover any possible relationships that might exist between the extent an individual teacher chose to cooperate with the school library media specialist and both teacher instructional choice status and teacher positive expansiveness, defined as the demonstrated desire of an individual to cooperate with others relative to a stated criterion. Of these factors, a statistically significant, but weak, relationship (rho = .26, p<.01) was only found between PEi, the positive expansiveness of the individual teacher, and the number of times individual teachers (N = 1,079) chose to cooperate with the school library media specialist. This suggests, logically, that teachers who are more open to cooperation in general tend to choose to cooperate more with the school library media specialist.

In line with approximately three decades of research in this area, no evidence was found in support of a relationship between measured personality characteristics of school library media specialists and the extent that they are chosen by teachers for involvement in instruction. Results of Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire indicated that the thirty-eight school library media specialists who provided data for the study differ in no important ways from the general
population. In a slight sense, not statistically significant, they were found to be more careful, prudent, serious, practical, and conservative (less fond of innovation) than the general population, while at the same time slightly higher in intelligence, perseverance, sensitivity, and questioning (skepticism) than the norm. The researcher did discover, however, that eight of the thirty-eight media specialists did score significantly low on assertiveness, a trait mentioned in the literature as important for the school library media specialist, while seven school librarians scored significantly above the general population on this characteristic. Eleven of the thirty-eight school media specialists scored low on enthusiasm, and only five scored significantly higher than people in general. However, in their lack of tolerance to innovation school librarians differentiated themselves greatest of all from the general population. Approximately one-third, twelve media specialists, scored significantly low in this area, while only four scored significantly higher than people in general in their openness to innovation.

However, none of the sixteen personality traits measured had statistically significant relationships with the measures of the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist. While logic makes it difficult to accept that personality traits are irrelevant to the success of instructional cooperation between teachers and school library media specialists, we should make note of Herrin's observation, already cited, that the measured personality traits of school media specialists are not necessarily observable in the day-to-day library setting. The fact is we are not fully aware of how school professionals, including the school library media specialist, adapt and adjust their behavior in response to the workplace. In addition, it is very possible that the dynamics, requirements, and characteristics of the school as an organization exert such a powerful effect on interpersonal and work relationships such as to hide the, perhaps, relatively small contribution made
by basic personality characteristics.

Another somewhat puzzling and disappointing result of the investigation was that, while the high academic schools were statistically higher than the low academic schools on the group instructional cohesion measure, the instructional status levels of the school library media specialists were not significantly correlated with the degree to which their campuses were instructionally cohesive/cooperative as measured in this study. We are left, then, with the data supporting higher levels of instructional cooperation among teachers themselves in effective schools, as well as indicating that teachers in highly effective schools are significantly more disposed to cooperate with the school media specialist in instruction than are teachers serving in relatively ineffective schools. However, we can point to no statistically significant direct relationship between the instructional status of the school library media specialist and the instructional cohesion/cooperation of the faculty as measured in this investigation.

There must be other unmeasured variables in operation that are affecting both cooperation levels among teaching faculty themselves, as well as cooperation levels among school library media specialists and teachers. Within the school organization have there been set up materials resource structures that compete with the school library? To what extent are teachers and administrators consumers of library services outside of the work environment? How are teaching teams organized, and is the school library media specialist formally included on faculty instructional teams? What are the purposes and extent of teaming among faculty, the leadership style and personal characteristics of principals, and the personal characteristics of teachers?

Every faculty is composed of some range of personality characteristics. Is
the range large or small, homogeneous or heterogeneous? How do these personality traits collectively and individually interact with the formal structures and organization of the school, and how do they mediate for or against cooperation with the elementary school librarian? With reference to Shavelson's speculation, cited earlier, that teachers may vary in their abilities to assess particular instructional situations, generate alternative teaching strategies, and, thus, be potential consumers of varied instructional materials and services, how do these characteristics and the personality traits of teachers predispose them to cooperate, or not, with the school librarian? How do teachers rate on openness to innovation, and how does this trait relate to their perceived need for library services and materials?

To date, none of these questions have been satisfactorily answered. As far as the schools in this study are concerned, we are fairly sure that teachers associated with academically successful schools, as opposed to less effective schools, indicate a willingness to more often choose the school library media specialist for cooperation on instructional problems, from simple to sophisticated levels. The trouble is we do not know how to explain why this is so.

One of the more disappointing results of this study was that no correlations were found between the instructional choice status of individual teachers and the number of times teachers elected to cooperate with the media specialist on instructional problems. As in the case of the elementary school library media specialists, based on the average number of times they were chosen, three levels of instructional choice status were also calculated for each of the 1,079 classroom teachers who participated in this study. The instructional choice status of a person is, of course, a measure of the degree of esteem that his or her colleagues hold for that person with regard to instructional matters. It would indeed have been an important finding for the school library profession if it had been determined that
teachers enjoying a higher peer-determined instructional status tended to work more extensively with the media specialist. However, no significant correlations were observed between these variables.

Several questions relating to the involvement of the school library media specialist in instruction were addressed using the data provided by this study that were not originally posed as formal research hypotheses. Years of experience of the school library media specialist as a school librarian, years of experience as the media specialist on the present campus, and the total number of years of experience in the field of education were not found to significantly correlate with the amount of involvement of the school librarian in instruction.

Likewise, the size of the school as represented by the number of teaching faculty was not found to significantly correlate with the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist. These findings generally agree with the total weight of research-based evidence generated by the profession over the last three decades.

One finding of this study that should give cause for concern was the result of a comparison of the instructional choice status of degreed (professional) and non-degreed (paraprofessional) media specialists. While the mean ranks of all three levels of the instructional choice status of the degreed media specialists were slightly higher than those of the non-degreed paraprofessionals serving in the capacity of school library media specialists in eleven of the thirty-nine elementary schools, none of the differences were statistically significant at the .05 level.

However, the good news of this research effort is that school media specialists rate very well indeed when their level of cooperation in instruction is compared with the levels of cooperation between teachers in the schools in which they serve. By comparing expected and observed instances of cooperation between
the teachers themselves and between the teachers and the school library media specialists, chi-square tests determined that, proportional to their numbers, all the school library media specialists participating in this study were chosen at least equally along with the teachers for all levels of the instructional problems stated. Thirty-six out of thirty-nine media specialists were, proportionately, chosen more by teachers for all of the problems taken together and for the low level problems than the teachers chose each other. More importantly, however, was the fact that on nine out of nineteen high academic campuses and on seven out of twenty low academic campuses, that is in more than 40% of the schools studied, teachers, proportionally speaking, more often chose the school library media specialist to cooperate with them on the high level instructional problems than they did their classroom colleagues.

Conclusions and Discussion

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are mixed. On the one hand the data definitely support the idea that highly effective public elementary schools, as opposed to less effective schools, are more instructionally cohesive. In such schools, the data also indicate that school library media specialists are more likely to be chosen by teachers for cooperation on instructional problems than they would be in much less effective schools. Likewise, when compared with the degree of avowed cooperation among teachers themselves, school media specialists, as indicated by the data, are likely to enjoy an amount of cooperation in instruction at least equal to, and in many cases greater, than that in effect between classroom teachers themselves.

On the other hand, the two major school climate factors investigated, instructional cohesion and group positive expansiveness, do not help account for the
observed differences in instructional choice status between school library media specialists serving academically highly effective schools and those associated with much less effective institutions. Therefore we have strong indications that the climates of these two groups of schools are different in important ways, and that school media specialists are likely to be more involved in instruction in the more effective schools; however, we are unable to explain these differences, nor are we, as a result of this study, able to establish a direct link between overall school climate and involvement by school media specialists in instruction.

Suggestions for Further Research

While lending support for a conviction that the overall relationship in instruction between teachers and school library media specialists can be in part determined by the academic effectiveness of the school, this study failed to identify specific variables associated with school effectiveness that might correlate significantly with a degree of involvement of the school library media specialist in instruction. As a first step, this study should be partially or fully replicated at the middle school and senior high levels, as well as in elementary schools representative of different socioeconomic characteristics than those investigated in this study. For instance, would a similar study of well-funded urban elementary schools attended predominantly by students from higher socioeconomic families yield results equivalent to those of this investigation which studied mainly rural and semi-rural elementary schools from low wealth districts attended in large part by students from families existing on incomes well below national poverty levels?

Another fruitful avenue might be to employ techniques and measures similar to those of this study to arrive at measures of cooperation between teachers and school library media specialists. Then, a case study approach could be
employed to determine in greater detail just how schools differ where school media specialists are and are not fully integrated into the instructional program of the school.

Also, researchers could measure the leadership styles of principals and their personality characteristics, as well as the personality traits of both teachers and school media specialists to determine differences, if any, in a mix of these variables related to the instructional integration of the school library media specialist. One interesting approach would be to follow up on Shavelson's speculation and measure the extent to which teachers may vary in the degree to which they are able to perceive and assess student needs in the learning environment and formulate alternative teaching strategies to address those needs. Such a measure may be related to teachers' perceived needs for varied instructional materials and support services which the school library media specialist is equipped to provide.

Also, it would be useful to employ alternative, perhaps standardized measures to those used in this study, especially as regards the measure of cohesion/cooperation among faculty. This research effort did find that the instructional cohesion measure among faculty was very low, even in the high academic group of schools. While this study failed to establish a relationship between the instructional choice status of the school library media specialist and instructional cohesion/cooperation among teachers in the school, other more discriminating measures might be able to do so.

Other important questions that might be addressed in future investigations of this type include the following: To what degree is the school organization formally structured to either restrict or encourage cooperation between school media specialists and teachers? Does the organization have a set of commonly agreed on instructional goals? How do these encourage or impede cooperation
among staff in general and particularly between school media specialists and teachers? Do competing structures exist within the organization that duplicate to some degree media center collections and services?
APPENDIX A:

CAMPUS SOCIOMETRIC CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Your school has just begun a sustained silent reading program in which all students, administrators, and faculty stop what they are doing every day at a designated time to read for pleasure. You would like to subscribe to some low difficulty/high interest sports magazines for some of the boys in your class, but you are not aware of sufficient titles, or how to subscribe.
2. The central office has asked each school to offer suggestions for changes in the discipline management plan. The person who was originally appointed to select and head a school team to study needed changes has become ill, and you have been appointed to take her place. Whom among you present faculty would you choose to help you revise the plan?

3. As a Thanksgiving Day observance, your class is arranging an international "feast" that will feature a typical dish from each of the major immigrant groups to the United States. Each student, with help from home, will be responsible for an item. You have neither a sufficient number nor variety of recipes available.

4. For the past two weeks you have been teaching a complicated concept to your class, and all but one of your students has now mastered the objectives involved. The student in question is neither physically nor learning disabled. After two attempts to re-teach the student, you realize that he/she just does not learn in the same way as the majority of students. You feel that the problem lies in either your approach or the materials you are using (or both). You need some help in analyzing your approach to teaching the concept, the suitability of your materials, and the possibility of alternative materials in order to arrive at a more promising way to help this particular student.
5. For language arts your students have chosen to create a television news show covering actual school events. You need to work with other faculty to help with set design, copy preparation, make-up, and equipment operation.

6. Your principal has asked you to write and prioritize a set of instructional goals for part of one of the subjects you teach. You need to know what types of information are usually included in goal statements, as well as the style or format the final document should take.

7. It's your turn to plan the annual Christmas party. This year no particular theme has been suggested. Also, it has been decided that the faculty will not be able to use fund-raisers this year to pay for the event. Whom would you select to help plan the party?
8. You are the grade-level chairperson for your grade at your school. While reviewing TEAMS scores, you notice that a large number of students scored low in the use of dictionaries, indexes, atlases, and other references. You and your principal agree that your program should be redesigned to improve student performance. It is up to you to work with fellow faculty members to solve this problem.

9. You are part of a committee set up to write a departmental or grade level test to test student mastery of a particular set of objectives. The objectives are properly stated, but your committee is not skilled in deriving good test items from objectives. In this area, you are the most knowledgeable member of the team; so, you have been tapped to conduct an inservice for the other team members. You need help with planning the session, with materials (especially sample objectives and test items), and with the logistics of holding the session, including space and equipment.
10. It has become your responsibility to nominate one of your fellow faculty for teacher-of-the-year from your school. You must select other co-workers to help you review criteria and qualifications in order to choose the nominee.

11. Class is about to start and the lamp burned out in the slide projector you need for a presentation. You have a replacement lamp but you do not know how it goes in. You do not have time to learn. You need help.

12. Faculty bowling teams are being formed to compete against each other and against other schools. The competition is all informal and just for fun. No prizes or trophies will be awarded. Whom would you pick to be with you on the team?
13. Your school has just instituted a Spanish as a foreign language program for the elementary grades. You have a minor in Spanish, and so have been assigned to teach the course, even though you have not actually taught in your minor before. No one else on the faculty has ever taught a foreign language before either. You have been given $500.00 to buy instructional materials (workbooks, tapes, filmstrips, realia, etc.). You feel you need some advice in order to make the best possible use of the money.

14. You have been teaching your American history unit the same way (mainly lecture) for the last several years. You are bored by it, and you feel that the students you are now getting are also turning off to your approach. You want to come up with new approaches and activities that not only are suitable for your objectives, but also allow students to use information and concepts from other subject areas. You want the new activities to be exciting for the students and to be varied enough so that differences in learning styles can be accommodated. You feel the need to consult with other members of the staff for help in this matter.
15. Your school has been "adopted" by a local service club. Your principal has asked you to select and meet with some of your colleagues to generate some ideas concerning how the club might be able to help the school. Whom would you choose to help you with this task?
APPENDIX B:

SCHOOL MEDIA SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE
NAME ___________________________ MEDIA CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please read each of the following statements describing typical school media center operations and/or services, and estimate the amount of time during a typical work week that you personally devote to each task or service in the school library/media center to which this questionnaire was sent. Then, please estimate the amount of your time you would devote to each if the conditions in your school or school library media center were ideal, that is if ideal staffing, funds, and administrative and faculty cooperation were available. Please estimate in units of whole, half, or quarter hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK/SERVICE</th>
<th>TIME ACTUAL</th>
<th>TIME IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collection management, compilation of statistics, compiling reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Answering fact questions posed by either students or faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching library skills to students (large group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructing individual students or small groups of students in the use of the library on an &quot;as needed&quot; basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Studying book and non-print media reviews in professional journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing individual reading, listening, and viewing guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Preparing purchase orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Providing in-service programs for teachers and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assisting teachers and/or students in the production of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you a certified school librarian? □ □
or Para-professional/library aide? □ □
or Other __________________________

Do you work full-time in one school? □ □

If you work in more than one school please list them below:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Including the 1988-89 school year, how many years have you been employed as the school librarian/media specialist on the campus to which this questionnaire was sent? _______.

Including the 1988-89 school year, how many years have you worked as a school librarian/media specialist? _______.

Before entering the school library profession, were you:
an elementary teacher? _______?
a secondary teacher? _______?
other? __________________________

Including your experience as a school librarian/media specialist, how many total years (incl. 1988-89) have you worked in education? _______.

OVER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Producing materials for teachers and/or students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Budget maintenance -- paying bills, reconciliation of accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Providing and/or coordinating special book related programs for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Participating with teachers in curriculum planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Processing print and non-print materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inventorying and weeding materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Staffing the circulation desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Evaluating print and non-print materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Card catalog maintenance -- filing cards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Providing consultation to individual teachers or teaching teams regarding availability of media center materials to support instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Decorating the library/media center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Helping students find materials in the library/media center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Helping teachers and staff find materials in the library/media center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Shelving books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. &quot;Reading&quot; shelves, putting materials and books in order on the shelves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Supervising library aides and/or volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:

SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE
WHAT TO DO: Inside this booklet are some questions to see what interests you have and how you feel about things. On most items there are no "right" or "wrong" answers because people have the right to their own views. All you have to do is answer what is true for you.

If a separate answer sheet has not been given to you, turn this booklet over and tear off the answer sheet on the back page. Write your name and the other information asked for on the answer sheet.

Now, read the four EXAMPLES below and think about how you would answer them.

EXAMPLES:

1. I like to watch team games.
   a. yes (often),
   b. sometimes,
   c. no (never).

2. People say I'm impatient.
   a. true,
   b. uncertain,
   c. false.

3. I prefer friends who are:
   a. quiet,
   b. in between,
   c. lively.

4. Adult is to child as cat is to:
   a. kitten,
   b. dog,
   c. baby.

In the last example there is a right answer—kitten. But there are very few such reasoning items.

Ask now if something isn't clear.

When the examiner tells you, start with number 1 and answer the questions. Keep these four things in mind:

1. Give only answers that are true for you. It is best to say what you really think.

2. Don't spend too much time thinking over each question. Give the first, natural answer as it comes to you. Of course, the questions are too short to give you all the information you might like, but give the best answer you can under the circumstances.

3. Answer every question one way or the other. Don't skip any.

4. You should use the a or c answer most of the time. Use the b answer only when you feel you have to, because neither a nor c seems to be right for you.
1. I have the instructions for this test clearly in mind.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

2. I am ready to answer each question as truthfully as possible.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

3. I would rather have a house:
   a. in a sociable suburb,
   b. in between,
   c. alone in the deep woods.

4. I can find enough energy to face my difficulties.
   a. always,  b. generally,  c. seldom.

5. I feel a bit nervous of wild animals even when they are in strong cages.
   a. yes (true),  b. uncertain,  c. no (false).

6. I hold back from criticizing people and their ideas.
   a. yes,  b. sometimes,  c. no.

7. I make smart, sarcastic remarks to people if I think they deserve it.
   a. generally,  b. sometimes,  c. never.

8. I prefer semiclassical music to popular tunes.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

9. If I saw two neighbors' children fighting, I would:
   a. leave them to settle it,
   b. uncertain,
   c. reason with them.

10. On social occasions I:
    a. readily come forward,
    b. in between,
    c. prefer to stay quietly in the background.

11. It would be more interesting to be:
    a. a construction engineer,
    b. uncertain,
    c. a writer of plays.

12. I would rather stop in the street to watch an artist painting than listen to some people having a quarrel.
    a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

13. I can generally put up with conceited people, even though they brag or show they think too well of themselves.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

14. You can almost always notice on people's faces when they are dishonest.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

15. It would be good for everyone if vacations (holidays) were longer and everyone had to take them.
    a. agree,  b. uncertain,  c. disagree.

16. I would rather take the gamble of a job with possibly large but uneven earnings, than one with a steady, small salary.
    a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

17. I talk about my feelings:
    a. only if necessary,
    b. in between,
    c. readily, whenever I have a chance.

18. Once in a while I have a sense of vague danger or sudden dread for reasons that I do not understand.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

19. When criticized wrongly for something I did not do, I:
    a. have no feeling of guilt,
    b. in between,
    c. still feel a bit guilty.

20. Money can buy almost everything.
    a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

21. My decisions are governed more by my:
    a. heart,
    b. feelings and reason equally,
    c. head.

22. Most people would be happier if they lived more like their friends and did much the same things as others.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

23. I occasionally get puzzled, when looking in a mirror, as to which is my right and left.
    a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

24. When talking, I like:
    a. to say things, just as they occur to me,
    b. in between,
    c. to get my thoughts well organized first.

25. When something really makes me furious, I find I calm down again quite quickly.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.
26. With the same hours and pay, it would be more interesting to be:
   a. a carpenter or cook,
   b. uncertain,
   c. a waiter or waitress in a good restaurant.

27. I have been elected to:
   a. only a few offices,
   b. several,
   c. many offices.

28. "Spade" is to "dig" as "knife" is to:
   a. sharp,
   b. cut,
   c. point.

29. I sometimes can't get to sleep because an idea keeps running through my mind.
   a. true,
   b. uncertain,
   c. false.

30. In my personal life I reach the goals I set, almost all the time.
   a. true,
   b. uncertain,
   c. false.

31. An out-dated law should be changed:
   a. only after considerable discussion,
   b. in between,
   c. promptly.

32. I am uncomfortable when I work on a project requiring quick action affecting others.
   a. true,
   b. in between,
   c. false.

33. Most of the people I know would rate me as an amusing talker.
   a. yes,
   b. uncertain,
   c. no.

34. When I see "sloppy," untidy people, I:
   a. just accept it,
   b. in between,
   c. get disgusted and annoyed.

35. I get slightly embarrassed if I suddenly become the focus of attention in a social group.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

36. I am always glad to join a large gathering, for example, a party, dance, or public meeting.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

37. In school I preferred (or prefer):
   a. music,
   b. uncertain,
   c. handwork and crafts.

38. When I have been put in charge of something, I insist that my instructions are followed or else I resign.
   a. yes,
   b. sometimes,
   c. no.

39. For parents, it is more important to:
   a. help their children develop their affections,
   b. in between,
   c. teach their children how to control emotions.

40. In a group task I would rather:
   a. try to improve arrangements,
   b. in between,
   c. keep the records and see that rules are followed.

41. I feel a need every now and then to engage in a tough physical activity.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

42. I would rather mix with polite people than rough, rebellious individuals.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

43. I feel terribly dejected when people criticize me in a group.
   a. true,
   b. in between,
   c. false.

44. If I am called in by my boss, I:
   a. make it a chance to ask for something I want,
   b. in between,
   c. fear I’ve done something wrong.

45. What this world needs is:
   a. more steady and "solid" citizens,
   b. uncertain,
   c. more "idealists" with plans for a better world.

46. I am always keenly aware of attempts at propaganda in things I read.
   a. yes,
   b. uncertain,
   c. no.

47. As a teenager, I joined in school sports:
   a. occasionally,
   b. fairly often,
   c. a great deal.

48. I keep my room well organized, with things in known places almost all the time.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

49. I sometimes get in a state of tension and turmoil as I think of the day's happenings.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.

50. I sometimes doubt whether people I am talking to are really interested in what I am saying.
   a. yes,
   b. in between,
   c. no.
51. If I had to choose, I would rather be:  
   a. a forester,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. a high school teacher.  

52. For special holidays and birthdays, I:  
   a. like to give personal presents,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. feel that buying presents is a bit of a nuisance.  

53. “Tired” is to “work” as “proud” is to:  
   a. smile,  
   b. success,  
   c. happy.  

54. Which of the following items is different in kind from the others?  
   a. candle,  
   b. moon,  
   c. electric light.  

55. I have been let down by my friends:  
   a. hardly ever,  
   b. occasionally,  
   c. quite a lot.  

56. I have some characteristics in which I feel definitely superior to most people.  
   a. yes,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. no.  

57. When I get upset, I try hard to hide my feelings from others.  
   a. true,  
   b. in between,  
   c. false.  

58. I like to go out to a show or entertainment:  
   a. more than once a week (more than average),  
   b. about once a week (average),  
   c. less than once a week (less than average).  

59. I think that plenty of freedom is more important than good manners and respect for the law.  
   a. true,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. false.  

60. I tend to keep quiet in the presence of senior persons (people of greater experience, age, or rank).  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

61. I find it hard to address or recite to a large group.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

62. I have a good sense of direction (find it easy to tell which is North, South, East, or West) when in a strange place.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

63. If someone got mad at me, I would:  
   a. try to calm that person down.  
   b. uncertain.  
   c. get irritated.  

64. When I read an unfair magazine article, I am more inclined to forget it than to feel like “hitting back.”  
   a. true,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. false.  

65. My memory tends to drop a lot of unimportant, trivial things, for example, names of streets or stores in town.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

66. I could enjoy the life of an animal doctor, handling disease and surgery of animals.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

67. I eat my food with gusto, not always so carefully and properly as some people.  
   a. true,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. false.  

68. There are times when I don’t feel in the right mood to see anyone.  
   a. very rarely,  
   b. in between,  
   c. quite often.  

69. People sometimes warn me that I show my excitement in voice and manner too obviously.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.  

70. As a teenager, if I differed in opinion from my parents, I usually:  
   a. kept my own opinion,  
   b. in between,  
   c. accepted their authority.  

71. I would prefer to have an office of my own, not sharing it with another person.  
   a. yes,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. no.  

72. I would rather enjoy life quietly in my own way than be admired for my achievements.  
   a. true,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. false.  

73. I feel mature in most things.  
   a. true,  
   b. uncertain,  
   c. false.  

74. I find myself upset rather than helped by the kind of criticism that many people offer one.  
   a. often,  
   b. occasionally,  
   c. never.  

75. I am always able to keep the expression of my feelings under exact control.  
   a. yes,  
   b. in between,  
   c. no.
76. In starting a useful invention, I would prefer:
   a. working on it in the laboratory,
   b. uncertain,
   c. selling it to people.

77. "Surprise" is to "strange" as "fear" is to:
   a. brave,  b. anxious,  c. terrible.

78. Which of the following fractions is not in the same class as the others?
   a. 3/7,  b. 3/9,  c. 3/11.

79. Some people seem to ignore or avoid me, although I don't know why.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

80. People treat me less reasonably than my good intentions deserve.
   a. often,  b. occasionally,  c. never.

81. The use of foul language, even when it is not in a mixed group of men and women, still disgusts me.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

82. I have decidedly fewer friends than most people.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

83. I would hate to be where there wouldn't be a lot of people to talk to.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

84. People sometimes call me careless, even though they think I'm a likable person.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

85. "Stage-fright" in various social situations is something I have experienced:
   a. quite often,  b. occasionally,  c. hardly ever.

86. When I am in a small group, I am content to sit back and let others do most of the talking.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

87. I prefer reading:
   a. a realistic account of military or political battles,
   b. uncertain,
   c. a sensitive, imaginative novel.

88. When bossy people try to "push me around," I do just the opposite of what they wish.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

89. Business superiors or members of my family, as a rule, find fault with me only when there is real cause.
   a. true,  b. in between,  c. false.

90. In streets or stores, I dislike the way some persons stare at people.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

91. On a long journey, I would prefer to:
   a. read something profound, but interesting,
   b. uncertain,
   c. pass the time talking casually with a fellow passenger.

92. In a situation which may become dangerous, I believe in making a fuss and speaking up even if calmness and politeness are lost.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

93. If acquaintances treat me badly and show they dislike me:
   a. it doesn't upset me a bit,
   b. in between,
   c. I tend to get downhearted.

94. I find it embarrassing to have praise or compliments bestowed on me.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

95. I would rather have a job with:
   a. a fixed, certain salary,
   b. in between,
   c. a larger salary, which depended on my constantly persuading people I am worth it.

96. To keep informed, I like:
   a. to discuss issues with people,
   b. in between,
   c. to rely on the actual news reports.

97. I like to take an active part in social affairs, committee work, etc.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

98. In carrying out a task, I am not satisfied unless even the minor details are given close attention.
   a. true,  b. in between,  c. false.

99. Quite small setbacks occasionally irritate me too much.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

100. I am always a sound sleeper, never walking or talking in my sleep.
    a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.
101. It would be more interesting to work in a business:
   a. talking to customers,
   b. in between,
   c. keeping office accounts and records.

102. "Size" is to "length" as "dishonesty" is to:
   a. prison,  b. sin,  c. stealing.

103. AB is to dc as SR is to:
   a. qp,  b. pq,  c. tu.

104. When people are unreasonable, I just:
   a. keep quiet,
   b. uncertain,
   c. despise them.

105. If people talk loudly while I am listening to music, I:
   a. can keep my mind on the music and not be bothered,
   b. in between,
   c. find it spoils my enjoyment andannoys me.

106. I think I am better described as:
   a. polite and quiet,
   b. uncertain,
   c. forceful.

107. I attend social functions only when I have to, and stay away any other time.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

108. To be cautious and expect little is better than to be happy at heart, always expecting success.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

109. In thinking of difficulties in my work, I:
   a. try to plan ahead, before I meet them,
   b. in between,
   c. assume I can handle them when they come.

110. I find it easy to mingle among people at a social gathering:
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

111. When a bit of diplomacy and persuasion are needed to get people moving, I am generally the one asked to do it.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

112. It would be more interesting to be:
   a. a guidance worker helping young people find jobs,
   b. uncertain,
   c. in charge of efficiency engineering.

113. If I am quite sure that a person is unjust or behaving selfishly, I show that person up, even if it takes some trouble.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

114. I sometimes make foolish remarks in fun, just to surprise people and see what they will say.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

115. I would enjoy being a newspaper writer on drama, concerts, opera, etc.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

116. I never feel the urge to doodle and fidget when kept sitting still at a meeting.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

117. If someone tells me something which I know is wrong, I am more likely to say to myself:
   a. "That person is a liar,"
   b. in between,
   c. "Apparently that person is misinformed."

118. I feel some punishment is coming to me even when I have done nothing wrong.
   a. often,  b. occasionally,  c. never.

119. The idea that sickness comes as much from mental as physical causes is much exaggerated.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

120. The pomp and splendor of any big state ceremony are things which should be preserved.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

121. It bothers me if people think I am being too unconventional or odd.
   a. a lot,  b. somewhat,  c. not at all.

122. In constructing something I would rather work:
   a. with a committee,
   b. uncertain,
   c. on my own.

123. I have periods when it's hard to stop a mood of self-pity.
   a. often,  b. occasionally,  c. never.

124. Often I get angry with people too quickly.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

125. I can always change old habits without difficulty and without slipping back.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.
126. If the earnings were the same, I would rather be:
   a. a lawyer.
   b. uncertain.
   c. a navigator or pilot.

127. “Better” is to “worst” as “slower” is to:
   a. fast,  b. best,  c. quickest.

128. Which of the following should come next at the end of this row of letters: xooooxxooooxxx?
   a. oxxx,  b. ooxx,  c. xooo.

129. When the time comes for something I have planned and looked forward to, I occasionally do not feel up to going.
   a. true,  b. in between,  c. false.

130. I can work carefully on most things without being bothered by people making a lot of noise around me.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

131. I occasionally tell strangers things that seem to me important, regardless of whether they ask about them.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

132. I spend much of my spare time talking with friends about social events enjoyed in the past.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

133. I enjoy doing “daring,” foolhardy things “just for fun.”
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

134. I find the sight of an untidy room very annoying.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

135. I consider myself a very sociable, outgoing person.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

136. In social contacts I:
   a. show my emotions as I wish,
   b. in between,
   c. keep my emotions to myself.

137. I enjoy music that is:
   a. light, dry, and brisk,
   b. in between,
   c. emotional and sentimental.

138. I admire the beauty of a poem more than that of a well-made gun.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

139. If a good remark of mine is passed by, I:
   a. let it go,
   b. in between,
   c. give people a chance to hear it again.

140. I would like to work as a probation officer with criminals on parole.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

141. One should be careful about mixing with all kinds of strangers, since there are dangers of infection and so on.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

142. In traveling abroad, I would rather go on an expertly conducted tour than plan by myself the places I wish to visit.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

143. I am properly regarded as only a plodding, half-successful person.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

144. If people take advantage of my friendliness, I do not resent it and I soon forget.
   a. true,  b. uncertain, c. false.

145. If a heated argument developed between other members taking part in a group discussion, I would:
   a. like to see a “winner,”
   b. in between,
   c. wish that it would be smoothed over.

146. I like to do my planning alone, without interruptions and suggestions from others.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

147. I sometimes let my actions get swayed by feelings of jealousy.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

148. I believe firmly “the boss may not always be right, but always has the right to be boss.”
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

149. I get tense as I think of all the things lying ahead of me.
   a. yes,  b. sometimes,  c. no.

150. If people shout suggestions when I’m playing a game, it doesn’t upset me.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.
151. It would be more interesting to be:
   a. an artist.
   b. uncertain.
   c. a secretary running a club.

152. Which of the following words does not properly belong with the others?
   a. any,  b. some,  c. most.

153. "Flame" is to "heat" as "rose" is to:
   a. thorn,  b. red petals,  c. scent.

154. I have vivid dreams, disturbing my sleep.
   a. often,  b. occasionally,  c. practically never.

155. If the odds are really against something's being a success, I still believe in taking the risk.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

156. I like it when I know so well what the group has to do that I naturally become the one in command.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

157. I would rather dress with quiet correctness than with eye-catching personal style.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

158. An evening with a quiet hobby appeals to me more than a lively party.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

159. I close my mind to well-meant suggestions of others, even though I know I shouldn't.
   a. occasionally,  b. hardly ever,  c. never.

160. I always make it a point, in deciding anything, to refer to basic rules of right and wrong.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

161. I somewhat dislike having a group watch me at work.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

162. Because it is not always possible to get things done by gradual, reasonable methods, it is sometimes necessary to use force.
   a. true,  b. in between,  c. false.

163. In school I preferred (or prefer):
   a. English,
   b. uncertain,
   c. mathematics or arithmetic.

164. I have sometimes been troubled by people's saying bad things about me behind my back, with no grounds at all.
   a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

165. Talk with ordinary, habit-bound, conventional people:
   a. is often quite interesting and has a lot to it.
   b. in between.
   c. annoys me because it deals with trifles and lacks depth.

166. Some things make me so angry that I find it best not to speak.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

167. In education, it is more important to:
   a. give the child enough affection,
   b. in between,
   c. have the child learn desirable habits and attitudes.

168. People regard me as a solid, undisturbed person, unmoved by ups and downs in circumstances.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

169. I think society should let reason lead it to new customs and throw aside old habits or mere traditions.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

170. I think it is more important in the modern world to solve:
   a. the question of moral purpose,
   b. uncertain,
   c. the political difficulties.

171. I learn better by:
   a. reading a well-written book,
   b. in between,
   c. joining a group discussion.

172. I like to go my own way instead of acting on approved rules.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.

173. I like to wait till I am sure that what I am saying is correct, before I put forth an argument.
   a. always,
   b. generally,
   c. only if it's practicable.

174. Small things sometimes "get on my nerves" unbearably, though I realize they are trivial.
   a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

175. I don't often say things on the spur of the moment that I greatly regret.
   a. true,  b. uncertain,  c. false.
176. If asked to work with a charity drive, I would
a. accept,
b. uncertain,
c. politely say I'm too busy.

177. Which of the following words does not belong
with the others?
a. wide,  b. zigzag,  c. straight.

178. "Soon" is to "never" as "near" is to:
a. nowhere,  b. far,  c. away.

179. If I make an awkward social mistake, I can
soon forget it.
a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

180. I am known as the type of person who almost
always puts forward some ideas on a problem.
a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

181. I think I am better at showing:
a. nerve in meeting challenges,
b. uncertain,
c. tolerance of other people's wishes.

182. I am considered a very enthusiastic person.
a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

183. I like a job that offers change, variety, and
travel, even if it involves some danger.
a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

184. I am a fairly strict person, insisting on always
doing things as correctly as possible.
a. true,  b. in between,  c. false.

185. I enjoy work that requires conscientious, ex-
acting skills.
a. yes,  b. in between,  c. no.

186. I'm the energetic type who keeps busy.
a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

187. I am sure there are no questions that I have
skipped or failed to answer properly.
a. yes,  b. uncertain,  c. no.

(End of test.)
APPENDIX D:

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE
January 23, 1989

Dear [TITLE] [LAST NAME]:

I am writing to you today to ask for your cooperation with the data collection phase of my doctoral dissertation at the University of North Texas. My study deals with the cooperation, or lack of, between the school librarian and classroom teachers.

It has been my observation through my years of experience that sometimes the library can be one of the most under-utilized school resources. I hope my project will shed some light on this, and perhaps lead to some improvement in this situation. Considering the tremendous investment that Texas school districts have in school libraries, it is important that we look for ways to ensure that children benefit fully from school resources.

I have carefully selected a number of Texas elementary schools to participate in the study. I hope to include the following elementary or intermediate schools from your district: [ONE] [TWO] [THREE] [FOUR] [FIVE]

I realize that your principals and teachers are very busy; therefore, I have tried to keep my data requirements to a bare minimum. First, I would need from each school a list of names of each professional employed at the school and each person’s assignment (3rd grade teacher, counselor, librarian, vice-principal, etc.). In February I would send a short questionnaire for each teacher to complete and return to me. I have enclosed a copy of the questionnaire I will use. In March, during a second phase of data collection, I would need to send a short questionnaire and a copy of Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire for each school library media specialist to complete and return. The teacher questionnaire should require less than twenty minutes to complete, while the librarians should require less than forty-five minutes to provide their information. It is very important that neither the teachers nor the school library media specialists know that the study deals with cooperation between the school librarian and the classroom teacher.

All information your district provides will be kept in strictest confidence. I will arrange my study in such a way that no one except I and my University of North Texas doctoral committee will see any of the data. When I publish the dissertation, neither schools nor school districts will be mentioned by name. I hope you will be able to cooperate with me in the completion of my doctoral dissertation. It would be very difficult for me to replace the school or schools selected from your district should you decide not to participate.

I will telephone you in a few days to answer any questions you might have. Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Michael Bell
February 15, 1989

Dear TITLE LAST NAME:

I am writing to you today to ask for your cooperation with the data collection phase of my doctoral dissertation at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas. My study deals with patterns of cooperation among school professionals.

I have contacted your superintendent, TSUPT SUPTLN, and he has given me his permission to contact you about my study.

Of course, all information provided by you and your staff will be kept strictly confidential. When published, the results of the study will not mention any school district, school, or individual by name.

To conduct the study, first I will need a list of names of all the professional personnel employed in your school along with each individual's present assignment (i.e., classroom teacher, including level of assignment; vice-principal; librarian; school nurse; counselor; etc.). If your school librarian is not a professional (teacher aide, parent volunteer, etc.) please include his/her name also, and indicate that he/she is not a professional. I do not need the home addresses of your personnel. I will make no attempt to contact them at home.

Soon after I receive the list, I will mail you a short fifteen-item questionnaire for your classroom teachers to fill out. The questionnaire should take less than twenty-five minutes to complete. The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine patterns of cooperation among your staff. Each teacher will have an envelope in which to seal his/her responses before returning them to me. I am the only person who will ever see any individual's responses. Because of the nature of the questionnaire, I must know the identity of each teacher returning a questionnaire in order to be able to analyze the data. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the return of the list.

After I receive all of the completed questionnaires from your school, I will mail a short questionnaire and a copy of Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire for your school librarian to complete and return to me. Both together should require less than forty-five minutes to complete.

Because of the nature of my experiment, I could include only 44 schools with characteristics similar to those of your school in my study. Your school is part of a very carefully selected random sample of schools from across the state. If your school should not cooperate with me in the study, it would be very difficult, perhaps impossible, to find a replacement.

I hope to be able to call you in a few days to answer any questions you might have. Thank you very much for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Michael Bell
April 2, 1989

Dear [TITLE] [LAST NAME]:

I am a school library coordinator with the La Joya Independent School District, La Joya, Texas. Previously I was a junior high school media specialist and, later, an elementary school librarian with Hurst/Euless/Bedford I.S.D. in the Fort Worth - Dallas area. For several years now I have been working toward completion of a Ph.D. in Library and Information Science at North Texas State University (now the University of North Texas). I am now at the dissertation stage.

My study deals, in part, with how elementary classroom teachers interact with the school library media specialist. I planned my study to include districts similar to the one in which I am employed, and I identified a random sample of such schools across the state. Your school is part of the sample.

A few days ago, most of the teachers in your school completed questionnaires providing information vital to the completion of my study. However, for that information to be used, I must also obtain certain information about you and your library. I have enclosed two questionnaires. One is the Media Center Questionnaire that asks a few questions concerning your experience and training, and asks you to estimate the amount of time per week devoted to various tasks/services in your library. The other, more lengthy questionnaire, is Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

I hope you will be able to find the time to help me with my study by completing the questionnaires and returning them to me as soon as possible. By so doing, you will make it possible for me to use the information already provided by your school colleagues, and you will also help our profession devise better ways for school libraries and school librarians to become more effective partners with teachers in the educational process.

Of course, I will keep strictly confidential all information you provide me. Also, if you will enclose a note when you return the questionnaires, I will send you a report and analysis of my study and your Cattell 16PF Questionnaire as soon as I have had time to analyze the data.

Before responding to the Cattell 16PF, please read the directions carefully, especially the part about choosing either response A or C most of the time, and choosing response B only in extreme situations where either A or C just will not fit. Also, please answer the Cattell 16PF on the answer sheet provided, not on the questionnaire itself. Please return all materials to me in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Thanks again, and please feel free to call if I can be of any service to you or answer any questions you may have about this study.

Sincerely,

Michael Bell


_________. "The Role of the School Media Program in the Curriculum." Southeastern Librarian 27 (Winter 1977): 221-226.


Stroud, Janet Gossard. "Evaluation of Media Center Services by Media Staff, Teachers, and Students in Indiana Middle and Junior High Schools." Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1976.


Sullivan, Janet S. "Initiating Instructional Design into School Library Media Programs." School Media Quarterly 8 (Summer 1980): 251-258.


Turner, Philip M. "Instructional Development at the K-12 Level: Attitudes and Activities." The Southeastern Librarian 29 (Spring 1979): 15-18.


