

1982

Attitudes of faculty and administrators toward the library at Hawkeye Institute of Technology

Sharon Gatewood
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1982 Sharon Gatewood

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gatewood, Sharon, "Attitudes of faculty and administrators toward the library at Hawkeye Institute of Technology" (1982). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2850.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2850>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Attitudes of faculty and administrators toward the library at Hawkeye Institute of Technology

Find Additional Related Research in UNI ScholarWorks

To find related research in UNI ScholarWorks, go to the collection of [School Library Studies Graduate Research Papers](#) written by students in the [Division of School Library Studies](#), Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, at the University of Northern Iowa.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the attitudes of the faculty and administrators toward the Library at Hawkeye Institute of Technology (HIT) in Waterloo, Iowa. Three years prior to this study the library collection at this vocational-technical school had been centralized in new facilities. By surveying library services used, the importance of materials and equipment to classroom teaching, student assignments and administrative duties and the responsibility for selecting and housing those materials and equipment, this researcher hoped 1) to determine if the faculty and administrators were accepting the new organizational pattern, and 2) to discover where those services and materials needed to be improved.

A four-part questionnaire was sent to 134 administrators and faculty. A 52% return was received and results were tabulated. Part I asked for general information about the respondent's status at HIT. Part II listed eight resources offered for programs and students and respondents were asked to rank order those. The Library was ranked fourth by faculty and fifth by administrators.

Part III listed fourteen library services offered and asked for an importance ranking. "Alerting staff to new items in their field" was most important service to both groups.

Part IV listed materials and equipment and asked respondents to indicate which were most important for classroom teaching and student assignments and which materials and equipment should be selected and housed in the Library and which materials and equipment should be selected and housed in the program areas. The most important items for classroom teaching and student assignments were the printed materials of textbooks and periodicals.

The Library was designated as the place for selection and housing of general purpose materials and the faculty was to select program specific materials. However, a 11Both 11 (librarian and faculty) category for selection drew a surprisingly large number of responses and a higher-than-anticipated number of respondents wanted program specific materials housed in the Library.

An over-all assessment of the results of this study pointed to a positive attitude toward both the Library and the centralized collection on the part of the faculty and administrators at HIT.

ATTITUDES OF THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS
TOWARD THE LIBRARY
AT HAWKEYE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A Research Paper
Presented to the
Faculty of the Library Science Department

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Sharon Gatewood

July 14, 1982

Read and approved by
Leah Hiland

Elizabeth Martin

Accepted by Department
Elizabeth Martin

Date 7/23/82

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the attitudes of the faculty and administrators toward the Library at Hawkeye Institute of Technology (HIT) in Waterloo, Iowa. Three years prior to this study the library collection at this vocational-technical school had been centralized in new facilities. By surveying library services used, the importance of materials and equipment to classroom teaching, student assignments and administrative duties and the responsibility for selecting and housing those materials and equipment, this researcher hoped 1) to determine if the faculty and administrators were accepting the new organizational pattern, and 2) to discover where those services and materials needed to be improved.

A four-part questionnaire was sent to 134 administrators and faculty. A 52% return was received and results were tabulated. Part I asked for general information about the respondent's status at HIT. Part II listed eight resources offered for programs and students and respondents were asked to rank order those. The Library was ranked fourth by faculty and fifth by administrators.

Part III listed fourteen library services offered and asked for an importance ranking. "Alerting staff to new items in their field" was most important service to both groups.

Part IV listed materials and equipment and asked respondents to indicate which were most important for classroom teaching and student assignments and which materials and equipment should be selected and housed in the Library and which materials and equipment should be

selected and housed in the program areas. The most important items for classroom teaching and student assignments were the printed materials of textbooks and periodicals.

The Library was designated as the place for selection and housing of general purpose materials and the faculty was to select program specific materials. However, a "Both" (librarian and faculty) category for selection drew a surprisingly large number of responses and a higher-than-anticipated number of respondents wanted program specific materials housed in the Library.

An over-all assessment of the results of this study pointed to a positive attitude toward both the Library and the centralized collection on the part of the faculty and administrators at HIT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM.	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Area Vocational-Technical Library. . .	1
Nature of This Study	3
Problem Statements	4
Hypotheses	5
Assumptions.	7
Limitations.	8
Definitions.	9
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Attitude/Use Surveys	12
Definition Literature.	16
3. METHODOLOGY.	19
Population	19
Data Collection.	20
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	22
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
Summary.	47
Conclusions.	48
Recommendations.	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
APPENDIXES	
A. COVER LETTER.	57
QUESTIONNAIRE	58
B. TABLE 15.	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Department.	23
2. Faculty Ranking of Resources Offered to Students	25
3. Administrator Rankings of Resources Offered to Students. . .	26
4. Library Services for Classroom Teaching as Ranked by Faculty and Administrators	28
5. Library Services for Administrative Duties as Ranked by Administrators	30
6. Faculty Rankings of Materials and Equipment for Classroom Teaching and Student Assignments	32
7. Faculty Choice for Selection of General Purpose Materials. .	36
8. Faculty Choice for Selection of Program Specific Materials.	37
9. Administrators' Choice for Selection of General Purpose Materials.	38
10. Administrators' Choice for Selection of Program Specific Materials.	39
11. Faculty Choice for Housing General Purpose Materials	42
12. Faculty Choice for Housing Program Specific Materials. . . .	43
13. Administrators' Choice for Housing General Purpose Materials.	44
14. Administrators' Choice for Housing Program Specific Materials.	45
15. General Information on Respondents	63

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The library that is part of the Hawkeye Institute of Technology (HIT) in Waterloo, Iowa, has undergone several changes since it was first organized in 1970. Because of those changes and with its growth in size, it seemed appropriate to examine the attitudes of the instructional faculty and administrators toward the services and resources now offered by the library.

Background of the Area Vocational-Technical Library

In 1965 the Iowa Legislature authorized the county school systems to form merged area schools through which to offer post-high school vocational-technical training. These merged area schools were free to develop in a variety of patterns in emphases and offerings. Some organized more as a community college--offering liberal arts programs as well as the vocational-technical studies. Others concentrated just on the vocational-technical fields.

The library/media center/learning resource center division of these area colleges developed just as diversely. Three main patterns of organization are still evident. Some follow the traditional keeper-of-the-print-material-in-one-place type of organization. Others decentralize the library materials into each program area's classrooms. Still others follow a third pattern and ". . . seem to be in the

forefront of a movement to convert traditional libraries into comprehensive learning resource centers."¹

In point of fact, the Hawkeye Institute of Technology's materials collection has encompassed all three patterns since 1970. When it began, the library was labeled a Learning Resources Center and essentially inventoried the instructional materials that were physically placed out among the institution's programs located in various places throughout the community. The library administrator and staff along with a general reference collection and some audio-visual equipment were located in first one, then two converted classrooms in the Electronics Building on the main campus just south of Waterloo.

In 1979 a new Administration Building (Hawkeye Center) was built, and it incorporated facilities for a centralized library collection to house all the materials that the library had purchased. At that point, print and nonprint materials purchased for the programs by the library staff in past years were collected and offered for use from a Library-of-Congress organized system of distribution. This allowed the collection to be expanded. Now periodical indexes that are subscribed to by the library are available to more students in more programs. The material covered by these indexes is located in the centralized collection and can be quickly obtained. Interdisciplinary materials are also available in one central area. Video production equipment is being purchased and a media production department has been established.

¹Deborah Orban, "The Learning Resource Center at the Community College: Its Function and Future," Community College Frontiers, 8:29, Spring, 1980.

Another change that was made as the new facilities were used was in the name. Because telephone callers continually asked for "the library," the name Learning Resources Center was dropped and the "HIT Library" was adopted. Students now have a "Library" to go to comparable to the physical facility that they had been used to in their high schools.

But what of the faculty and administrators who were used to having and being responsible for those materials located within their program areas? Does the increased availability of materials and services compensate for the materials being located farther away?

Nature of This Study

This study then proposed to examine the attitudes of the instructional faculty and administrators toward the Library at HIT. The move into new facilities, the reorganization of materials into a centralized collection and the re-assuming of the title "Library" all pointed toward the desirability of touching base with the faculty and administrators to examine their attitudes toward several aspects of library offerings and services--a kind of measuring of the library's standing in its community.²

The head librarian was also interested in sampling the attitudes of the faculty and administrators. He knew what resources and services are being used by these two groups of patrons. So by surveying these people, he hoped to provide more fully for those areas

²Maurice B. Line, Library Surveys: An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure and Presentation, Hampden, CT: The Shoestring Press, 1967, p. 56.

that the survey showed were in need of increased attention and to initiate services in areas that were not being covered adequately.

In a study done in 1965 at a California public junior college, Richard Hostrop concluded that, ". . . if the Library . . . is to be used as an instrument for furthering learning, . . . then attention must be turned toward . . . the individual instructor and his teaching as potential fonts of true motivation."³

Problem Statements

There were four main areas that the survey examined. They were: 1) the importance of the Library among the student resources offered at HIT, 2) the ranking of the various library services by both faculty and administrators, 3) the ranking of the use of materials and equipment by both faculty and administrators as they provide for the education of the students, and 4) the selection and housing of general purpose materials and program specific materials by both the faculty and administrators.

Specifically the problem statements were as follows:

1. What ranking will the faculty assign to library services among a listing of resources offered to students at HIT?
2. What ranking will administrators assign to library services among a listing of resources offered to students at HIT?
3. What library services offered at HIT will be ranked highest by the faculty for use in classroom teaching?

³Richard Hostrop, Teaching and the Community College Library, Hampden, CT: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1968, p. 166.

4. What library services offered for use to the faculty in classroom teaching will be ranked highest by the administrators?
5. What library services offered at HIT will be ranked highest by the administrators for use in the performance of their administrative duties?
6. What materials will faculty rank most important for classroom teaching?
7. What materials will faculty rank most important to assist students in completing assignments?
8. Who will the faculty indicate should be involved in the selection of general purpose and program specific materials?
9. Who will the administrators indicate should be involved in the selection of general purpose and program specific materials?
10. What materials will the faculty indicate should be purchased and housed in the Library?
11. What materials will the administrators indicate should be purchased and housed in the Library?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses formulated to investigate the four areas and the specific problem statements were as follows:

1. The faculty will rank the library third among the eight resources offered to the students.
2. The administrators will rank the library fourth among the eight resources offered to students.
3. Faculty will rank library orientation, preparation of bibliographies and free-loan film service as the library services they need most for their classroom teaching.

4. Administrators will rank library orientation, production of audio-visual materials and preparation of bibliographies as the three most important library services needed by the faculty for their classroom teaching.
5. Administrators will indicate that production of audiovisual materials, use of audiovisual equipment, and reference service will be the three most important library services needed by them in performing their duties.
6. Faculty will rank periodicals, slides and transparencies as the three materials most important for their classroom teaching.
7. Faculty will rank periodicals as the material most important to help students in completing assignments.
8. Eighty per cent or more of the faculty will indicate that the librarians should select, or be involved in the selection of, general purpose materials and equipment, and the faculty should select, or be involved in the selection of, program specific materials and equipment.
9. Sixty per cent or more of the administrators will indicate that the librarian should select, or be involved in the selection of, general purpose materials and equipment and that the faculty should select, or be involved in the selection of, program specific materials and equipment.
10. Seventy-five per cent or more of the faculty will want general purpose materials purchased and housed in the Library and program specific materials purchased and housed in the program areas.
11. Eighty per cent or more of the administrators will want the Library to purchase and house all types of materials.

Assumptions

There were several assumptions that underlay this study. The basic one was that the library should be an important part of all programs offered at HIT. Administratively, in 1970 the Learning Resources Center was part of the Curriculum and Instructional Division. In 1975 the Library was moved into the Student Services and Institutional Services Division. This emphasized the undergirding of an entire institution. The head librarian, however, sees that it also separates the library staff from the program instructors that they are trained to serve, thus creating a gap between library resources and their users.

Another assumption of this study was that if the library staff knew the attitudes of the faculty and examined what this group wanted to use in materials and services, changes would be made in the Library itself so that its services and collections would be used more by faculty and administrators.

Attitudes are complex in nature; yet this study assumed that answering a questionnaire would accurately reflect the attitude of a group of people toward a specific object.

Finally, because the faculty would be more aware of what the Library offers and because changes would be made to meet faculty needs and attitudes, the students would be the ultimate benefactors with a better educational program at HIT. They would also develop a stronger foundation for life-long learning by having acquired the skills to use the library resources offered in the communities in which they will reside.

Limitations

This study surveyed only one area vocational-technical post-high school institution in Iowa. Therefore, the responses reflected only the attitudes of that faculty and administration. The results were dependent on those people's responses to a single instrument.

HIT has a diverse program organization and is dispersed over several physical locations. There is also no common, basic employment requirement for faculty. HIT had no main campus facilities until 1969. Each of the original programs rented space in buildings around the metropolitan Waterloo-Cedar Falls area. This allowed each program to develop according to the desires of the personnel operating that program. Emphasis in hiring in all programs was on people who had experience and expertise from having worked in the field in which they would be teaching. Hence the lack of basic employment requirements.

HIT operates full-time day programs and also adult and continuing education and community service programs. This study was limited to the instructional faculty and administrators of the full-time day programs. The adult and continuing education faculty and most of the community service program people are not on continuing employment contracts and the Library hours do not coincide with those hours during which adult and continuing education and community service programs are held.

Another limitation of this study was that the centralized library facility had been in operation for only three years and this time factor could have also influenced the respondents' answers on the questionnaire.

Definitions

Attitude was the key word in this study. What is an "attitude?" The literature review of this paper presents what can be found for definitions in the readings in the field. For this study attitude was defined as the internal feelings that the administrators and instructional faculty had toward the HIT Library that resulted in them reporting the importance of that Library to HIT and in using its materials and services in their classrooms. Perception defined as sensory impressions/intake of stimuli was not used in this study as a synonym for attitude.

Instructional faculty were those people who were teaching in the classroom. They held full-time contracts and taught in the day programs offered at HIT.

Administrators consisted of those persons who had exclusive duties to administer programs and most of whom had offices in the Administrative Building itself as well as each of the department heads.

Audiovisual equipment at HIT included overhead projectors, slide/film/filmstrip projectors, audio recorders, video tape recorders/players, video cameras, record players, duplicating equipment.

Audiovisual materials were slides, films, filmstrips, audio and video cassettes and tapes, records, transparencies, models.

Program at HIT identified the most specific group of classes offered in a particular field. Textiles and Fashion Merchandising, Practical Nursing, Electronic Engineering Technology are three examples of the forty-six career programs available at HIT.

Department indicated the grouping of programs under eight

broader areas of knowledge. The Graphic and Applied Arts Department included the programs of Photography, Interior Design, Commercial Art and Textile and Fashion Merchandising.

General purpose materials designated those items that could be used by several programs; e.g., writing/speech books, human relations materials, reference books, telephone books, business directories, vertical file materials, video recorders, cameras, playback equipment, previewing equipment.

Program specific materials included service manuals, materials produced by manufacturers and industries for a particular field, audiovisual materials and models covering specific subjects; e.g., slides on architectural styles or a skeleton.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are few published articles on junior college libraries, particularly vocational-technical college libraries. The periodical Community College Frontiers does include articles about libraries, but because community colleges are so diverse, the information was often not applicable to vocational-technical schools.

The American Library Association (ALA)/American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC)/Association for Educational Communications Technology (AECT) have jointly published Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (1972) and the same organizations' Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs (1979). The Guidelines offer a fourfold role for the Learning Resources Program in the following areas:

1. development of instructional systems
2. offering of an organized and readily-accessible collection of materials
3. a staff to meet the needs of users
4. encouragement of innovation, learning and community service.⁴

These goals are broader than those set up for the HIT Library. "Development of instructional systems," for example, is not included in HIT's objectives. Nor has the Library been able to do much in the community service area.

⁴ALA/AACJC/AECT, "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resource Programs," College and Research Libraries News, 11:307, December, 1972.

Attitude/Use Surveys

Literature about attitude surveys taken in schools and also literature about the principles behind designing an instrument that could measure attitudes toward a vocational-technical library were examined. The material for designing attitude questionnaires is voluminous. One particularly helpful source was Douglas Berdie and John Anderson's Questionnaires: Design and Use (1974).⁵ This book raised important general questions to be considered when designing questionnaires. It also contained an extensive appendix of sample questionnaires, a case history of a study using questionnaires, and several sample follow-up letters. A sample check-off list completed this book.

Steven Chwe provided four categories of library user needs that can be considered in designing a general-condition questionnaire. He also included a fifty-three item questionnaire about library users that covered "present conditions" and "how important" response options for each item.⁶

Faculty at the U.S. Air Force Academy were one group surveyed by Marcy Murphy in her study that measured library use. She found that the three reasons that ranked highest for using the library by the faculty were (in order): 1) to check out or return a book, 2) to prepare for a class assignment, and 3) to do research for a paper or project. She also determined that 40 per cent of the faculty used the

⁵Douglas Berdie and John Anderson, Questionnaires: Design and Use, Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

⁶Steven Chwe, "A Model Instrument for User-Rating of Library Services," California Librarian, 39:46-55, April, 1978.

library at least once a week. When questioned about their knowledge of library services, over half of the faculty did not know about orientation for freshmen, library tours for special classes, or that a music collection and a microfilm collection were available. Over one-third of the faculty were unaware of fourteen other services from a list of twenty-eight offered by the library.⁷

In the Pemberton and Smith study on the role perception of the school library media specialist, the administrators, the library media specialists and the classroom teachers of two West Georgia school districts were sampled. Attitudes and perceptions of classroom teachers and administrators were ". . . generally neutral or even negative regarding the abilities and responsibilities of school media specialists."⁸ This indicated further work needed to be done in defining the role of the library media specialist in the field of education.

Stroud and Loertscher in their survey of librarians, teachers and students of elementary, junior high and high schools concerning their perceptions of services provided by the library measured the variety of library services offered as well as frequency with which those services were offered. Responses from the teachers exhibited a lack of awareness of services available to them. Stroud and Loertscher found this result disturbing because of the far-reaching implications

⁷Marcy Murphy, "Measuring Library Effectiveness: A Prelude to Change," Special Libraries, 70:18-25, January, 1979.

⁸Margaret A. Pemberton and Earl P. Smith, "A Comparison of Role Perceptions of the School Media Specialist Among Administrators, Classroom Teachers, and Library Media Specialists," Southeastern Librarian, 28:92-5, Summer, 1978.

in that teachers who do not use the library are not likely to encourage students to do so.⁹

They also reported that services most frequently provided and considered most important by high school teachers were ". . . traditional supply and distribution type services: preparing bibliographies, distributing lists of new materials and equipment, providing reserve collections, purchasing materials and equipment, helping patrons find materials, etc."¹⁰

Pfister and Alexander conducted a study in elementary and secondary schools in eighteen counties in Texas. The study investigated the actual and the desired performance of school librarians. While their study concentrated on the role of the person rather than on the uses of resources and services as this study did, they did conclude that responsibility for audiovisual materials and equipment is less recognized as properly belonging to the librarian than is the responsibility for print materials.¹¹

Dr. John Lolley, Director of Library Services at Tarrant County Junior College District, South Campus (Texas), published the most relevant series of articles in relation to his doctoral dissertation, Uses of Instructional Resources by Community Junior College Occupational Instructors (1978). The purpose of his study was to

⁹Janet G. Stroud and David Loertscher, "User Needs and School Library Service," in Achieving Accountability, ed. Ron Balzek, Chicago: American Library Association, 1981, p. 163.

¹⁰Ibid. p. 166.

¹¹Fred Pfister and Karen Alexander, Discrepancies Between Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians as Perceived by School Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 138 188, 1976.

develop information and understanding concerning the use of instructional resources, including library materials, by community junior college occupational instructors.¹² The study examined via a questionnaire the kinds and amounts of instructional materials used by the occupational instructors. Library users filled out a second instrument that contained eleven attitudinal statements about why they use the library. Non-library users filled out a twelve-point attitudinal questionnaire to show their reasons why they did not use library resources.

Correlations were computed between library use and 1) level of formal education; 2) number of courses of higher education; 3) years of teaching experience; and 4) teaching status--full or part time. Lolley found there was little relationship between library use and the four teacher characteristics. What did make a difference was that those who did not use the library felt that "1) their courses predominantly involve skill development, and 2) the materials must be readily accessible to the classroom, laboratory or shop."¹³ Lolley's study helped in defining the particular library resources and services that can be offered for vocational-technical studies.

Richard Hostrop's study Teaching and the Community College Library concentrated on student use of the library and the motivation for that use. Among the conclusions he came to were that the nine

¹²John Lolley, "Use of Instructional Resources by Community Junior College Occupational Instructors," Dissertation Abstracts International, 39:1172A, September, 1978.

¹³Ibid., p. 1173A.

instructors he interviewed who considered ". . . the library an essential adjunct to the instructional program . . . were positive factors in impelling use of library materials."¹⁴ Again, this conclusion reinforces the need to survey HIT faculty and their attitudes toward the library in order that students might be offered the best possible education.

Definition Literature

In looking at literature definitions for this study, the following terms were important.

Attitude was basic. Milton Rokeach defined it as ". . . a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner."¹⁵ Rokeach and others reported that attitude is formed from previous experiences and has cognitive, affective and behavioral interrelated components. Attitudes provide a frame of reference for reacting to a current situation that "saves time, organizes knowledge, has implications for the real world and that changes in the face of new evidence."¹⁶

Attitudes can be determined by observing behavior and seeing what that behavior reflects about the object involved and the situation in which that object is set. Attitudes have content, intensity and duration and the farther at the extreme ends that attitudes exist, the

¹⁴Hostrop, op. cit., p. 153.

¹⁵Milton Rokeach, "The Nature of Attitudes," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, ed. David Sills, New York: The Macmillan Company and the Free Press, 1968, Vol. 1, p. 450.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 457.

more intense they are. Stuckhardt reiterates that there is a

. . . strong correlation which has been shown to exist between held attitudes and overt behavior. This correlation between attitude and behavior provides a basis for inferring that teachers holding positive attitudes towards arts education are likely to participate constructively in an arts education program.¹⁷

The same correlation could be applied to libraries and library services.

How is effective library services defined? Murphy says that library effectiveness results in ". . . use which will encourage further use."¹⁸

Perception is a word that often finds its way into articles on attitude testing, but the literature of the field pretty well limits its definition to the sensory experiences which have gained meaning or significance.¹⁹

In summary, then, the literature of the field supplied basic principles about how attitude surveys have been constructed and the categories of subjects and materials and services that could be included in such surveys. Dr. Lolley's study offered the finding that teacher characteristics do not seem to have much effect on teacher attitudes toward or use of the library. The other user surveys included here pointed out that faculty awareness of and use of library resources and services are a key factor in students' use

¹⁷Michael Stuckhardt and Jerry W. Morris, "The Development of a Scale to Measure Attitudes Held Toward Arts Education," Studies in Art Education, 21:50, 1980.

¹⁸Murphy, op. cit., p. 21.

¹⁹Julius Gould, ed. A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 491.

of the library. Student use of and knowledge about resources in the library should be an important part of their educational process.

These studies also seemed to indicate that there is a lack of definition of what the library and the librarians' roles should be as far as the faculty and the administrators are concerned. Therefore, surveying the faculty and administrators at HIT about library resources and services would add needed information to this aspect of the library field.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Population

In order to measure the attitudes of the HIT faculty and administrators toward the Library, this researcher designed and sent out questionnaires to 134 faculty and administrators that made up the full-time staff of the day programs at Hawkeye Institute of Technology in Waterloo, Iowa. The head librarian at HIT agreed to be the facilitator and sponsor for such a project. He has held that position at HIT since 1974 when the Learning Resources Center was a decentralized collection through the designing, building, and moving into the new centralized Library's own facilities in the Hawkeye Center on the main campus.

One questionnaire was used in this project and was received by the staff the last two weeks of the Spring Quarter, June, 1982. The following classes of administrators received the questionnaire:

Class	Number in class
Administrative directors	5
Ancillary officer	1
Admissions officer	1
Financial Aid	1
Registrar	1
Counseling and Placement	4
Information Services (now News and Publications)	1
Superintendent	1
Special Needs	2
Department heads	8

The instructional faculty which includes program heads as well as full-time classroom instructors are grouped under eight departments with three to ten programs under each department. They are as follows:

Department	Number of programs
Agriculture and Natural Resources	5
Business	10
Criminal Justice and Public Service	3
Electronics	3
Graphic and Applied Arts	4
Health Science	7
Industrial Technology	8
Power Mechanics	7

Data Collection

The questionnaire consisted of four parts. Part I General Information asked for faculty/administrator designation, department name, years at HIT, and number of classes taught Spring Quarter.

Part II asked for a ranking of eight resources offered for programs and students at HIT.

Part III presented a list of fourteen library services. Respondents were asked to rank how important those services were to classroom teaching and/or the performance of administrative duties.

Part IV on Materials and Equipment had two sections; (A) (filled in by faculty only) asked for ranking according to how useful twenty-two items were 1) for classroom teaching and 2) for student assignments. Section (B) (completed by faculty and administrators) presented thirty-two items and asked respondents to indicate 1) who should be responsible for selecting the materials and equipment and 2) who should purchase and house those items.

The respondents were asked to check the department to which they belonged, but no attempt was made to further identify them by either program or individual name.

The questionnaire along with a cover letter signed by this researcher and the head of the Library, was printed on HIT letterhead stationery, and sent out to the faculty and administrators through campus mail. (Copies of both of these items are in Appendix A.) The completed questionnaires were returned to the HIT Library.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Of the 134 questionnaires sent a total of seventy, or 52%, were returned by eleven administrators and fifty-nine faculty members. This researcher was pleased with this percentage even though the staff received the questionnaire near the end of the quarter, faculty in some of the programs have never made use of the Library, and some of the returned questionnaires indicated faculty resistance to being limited to set responses. Some questionnaires were only partially filled in correctly, so all tables do not show the same number of responses.

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of faculty who returned the questionnaire by departments. It should be noted that the Departments of Agriculture, Business, and Electronics had return percentages of 41% or less, yet the total number of faculty in those three Departments (33) represents 28% of the 119 questionnaires sent out to faculty. Therefore, the acceptance of the paper's hypotheses and the conclusions drawn do not reflect the attitude of people from those Departments. (See Table 15 in Appendix B for the tabulation of years of experience at HIT and the number of classes taught Spring Quarter.)

Parts II through IV of the questionnaire produced information in four general areas: 1) resources for students and programs at HIT, 2) library services offered, 3) the use of materials and equipment,

Table 1
Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Department

Department	No. in Dept.	No. Retd.	Per cent
Agriculture and Natural Resources	9	3	33
Business	17	7	41
Criminal Justice and Public Service	6	3	50
Electronics	7	1	14
Graphic and Applied Arts*	15	12	80
Health Science	18	10	56
Industrial Technology	19	11	58
Power Mechanics	16	11	69
Other+	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	8
Total	119	59	

*Researcher taught related English courses in this program for five years immediately preceding this survey.

+Other There are some faculty in the category of "Related Instructors" who teach for several departments. These are included in the "Other" category.

and 4) responsibility for selecting and housing those materials and equipment.

Responses from Part II about resources were tabulated as shown in Tables 2 and 3. The number of responses for each rank for each of the eight resources was multiplied by the assigned value of the rank,

e.g., rank one was assigned a value of one. Those products were then totaled and the totals were used to rank each of the eight resources according to how important they were to providing the best possible education for students at HIT.

A comment that was made on several questionnaires for Part II was that the faculty or instructional staff should have been listed as a resource. This researcher intended that the eight resources listed were in addition to the faculty which naturally would be needed to provide such programs in the first place.

Hypothesis 1 stated that "The faculty will rank the library third among the eight resources offered to students." Table 2 shows that the library was ranked fourth among the resources; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

The resources ranked 1, 2, 3--Equipment, Facilities, Supplies--might well be termed "essentials to operate anything," so that the Library could be interpreted as the first choice of the faculty once their own classrooms were supplied. The Special Needs resource and Food Services are two of the newest programs at HIT.

Hypothesis 2 stated that "The administrators will rank the library fourth among the eight resources offered to students." Table 3 shows the library was ranked fifth and the hypothesis was rejected.

Administrators placed Counseling and Placement one rank ahead of the Library. Administrators do consult with counselors about specific students and their needs while the administrators' contacts with the Library are more often in connection with their own administrative duties. This might account for the lower ranking the Library received by the administrators.

Table 2
Faculty Ranking of Resources Offered to Students

Resources	Rank								Total Values	Rank
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Counseling and Placement	4	3	5	13	12	7	3	2	216	5
Equipment	22	17	4	5	1	0	0	0	99	1
Facilities	16	11	10	6	2	2	2	0	128	2
Food Service	0	1	0	1	0	5	11	31	361	8
Information Services	2	0	1	3	7	11	19	6	299	6
Library	2	5	16	11	12	2	1	0	183	4
Special Needs	0	1	1	3	7	17	11	9	303	7
Supplies	4	11	12	7	8	4	2	1	176	3

In Part III A and B and in Part IV A covering library services offered at HIT and materials and equipment used by faculty for classroom teaching and in student assignments, there were four response categories: "Of most importance," "Of some importance," "Of little importance," and "NA" (Not Applicable). The faculty and administrator responses were tabulated separately and then the first response category was assigned a value of 3, the second a 2, the third category was assigned a 1 and the NA was a 0. The number of responses in each category was multiplied by the appropriate assigned value; the products were added together and those sums were then given rank order. (See Tables 4, 5, 6.)

Table 3
Administrator Rankings of Resources Offered to Students

Resources	Rank								Total Values	Rank
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Counseling and Placement	2	1	1	2	3	1	0	1	44	4
Equipment	3	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	1
Facilities	4	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	29	2
Food Service	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	76	8
Information Services	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	74	7
Library	0	0	2	4	2	2	1	0	51	5
Special Needs	0	1	0	1	3	3	1	2	62	6
Supplies	2	0	6	0	1	0	2	0	39	3

In Part III A the faculty and administrators responded to the importance of fourteen library services to classroom teaching. Hypothesis 3 proposed that library orientation, preparation of bibliographies and free-loan film service would be the library services the faculty ranked as most important for their classroom teaching. As Table 4 shows, "alerting staff to new items in their field," "reference service," and "free-loan film service" were ranked 1, 2, 3 by faculty. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

The two professional librarians and one clerk at the Library photocopy tables of contents of periodicals and announcements of new publications, and route subject-related periodicals to appropriate

programs at HIT. The first-ranked service is one that the faculty receives frequently from the Library. Reference questions that come from faculty and administrators are readily researched. If additional material is needed to answer the questions, the library people will write letters to the appropriate sources asking for the information. Therefore, answers are found for most questions. The free-loan film service is frequently publicized in the HIT Parade, the library newsletter, and reviews of films related to program areas are often included.

The two lowest-ranked services--conference rooms and typing rooms--have been available only since the new facilities were completed and both of these services are also found in each of the program areas.

Hypothesis 4, "Administrators will rank library orientation, production of audiovisual materials, and preparation of bibliographies as the three most important library services needed by the faculty for their classroom teaching," was also rejected. Table 4 shows that "alerting staff to new items in their field" was ranked first and there was a three-way tie for second--"audiovisual materials production," "reserve materials system," and "reference service." Evidently the administrators think the reserve materials system is used more than the faculty indicates they actually do. Faculty ranked it eighth.

Preparation of bibliographies does not seem to have a very high priority for classroom use by either group. It might be speculated that the users do not know what materials are available in the Library for their particular programs and, therefore, do not request lists of possible resources for use either by themselves or by their students.

Table 4

Library Services for Classroom Teaching as Ranked by Faculty and Administrators

Library Services	Most Impt.		Some Impt.		Little Impt.		Don't Know		Total Fac.	Rank Fac.	Total Ad.	Rank Ad.
	No. Fac.	No. Ad.	No. Fac.	No. Ad.	No. Fac.	No. Ad.	No. Fac.	No. Ad.				
1. Alerting staff to new items in their field	33	8	19	3	2	0	1	0	139	1	30	1
2. Audiovisual equipment checkout	21	6	19	4	13	1	2	0	114	6	27	7
3. Audiovisual materials production	18	7	26	4	7	0	4	0	113	7	29	2.3
4. Audiovisual previewing facilities	13	2	21	7	17	2	4	0	98	9.5	22	12.5
5. Conference rooms	7	2	20	9	21	0	7	0	82	13.5	24	10
6. Equipment trouble-shooting	18	3	14	5	16	3	7	0	98	9.5	22	12.5
7. Free-loan film service	26	4	23	6	5	1	1	0	129	3	25	9
8. Interlibrary loan	22	7	23	3	6	1	4	0	118	4.5	28	5.5
9. Newsletter "HIT Parade"	5	2	30	8	18	1	2	0	93	11	23	11
10. Orientation for students	24	7	20	3	6	1	5	0	118	4.5	28	5.5
11. Preparation of bibliographies	12	5	18	5	14	1	11	0	86	12	26	8
12. Reserve materials system	20	7	20	4	6	0	9	0	106	8	29	2.3
13. Reference service	33	7	15	4	4	0	2	0	133	2	29	2.3
14. Typing room	9	2	18	6	19	3	9	0	82	13.5	21	14

Lolley's study²⁰ indicated that the source of classroom teaching materials for teachers in his study was either departmental or personal collections. If this is the practice at HIT, it might also offer an explanation for less use of the preparation of bibliographies service.

Hypothesis 5 stated that "Administrators will indicate that production of audiovisual materials, use of audiovisual equipment, and reference service will be the most important services needed by them in performing their duties." Data in Table 5 show that this hypothesis was rejected. As with the faculty, the administrators first wanted to be alerted to new items in their field. Interlibrary loan was ranked second, and reference service and production of audiovisual materials were of equal importance as they performed their administrative duties.

Part IV A on the questionnaire was answered only by the faculty and sought data about materials and equipment needed for their classroom teaching and for student assignments. Table 6 summarizes the results of this section of the questionnaire. Hypothesis 6, "Faculty will rank periodicals, slides, and transparencies as the three most important materials for their classroom teaching" was rejected and Hypothesis 7, "Faculty will rank periodicals as the materials most important to help students in completing assignments" also was rejected.

²⁰John Lolley, Vocational Teachers and the College Community Library, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 188 704, 1980, p. 13.

Table 5

Library Services for Administrative Duties as Ranked by Administrators

Library Services	Most Impt.	Some Impt.	Little Impt.	Don't Know	Total Value	Rank
1. Alerting staff to new items in their field	8	2	0	0	28	1
2. Audiovisual equipment checkout	5	3	2	0	23	6.3
3. Audiovisual materials production	5	5	0	0	25	3.5
4. Audiovisual previewing facilities	1	6	3	0	18	13
5. Conference rooms	4	5	1	0	23	6.3
6. Equipment trouble-shooting	3	4	3	0	20	11.5
7. Free-loan film service	3	6	1	0	22	9.5
8. Interlibrary loan	6	4	0	0	26	2
9. Newsletter "HIT Parade"	2	6	2	0	20	11.5
10. Orientation for students	5	3	2	0	23	6.3
11. Preparation of bibliographies	5	4	1	0	24	5
12. Reserve materials system	4	4	2	0	22	9.5
13. Reference service	6	3	1	0	25	3.5
14. Typing room	1	4	5	0	16	14

Several interesting observations can be made about the data in Table 6. Books, periodicals and textbooks were ranked 1, 2, 3 as the most important items for both teaching and student assignments.

Descriptions of vocational-technical programs such as HIT's stress the practical, hands-on, world-of-work types of learning experiences as the most important methods of teaching. This description would seem to indicate that HIT would place less reliance on printed matter as educational materials for students who choose not to attend a four-year college with its book orientation. Audiovisual materials did rank 4 and 5 for classroom teaching, but students attending the programs represented by the respondents to this questionnaire need to be aware that reading of printed material will be a foundation activity for most of their work at HIT.

Video equipment ranked low--perhaps because of its relative newness in the education field and the few pieces of equipment that are generally available. The Library has one video camera and one recording/playback unit.

Models ranked lowest which was another surprise for a school that has aircraft sitting beside the Industrial Technology Building and TV sets in various states of repair in the Electronics classrooms. This researcher's interpretation of this result is that the meaning of "models" was not clear as was probably true for "Vertical file material" whose rankings in other tables in this report went against expected trends. However, vertical file material did rank relatively high (6) for use in student assignments as did manuals (7.5).

In Part IV B a list of thirty-two items of materials and equipment was given with some specified "general" (for all programs), some "program" (for specific subject areas), and others undesignated (used either way). These thirty-two items were divided into two categories: 1) selection--by librarian, faculty, or both; and

Table 6

Faculty Rankings of Materials and Equipment for Classroom Teaching and Student Assignments

Materials and Equipment	Classroom Teaching						Student Assignments					
	Most Impt.	Some Impt.	Little Impt.	NA	Total	Rank	Most Impt.	Some Impt.	Little Impt.	NA	Total	Rank
1. Audio cassettes	18	23	13	3	113	11	12	11	17	10	75	9
2. Audio recorders	14	21	18	4	102	14.5	10	13	18	9	74	10
3. Books	38	11	3	0	139	1	39	7	2	2	133	1
4. Filmstrips	23	27	6	1	129	4	13	13	19	5	84	5
5. Manufacturer/Industrial manuals	19	17	14	7	105	13	15	10	11	14	76	7.5
6. Models	3	14	12	27	49	22	5	7	12	26	41	22
7. Newspapers	8	20	18	11	82	20	7	18	14	11	71	13
8. Periodicals	34	14	8	2	138	2	28	11	7	4	118	2
9. Periodical indexes	20	21	14	2	116	8	21	11	12	6	97	4
10. Proj.-filmstrip/slide	22	25	10	0	126	6	8	15	19	8	73	11
11. Proj.-overhd.	19	23	11	4	114	9.5	8	9	20	13	62	15.5
12. Proj.-16mm	15	18	19	5	102	14.5	4	13	19	14	57	19

Table 6 (continued)

Materials and Equipment	Classroom Teaching						Student Assignments					
	Most Impt.	Some Impt.	Little Impt.	NA	Total	Rank	Most Impt.	Some Impt.	Little Impt.	NA	Total	Rank
13. 16mm film	16	27	12	2	114	9.5	2	15	20	13	56	20
14. Slides	24	24	8	1	128	5	8	16	16	10	72	12
15. Slide/tape programs	21	25	9	1	122	7	9	18	13	10	76	7.5
16. Telephone books (non-local)	9	16	22	10	81	21	6	18	15	11	69	14
17. Textbooks	30	17	6	4	130	3	29	12	4	5	115	3
18. Transparencies	15	27	11	4	110	12	8	11	16	15	62	15.5
19. Vertical file materials	12	24	14	7	98	16	11	19	12	9	83	6
20. Video camera	11	19	15	12	86	19	8	7	16	19	54	21
21. Video cassettes	13	21	12	11	93	17	9	10	14	16	61	17
22. Video recorders/playback	12	20	13	12	89	18	10	7	16	17	60	18

2) purchase/house by the Library or by the department/program.

Responses from the faculty and administrators were tabulated separately and then the percentages in each category were calculated according to the total number of responses received. To test the four hypotheses covered by this part of the questionnaire, the percentages for "Librarian" and "Both" in the general purpose materials, Tables 7 and 9, were added together. Those sums were then totaled and divided by the numbers of general purpose or program specific items listed in each table so that an average percentage could be determined and the hypotheses tested. The same procedure was followed for "Faculty" and "Both" figures in the program specific materials, Tables 8 and 10.

Hypothesis 8 stated that "Eighty per cent or more of the faculty will indicate that the librarians should select, or be involved in the selection of, general purpose materials and equipment and the faculty should select, or be involved in the selection of, program specific materials and equipment." Tables 7 and 8 display Part IV B data in the two categories of "General purpose" and "Program specific" items. Data in Table 7 show 93.42% of the faculty wanted the librarian to select general purpose materials and 92.89% of the faculty wanted the faculty to select program specific materials. Hypothesis 8 was accepted.

Two items of audiovisual equipment listed in Table 7 are revealed as items that the faculty prefer to be more involved in selecting--filmstrip/slide projectors and overhead projectors. Since almost every classroom at HIT has an overhead, and filmstrips and slides were ranked 4 and 5 for classroom teaching, it is understandable that faculty feel a greater responsibility for selecting those items.

The surprising result was in Table 8 which shows that 41.51% of the faculty wanted both the librarian and the faculty to select textbooks when, in fact, all the current librarians have done in that area is to notify faculty of new editions and prices.

Hypothesis 9 stated that "Sixty per cent or more of the administrators will indicate that the librarian should select, or be involved in the selection of, general purpose materials and equipment and that the faculty should select, or be involved in the selection of, program specific materials and equipment." Since data in Table 9 show the average percentage for the librarian to select general purpose materials to be 96.17% and data in Table 10 show the average percentage for faculty selecting program specific materials to be 97.90%, this hypothesis was accepted.

Two results of interest to note are: 1) only overhead projectors went against the pattern of the librarian selecting general purpose material in the administrators' responses; and 2) vertical file material again went against the study's results of faculty being the chief people involved in the selection of program specific material. This researcher assumes that the administrators know of the number of overheads in the classrooms and also may be unsure of the meaning of "Vertical file material."

The second section of Part IV B asked about the purchasing and housing of the same thirty-two items with the designation of "general" and "program" and no designation for those that could be used either way. The respondents were to indicate where they thought the materials should be housed. Hypothesis 10 stated that "Seventy-five per cent of the faculty will want general purpose materials and equipment purchased and

Table 7

Faculty Choice for Selection of General Purpose Materials

Materials and Equipment	Librarian		Faculty		Both		Total % Libr. and Both
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
2. Audio cassette (gen.)	19	35.84	2	3.77	32	60.38	96.22
3. Audio recorders	26	50.98	6	11.76	19	37.25	88.23
5. Books (gen.)	18	33.96	4	7.55	31	58.49	92.45
7. Filmstrips (gen.)	17	32.08	1	1.89	35	66.04	98.12
10. Newspapers	36	67.92	1	1.89	16	30.19	98.11
12. Periodicals (gen.)	29	54.72	2	3.77	22	41.51	96.23
13. Periodical Indexes	37	69.81	1	1.89	15	28.30	98.11
14. Projectors-filmstrip/ slide	18	33.96	12	22.64	23	43.40	77.36
15. Projectors-overhead	16	30.19	12	22.64	25	47.17	77.36
16. Projectors-16mm	22	41.51	6	11.32	25	47.17	88.68
18. 16mm film (gen.)	24	46.15	2	3.85	26	50.00	96.15
20. Slides (gen.)	23	43.39	2	3.77	28	52.83	96.22
22. Slide/tape (gen.)	22	41.51	2	3.77	29	54.72	96.23
23. Telephone books (non-local)	42	79.25	2	3.77	9	16.98	96.23
26. Transparencies (gen.)	17	32.08	1	1.89	35	66.03	98.11
28. Vertical file material (gen.)	32	60.38	1	1.89	20	37.74	98.12
30. Video cassette (gen.)	22	41.51	2	3.77	29	54.72	96.23
31. Video camera	35	66.03	3	5.66	15	28.30	94.33
32. Video recorder/ playback	34	64.15	4	7.55	15	28.30	92.45
Average %							93.42

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 19 items; 53 responses, except Nos. 3 = 51 and 18 = 52.

Table 8

Faculty Choice for Selection of Program Specific Materials

Materials and Equipment	Librarian		Faculty		Both		Total % Fac. and Both
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Audio cassette (prog.)	1	1.89	32	60.38	20	37.73	98.11
4. Books (prog.)	0	-	38	74.51	13	25.50	100.00
6. Filmstrips (prog.)	1	1.89	39	73.58	13	24.53	98.11
8. Manufacturer/Industrial manuals	4	7.55	23	43.39	26	49.06	92.45
9. Models	8	15.09	23	43.40	22	41.51	84.91
11. Periodicals (prog.)	4	7.55	22	41.51	27	50.94	92.45
17. 16mm film (prog.)	6	11.32	30	56.60	17	32.08	88.68
19. Slides (prog.)	1	1.89	36	67.92	16	30.19	98.11
21. Slide/tape (prog.)	0	-	35	66.04	18	33.96	100.00
24. Textbooks	1	1.89	30	56.60	22	41.51	98.11
25. Transparencies (prog.)	1	1.89	37	69.81	15	28.30	98.11
27. Vertical file material (prog.)	18	33.96	11	20.75	24	45.28	66.03
29. Video cassette (prog.)	4	7.55	32	60.38	17	32.08	92.46
Average %							92.89

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 13 items; 53 responses, except No. 4 = 51.

Table 9

Administrators' Choice for Selection of General Purpose Materials

Materials and Equipment	Librarian		Faculty		Both		Total % Libr. and Both
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
2. Audio cassette (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
3. Audio recorders	8	72.73	0	-	3	27.27	100.00
5. Books (gen.)	6	54.55	1	9.10	4	36.36	90.91
7. Filmstrips (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
10. Newspapers	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
12. Periodicals (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
13. Periodical Indexes	7	63.64	0	-	4	36.36	100.00
14. Projectors-film- strip/slide	7	63.64	1	9.10	3	27.27	90.91
15. Projectors-overhead	6	54.55	3	27.27	2	18.18	72.73
16. Projectors-16mm	7	63.64	1	9.10	3	27.27	90.91
18. 16mm film (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
20. Slides (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
22. Slide/tape (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
23. Telephone books (non-local)	9	81.82	1	9.10	1	9.10	90.90
26. Transparencies (gen.)	5	45.45	1	9.10	5	45.45	90.90
28. Vertical file material (gen.)	6	54.55	0	-	5	45.45	100.00
30. Video cassette (gen.)	5	45.45	0	-	6	54.55	100.00
31. Video camera	8	72.73	0	-	3	27.27	100.00
32. Video recorder/ playback	7	63.64	0	-	4	36.36	100.00
Average %							97.90

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 19 items; 11 responses.

Table 10

Administrators' Choice for Selection of Program Specific Materials

Materials and Equipment	Librarian		Faculty		Both		Total % Fac. and Both
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Audio cassette (prog.)	0	-	4	36.36	7	63.64	100.00
4. Books (prog.)	0	-	7	63.64	4	36.36	100.00
6. Filmstrips (prog.)	0	-	7	63.64	4	36.36	100.00
8. Manufacturer/Industrial manuals	0	-	7	63.64	4	36.36	100.00
9. Models	0	-	6	54.55	5	45.45	100.00
11. Periodicals (prog.)	0	-	3	27.27	8	72.73	100.00
17. 16mm film (prog.)	0	-	5	45.45	6	54.55	100.00
19. Slides (prog.)	0	-	7	63.64	4	36.36	100.00
21. Slide/tape (prog.)	0	-	5	45.45	6	54.55	100.00
24. Textbooks	0	-	8	72.73	3	27.27	100.00
25. Transparencies (prog.)	0	-	7	63.64	4	36.36	100.00
27. Vertical file material (prog.)	3	27.27	3	27.27	5	45.45	72.72
29. Video cassette (prog.)	0	-	6	54.55	5	45.45	100.00
Average %							97.90

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 13 items; 11 responses.

housed in the Library and program specific materials and equipment purchased and housed in the department/program. In Tables 11 and 12 the percentages for each of the two categories were totaled and then divided by the number of items to find the average percentage with which to test the hypothesis. Hypothesis 10 was rejected. Data in Table 11 show 83.90% of the faculty wanted general purpose materials housed in the Library and data in Table 12 indicate that 64.25% want program specific materials housed in departments. Over 35% of the faculty want program specific materials housed in the Library. This would seem to indicate that the faculty is moving toward acceptance of the centralized collection.

Following the patterns established for selection of materials as shown previously in Tables 7 and 8, more faculty wanted the overhead, filmstrip/slide, and 16mm film projectors housed in the departments than they did any of the other materials. The surprising result about textbooks is continued as 37.35% of the faculty wanted textbooks housed in the Library. Additionally, 52.94% of the faculty wanted "program" periodicals housed in the Library. That particular percentage is significant for HIT because periodicals had been an item that was collected from the departments when the Library became a centralized collection. This response also seems to indicate a movement toward the acceptance of the centralized collection.

A good number of 16mm films and video cassettes are scheduled through the Library and this could account for the higher percentages for those materials. Models seem to be claimed for housing by departments, but manuals are not.

The administrators were asked to make the same indication about the housing of materials and equipment. The results of their responses were tabulated in the same way as the faculty's.

Hypothesis 11, "Eighty per cent or more of the administrators will want the Library to purchase and house all types of materials," was rejected. The administrators continued to make the distinction between materials for general purpose uses and those for specific programs which this researcher had hypothesized they would not. Table 14 shows that 67.83% of the administrators still want program specific materials housed in the departments. Housing overhead projectors in the departments was the most notable exception to housing general purpose materials in the Library, and over half of the administrators wanted "program" periodicals housed in the Library rather than in departments, as might have been expected. A significant per cent also wanted program specific books and manuals housed in the Library. Administrator responses generally matched the responses by faculty.

The percentage of responses by the administrators for general purpose materials to be housed in the Library (81.67%) and for housing program specific materials in the departments (67.83%) would seem to indicate, as it did with the faculty, that the desire for program materials only in program areas as in the former decentralized organization is slowly being replaced with the recognition of the value or acceptance of the centralized collection.

A word of explanation about why almost half of the hypotheses were about the selection and housing of materials and equipment. The HIT Library collection has only been centralized for three years and

Table 11
Faculty Choice for Housing General Purpose Materials

Materials and Equipment	Library		Department	
	No.	%	No.	%
2. Audio cassette (gen.)	47	92.16	4	7.84
3. Audio recorders	37	72.55	14	27.45
5. Books (gen.)	49	96.08	2	3.92
7. Filmstrips (gen.)	49	96.08	2	3.92
10. Newspapers	48	94.12	3	5.88
12. Periodicals (gen.)	48	94.12	3	5.88
13. Periodical Indexes	48	94.12	3	5.88
14. Projectors/filmstrip/ slide	26	50.98	25	49.02
15. Projectors/overhead	21	41.18	30	58.82
16. Projectors-16mm	27	52.94	24	47.06
18. 16mm film (gen.)	48	94.12	3	5.88
20. Slides (gen.)	48	94.12	3	5.88
22. Slide/tape (gen.)	47	92.16	4	7.84
23. Telephone books (non-local)	48	94.12	3	5.88
26. Transparencies (gen.)	46	90.20	5	9.80
28. Vertical file material (gen.)	48	94.12	3	5.88
30. Video cassette (gen.)	46	90.20	5	9.80
31. Video camera	42	82.35	9	17.65
32. Video recorder/ playback	40	78.43	11	21.57
Average %		83.90		16.10

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 19 items; 51 responses.

Table 12
Faculty Choice for Housing Program Specific Materials

Materials and Equipment	Library		Department	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Audio cassette (prog.)	9	17.65	42	82.35
4. Books (prog.)	15	29.41	36	70.59
6. Filmstrips (prog.)	14	27.45	37	72.55
8. Manufacturer/Industrial manuals	24	47.06	27	52.94
9. Models	17	33.33	34	66.67
11. Periodicals (prog.)	27	52.94	24	47.06
17. 16mm film (prog.)	22	43.14	39	76.47
19. Slides (prog.)	12	23.53	29	56.86
21. Slide/tape (prog.)	13	25.50	38	74.50
24. Textbooks	19	37.25	32	62.75
25. Transparencies (prog.)	8	15.69	43	84.31
27. Vertical file material (prog.)	38	74.51	13	25.49
29. Video cassette (prog.)	19	37.25	32	62.75
Average %		35.75		64.25

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 13 items; 51 responses.

Table 13

Administrators' Choice for Housing General Purpose Materials

Materials and Equipment	Library		Department	
	No.	%	No.	%
2. Audio cassette (gen.)	8	72.73	3	27.27
3. Audio recorders	9	81.82	2	18.18
5. Books (gen.)	10	90.91	1	9.10
7. Filmstrips (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
10. Newspapers	10	90.91	1	9.10
12. Periodicals (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
13. Periodical Indexes	10	90.91	1	9.10
14. Projectors-filmstrip/ slide	8	72.73	3	27.27
15. Projectors/overhead	6	54.55	5	45.45
16. Projectors-16mm	8	72.73	3	27.27
18. 16mm film (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
20. Slides (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
22. Slide/tape (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
23. Telephone books (non-local)	9	81.82	2	18.18
26. Transparencies (gen.)	8	72.73	3	27.27
28. Vertical file material (gen.)	10	90.91	1	9.10
30. Video cassette (gen.)	9	81.82	2	18.18
31. Video camera	10	90.91	1	9.10
32. Video recorder/ playback	10	90.91	1	9.10
Average %		81.34		18.66

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 19 items; 11 responses.

Table 14
Administrators' Choice for Housing Program Specific Materials

Materials and Equipment	Library		Department	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Audio cassette (prog.)	3	27.27	8	72.73
4. Books (prog.)	5	45.45	6	54.55
6. Filmstrips (prog.)	2	18.18	9	81.82
8. Manufacturer/Industrial manuals	5	45.45	6	54.55
9. Models	2	18.18	9	81.82
11. Periodicals (prog.)	7	63.64	4	36.36
17. 16mm film (prog.)	4	36.36	7	63.64
19. Slides (prog.)	2	18.18	9	81.82
21. Slide/tape (prog.)	2	18.18	9	81.82
24. Textbooks	2	18.18	9	81.82
25. Transparencies (prog.)	1	9.10	10	90.91
27. Vertical file material (prog.)	8	72.73	3	27.27
29. Video cassette (prog.)	3	27.27	8	72.73
Average %		32.17		67.83

Numbers in the table are from the questionnaire. 13 items; 11 responses.

there has been some question about how the faculty and administration were accepting this change in operation. The head librarian was also concerned that the faculty did not seem inclined to take much responsibility in helping to develop the centralized collection as it related to their specialized fields. Did the faculty have any desire to work with the Library in selecting appropriate materials or did they want the librarian to take care of the Library and they would take care of materials in the classroom?

As noted previously, acceptance of the centralized concept is greater than anticipated and it is interesting to note the fairly high percentage of responses for selection and housing that appear under "Both" for general purpose materials and program specific materials. The faculty are more open to the involvement of the librarian than the administrators.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to analyze the attitudes of the faculty and administrators toward the Library at the Hawkeye Institute of Technology (HIT) with regard to the provision of library services offered to the students and staff at HIT and the selection and housing of materials and equipment. After the analysis, plans could then be made to improve those services, materials and equipment deemed most important to classroom teaching, student assignments and administrative duties, and to upgrade other services, materials and equipment so they would be more usable.

A questionnaire was sent June, 1982, to the administrators and full-time instructors of the day programs at HIT. A 52% response was received with three of the eight departments returning less than 41%. The questionnaire contained four parts: I. General Information, II. Resources Provided for Programs and Students, III. Library Services Offered, IV. Materials and Equipment. Respondents were asked to rank resources and services and to indicate the "importance" of materials and equipment.

The data analysis indicated that the Library was ranked fourth by faculty and fifth by administrators among eight resources offered at HIT, and that alerting staff to new items in their fields was the most important service of the Library for both faculty and administrators.

The most important materials for classroom teaching and student assignments as indicated by both faculty and administrators were print materials. Textbooks and periodicals were ranked first and second for teaching and student assignments while filmstrips and slides were ranked fourth and fifth only for classroom teaching. It had been assumed that nonprint materials would rank higher than that in a vocational-technical educational setting.

In selecting materials and equipment both the administrators and faculty indicated that the librarian should select general purpose materials and equipment and that faculty should select program specific materials and equipment. However, the category of "Both" (librarian and faculty) being involved in the selection of all materials received a surprisingly large number of responses.

In the housing of materials both faculty and administrators wanted general purpose materials located in the Library, as had been expected, but over 32% of both groups wanted program specific materials also housed in the Library. Since the collection had previously been decentralized in the program areas, this finding took on significance.

Conclusions

This study was conducted to determine the attitudes of faculty and administrators toward the Library at HIT. How important several aspects of the Library were to the work these people performed would reveal a general attitude toward the Library itself. An over-all assessment from the tabulated responses on the questionnaire would be that the Library is important to the HIT program areas after equipment, facilities and supplies are provided. There also seemed to be a

willingness on the faculty's part to work with the librarian in selecting materials and equipment for the students to use.

The most surprising result was the attitudes of the faculty and administrators toward the housing of materials and equipment. As expected over 80% of both groups preferred general purpose materials to be housed in the Library. However, 67% of both groups wanted program specific materials housed in the program areas. Because of the former decentralized operation of the Library which put all subject-related materials in the program areas, it was anticipated that there would be a high percentage of faculty wanting program materials close by. The fact that 33% of them did not, then, was significant. This researcher would interpret all of these findings to mean that the faculty's and the administrators' attitudes are positive toward having the Library with its centralized collection as a vital part of HIT.

In looking at other parts of the study, specifically library services, those items that require little effort to be expended by faculty ranked highest while those that are either a result of the new facilities or require faculty input were ranked lowest.

Another conclusion that might be drawn from studying the tables as a whole would be that the highest-ranked services tended to be those that were also most frequently used or received. While the directions on the questionnaire clearly stated that the responses were to be based on importance to the students' education or to teaching, the faculty response seemed to be based on what was most often used or received.

Traditional books, periodicals and pamphlets and standard audiovisual materials (slides, filmstrips) are the most frequently used materials for both classroom teaching and student assignments with not much evidence of the new video technology or reliance on literature from various businesses and industries. The emphasis the HIT faculty placed on print materials contradicts a finding in Lolley's study that "vocational-technical teachers relied far less on textbooks, manuals or guides than their academic counterparts. . ."21 Perhaps because this study's questionnaire came from the Library and a majority of materials the staff might use from there would be print, faculty were unconsciously influenced to respond in favor of print items.

Studies like this can be valuable in making collection development decisions, as well as in determining the adequacy of services. Working with faculty and administrators is an important role of a college librarian, and knowing the attitudes of the people one serves ought to make the library meet user needs with realism.

Recommendations for Further Study

An HIT student survey of use of materials, equipment and services might well be another step in gaining knowledge about patron needs. The number of students who use the Library is greater than the number of faculty, and a sampling of their attitudes could also prove useful in making decisions about the HIT Library's services and programs.

²¹John Lolley, Vocational Teachers and the Community College Library, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 188 704, 1980, p. 7.

In the more generalized area of vocational-technical schools, replication of this study would offer a broader foundation for conclusions and might explain some of the results found in this survey as well as the different results found in the study by Lolley.

In using the questionnaire again, there are several changes that might be made. Adding "Instructional Staff" to the list of resources might be considered, but a speculation about this would be that it would push the Library farther down the rankings. Perhaps a better solution would be to eliminate those items that are absolutely essential to operating any vocational-technical educational system-- faculty, equipment, facilities--and concentrate solely on student service items.

While the "Library Services" section is important to determine what the faculty and administrators want to see the Library offer, or what these groups use the most, it did not reveal much about how important each of the services is to the users. Maybe it stimulated thoughts about the materials and equipment used, though, and who should be responsible for these items.

A better method of designating materials for general purpose and program specific use might be devised. The one used was cumbersome to respond to and to tabulate.

Another recommendation is that this study should be repeated in three to five years to see if attitudes continue to change, or if turnover in personnel would have any effect on results.

The needs that a library for a vocational-technical school must fill are somewhat specialized and are most dependent on the programs offered at that particular school. A continuing determination of needs

and attitudes should be built into program evaluations of these libraries. A study similar to this one could prove beneficial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Library Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Association for Educational Communications and Technology. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs." College and Research Libraries News, 33:305-15, December, 1972.
- American Library Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Association for Educational Communications and Technology. "Draft Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs." College and Research Libraries News, 40:69-73, March, 1979.
- Berdie, Douglas, R. and John Anderson. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974.
- Bock, Joleen D. "From Library to LRC." Community College Frontiers, 8:4-9, Fall, 1979.
- Bock, Joleen D. "Two-Year College Learning Resources Center Buildings in 1979." The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 25th ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1980.
- Chwe, Steven Seokho. "Model Instrument for User-Rating of Library Service." California Librarian, 39:46-55, April, 1978.
- Ford, Geoffrey, ed. User Studies: An Introductory Guide and Select Bibliography. Sheffield, England: University of Sheffield Centre for Research on User Studies, Occasional Paper No. 1, 1977.
- Goldman, Paul. "Evolutions of a Learning Resources Center." Community College Frontiers, 8:30-32, Fall, 1979.
- Gould, Julius, ed. Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Compiled under the auspices of UNESCO, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, pp. 40-41; 491-2.
- Hannigan, Jane Anne, and Kay E. Vandergrift. "Student Viewpoints: An Exploratory Research Design." in Media Center Facilities Design, Chicago: American Library Association, 1978, pp. 14-18.
- Hawkeye Institute of Technology Catalog, 1979-1981. Waterloo, Iowa: HIT, 1979.
- Hostrop, Richard. Teaching and the Community College Library. Hampden, CT: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1968.

- Line, Maurice, B. Library Surveys: An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure and Presentation. Hampden, CT: The Shoe-string Press, Inc., 1967.
- Lolley, J. L. "Use of Instructional Resources by Community Junior College Occupational Instructors," Dissertation Abstracts International, 39:1172-A, September, 1978.
- _____. Vocational Teachers and the College Library. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 188 704, 1980.
- _____. "Vocational-Technical Faculty and the Library: Why Some Use It and Some Don't." Texas Library Journal, 55:50-1, Spring, 1979.
- Millard, Joseph E., and Wanda Everage. "Evaluating Attitudes: A Procedure that Works." Clearinghouse, 53:244-47, January, 1980.
- Murphy, Marcy. "Measuring Library Effectiveness: A Prelude to Change." Special Libraries, 70:18-25, January, 1979.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Orban, Deborah. "The Learning Resource Center at the Community College: Its Function and Future." Community College Frontiers, 8:29-34, Spring, 1980.
- Pemberton, Margaret A., and Earl P. Smith. "A Comparison of Role Perceptions of the School Media Specialist Among Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Library Media Specialists." Southeastern Librarian, 28:92-5, Summer, 1978.
- Pfister, Fred, and Karen Alexander. Discrepancies Between Actual and Ideal Roles and Functions of Texas School Librarians as Perceived by School Superintendents, Principals, and Librarians. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 134-188, 1976.
- Rokeach, Milton. "The Nature of Attitudes." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. ed. David L. Sills. New York: Macmillan Co. and the Free Press, 1968, I, pp. 449-458.
- "School Librarians Research Forum: Role Perceptions--Seeing Selves as Others See Them." American Libraries, 7:506, September, 1976.
- Shaw, Marvin E., and Jack M. Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Stroud, Janet G., and David Loertscher. "User Needs and School Library Service." in Achieving Accountability. ed. Ron Blazek. Chicago: American Library Association, 1981, pp. 161-69.

- Stuckhardt, Michael, and Jerry W. Morris. "The Development of a Scale to Measure Attitudes Held Towards Arts Education." Studies in Arts Education, 21:2:50-56, 1980.
- Tauber, Maruice, F., and Irlene Roemer Stephens, eds. Library Surveys. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Veit, Fritz. The Community College Library. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- Weinstein, Alan G. "Predicting Behavior from Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, 36:355-60, Fall, 1972.
- Wheeler, Helen Rippier. The Community College Library: A Plan for Action. Hampden, CT: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1965.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE



Hawkeye Institute of Technology

P.O. Box 8015, Waterloo, Iowa 50704

Library

June 1, 1982

Dear Staff Member:

HIT Library is always interested in providing the services and resources that are needed by faculty and administrators. In order to fulfill that goal, we would like your help.

We would like to survey your attitude toward the Library, and we would also like to determine what materials and services you think are most important and necessary in order to offer our students the best educational opportunities.

Sharon Gatewood, a graduate student in the Department of Library Science at UNI, is undertaking the above-described study as her research paper for the Masters Degree in Library Science. She has taught English for three of the Graphics and Applied Arts programs at HIT.

We ask that you do not identify yourself individually, but we would like you to indicate with which department you are affiliated. All responses will remain confidential.

We appreciate the time you take to fill out this survey. The more surveys that are completed and returned, the more meaningful our data will be. We will use the results to better serve you and the students. Please return completed surveys via campus mail to the Library.

Sincerely,

Bob Chittenden, Librarian

Sharon Gatewood

SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD THE HIT LIBRARY
BY THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

As part of our constant effort to improve services for you, we are asking your help by filling out this survey. Please be assured your responses will not be identified in the final report. We appreciate your cooperation.

PART I GENERAL INFORMATION

Please check the appropriate line:

1. ☐ Faculty

2. ☐ Administrator

Department:

3. ☐ Agricultural and Natural
Resources

6. ☐ Electronic

10a ☐ Special Needs

4. ☐ Business

7. ☐ Graphic and Applied Arts

10b ☐ Other _____
(Specify)

5. ☐ Criminal Justice and Public
Service

8. ☐ Health Science

9. ☐ Industrial Technology

10. ☐ Power Mechanics

Number of years at HIT:

11. ☐ 0-3

13. ☐ 8-11

12. ☐ 4-7

14. ☐ 12-15

Number of classes teaching Spring Quarter:

15. ☐ 0

18. ☐ 3

16. ☐ 1

19. ☐ 4

17. ☐ 2

20. ☐ 5

PART II RESOURCES FOR PROGRAMS AND STUDENTS

Please rank the following resources offered at HIT according to how important they are in providing the students with the most complete education possible:

Use 1 for most important through 8 for least important.

☐ Counseling and placement

☐ Information services

☐ Equipment

☐ Library

☐ Facilities

☐ Special Needs

☐ Food Service

☐ Supplies

PART III LIBRARY SERVICES OFFERED AT HIT

A. Faculty and Administrators:

Please rank the following library services according to how important the services are to classroom teaching.

LIBRARY SERVICES	Of most importance	Of some importance	Of little importance	Don't know
1. Alerting staff to new items in their field				
2. Audiovisual equipment checkout				
3. Audiovisual materials production (transparencies, tapes, etc.)				
4. Audiovisual previewing facilities				
5. Conference rooms				
6. Equipment troubleshooting				
7. Free-loan film service				
8. Interlibrary loan				
9. Newsletter "HIT Parade"				
10. Orientation for students				
11. Preparation of bibliographies				
12. Reserve materials system				
13. Reference service (questions answered)				
14. Typing room				

B. For Administrators Only (If not an Administrator, please proceed to Part IV)

Please rank the following library services according to how important they are to the performance of your administrative duties.

LIBRARY SERVICES	Of most importance	Of some importance	Of little importance	Don't know
1. Alerting staff to new items in their field				
2. Audiovisual equipment checkout				
3. Audiovisual materials production (transparencies, tapes, etc.)				
4. Audiovisual previewing facilities				
5. Conference rooms				
6. Equipment troubleshooting				
7. Free-loan film service				
8. Interlibrary loan				
9. Newsletter "HIT Parade"				
10. Orientation for students				
11. Preparation of bibliographies				
12. Reserve materials system				
13. Reference service (questions answered)				
14. Typing room				

PART IV MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT (A)

For Faculty Only (If an administrator, please proceed to IV B)

Instructional materials and equipment are listed below. For each item please mark whether that particular item is "Of most importance," "Of some importance," "of little importance," or "NA" (not applicable) for each of the two use categories

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT	CLASSROOM TEACHING				STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS			
	Of most importance	Of some importance	Of little importance	NA	Of most importance	Of some importance	Of little importance	NA
1. Audio cassettes								
2. Audio recorders								
3. Books								
4. Filmstrips								
5. Manufacturer/Industrial Manuals								
6. Models								
7. Newspapers								
8. Periodicals								
9. Periodical indexes								
10. Projectors-filmstrip/slide								
11. Projectors-overhead								
12. Projectors-16mm								
13. 16mm films								
14. Slides								
15. Slide/tape programs								
16. Telephone books (non-local)								
17. Textbooks								
18. Transparencies								
19. Vertical file materials (pamphlets, clippings)								
20. Video camera								
21. Video cassettes								
22. Video recorders/playback								

PART IV MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT (B)
(FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS BOTH PLEASE COMPLETE)

The same instructional materials and equipment are listed again. Some are marked "program specific" (program) which means that the subject content of those items is limited to information that applies to only one program area (e.g. practical nursing). The "general purpose" (general) items are those that might be used in several programs (e.g. effective public speaking). Those items not marked "general" or "program" could be used for either.

For each of the 32 items please mark who you think should (1) be responsible for selecting the item, and (2) who should purchase and house each of them.

MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT	(1) SELECTION			(2) PURCHASE/HOUSE	
	Librarian	Faculty	Librarian and Faculty	Library	Department/ Program
1. Audio cassette (program)					
2. Audio cassette (general)					
3. Audio recorders					
4. Books (program)					
5. Books (general)					
6. Filmstrips (program)					
7. Filmstrips (general)					
8. Manufacturer/Industrial Manuals					
9. Models					
10. Newspaper					
11. Periodicals (program)					
12. Periodicals (general)					
13. Periodical Indexes					
14. Projectors-filmstrip/slide					
15. Projectors-overhead					
16. Projectors-16mm					
17. 16mm film (program)					
18. 16mm film (general)					
19. Slides (program)					
20. Slides (general)					
21. Slide/tape (program)					
22. Slide/tape (general)					
23. Telephone books (non-local)					
24. Textbooks					
25. Transparencies (program)					
26. Transparencies (general)					
27. Vertical file material (program) (pamphlets, clippings)					
28. Vertical file material (general)					
29. Video cassette (program)					
30. Video cassette (general)					
31. Video camera					
32. Video recorder/playback					

APPENDIX B

TABLE 15

Table 15
General Information on Respondents

Years at HIT				Classes Taught Spring Quarter			
Range of Years	Fac.	Ad.	Total	No. of Classes	Fac.	Ad.	Total
0-3	13	2	15	0	1	9	10
4-7	13	1	14	1	4	2	6
8-11	18	3	21	2	10	0	10
12-15	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>20</u>	3	20	0	20
Totals	59	11	70	4	13	0	13
				5	9	0	9
				6	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
				Totals	59	11	70