

1976

Perceptions and Actions Related to Continuing Education: A Comparative Study of Single-Purpose and Multi-Purpose Library School Graduates

Marilyn M. Norton
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1976 Marilyn M. Norton

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

Recommended Citation

Norton, Marilyn M., "Perceptions and Actions Related to Continuing Education: A Comparative Study of Single-Purpose and Multi-Purpose Library School Graduates" (1976). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3960. <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3960>

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.

Perceptions and Actions Related to Continuing Education: A Comparative Study of Single-Purpose and Multi-Purpose Library School Graduates

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 investigate the effect, if any, of professional preparation, single-purpose or multi-purpose graduate school librarianship programs, upon continuing education. A previously validated questionnaire was used to ascertain: a) the degree of involvement in continuing education activities, b) the degree of importance placed upon continuing education activities, c) the degree of disparity between involvement in and importance placed upon continuing education activities, and d) the form of continuing education pursued or viewed as most desirable. The survey instrument was administered to two randomly drawn samples: 1) University of Iowa, a multi-purpose program (N=50) and 2) University of Northern Iowa, a single-purpose program (N=50.)

Analysis of the generated data yielded the following major findings:

1. Analysis of variance showed no statistically significant difference between the two samples in degree of involvement, degree of importance, or disparity between involvement and importance.
2. The Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient revealed no statistically significant difference between the two groups in the form of continuing education activities pursued or held most valuable.

With respect to the limited sampling and the delimitations of the study, it appears doubtful that the form of professional preparation has any impact upon perceptions and actions pertaining to continuing education; thereby responding, in part, to questions concerning single-purpose programs which have been posed in the professional literature of library science.

Perceptions and Actions Related to
Continuing Education; a Comparative Study
of Single-Purpose and Multi-Purpose
Library School Graduates

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

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

Marilyn M. Norton
July 12, 1976

Read and approved by

Leah Hiland

Elizabeth Martin

Accepted by Department

Elizabeth Martin

Date July 19, 1976

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect, if any, of professional preparation, single-purpose or multi-purpose graduate school librarianship programs, upon continuing education. A previously validated questionnaire was used to ascertain: a) the degree of involvement in continuing education activities, b) the degree of importance placed upon continuing education activities, c) the degree of disparity between involvement in and importance placed upon continuing education activities, and d) the form of continuing education pursued or viewed as most desirable. The survey instrument was administered to two randomly drawn samples: 1) University of Iowa, a multi-purpose program (N=50) and 2) University of Northern Iowa, a single-purpose program (N=50.)

Analysis of the generated data yielded the following major findings:

1. Analysis of variance showed no statistically significant difference between the two samples in degree of involvement, degree of importance, or disparity between involvement and importance.

2. The Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient revealed no statistically significant difference between the two groups in the form of continuing education activities pursued or held most valuable.

With respect to the limited sampling and the delimitations of the study, it appears doubtful that the form of professional preparation has any impact upon perceptions and actions pertaining to continuing education; thereby responding, in part, to questions concerning single-purpose programs which have been posed in the professional literature of library science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	4
ASSUMPTION OF THE STUDY	4
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	5
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
3. METHODOLOGY	15
POPULATION	15
INSTRUMENTATION	15
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	19
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
SUMMARY	31
CONCLUSIONS	33
RECOMMENDATIONS	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIXES	
A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	39
B. COVER LETTER	42
C. FOLLOW-UP LETTER	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Degree of Involvement	20
2. ANOVA for Degree of Involvement	21
3. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Degree of Importance	22
4. ANOVA for Degree of Importance	22
5. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Disparity	23
6. ANOVA for Disparity	23
7. Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient for Total of All Items Representing Involvement and Importance	24
8. Involvement Item-by-Item t-tests	25
9. Importance Item-by-Item t-tests	27
10. Composite Recommendations to Library Schools for Continuing Education Activities	30

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The necessarily unique education of school librarians which, simplistically stated, blends elements of educational principles with those of library science, has been a long recurring topic of discussion and concern within the profession of librarianship. The frequency and intensity of comment has increased apace with the steadily growing number of graduate programs established for the sole purpose of educating school librarians. These programs are referred to as single-purpose programs in contrast to the once prevalent multi-purpose programs which seek to prepare individuals for all areas of library science: academic, public, school and special librarianship.

Evidence of the proliferation of these programs was first detected by a subcommittee of the Library Education Division of the American Library Association who noted that the statistics from The Survey of Library Education Programs, Fall, 1964 ". . . indicates (but does not tabulate) the growth of single purpose library education programs" ¹

¹American Library Association Library Education Division Newsletter, 59:2, September, 1966.

Further evidence of this trend may be shown through an analysis of Table 3 in the North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, which provides general information and enrollment data of graduate library programs. In the fall of 1966, there were 17 single-purpose school librarianship programs serving 491 part- and full-time students. The 1967 statistics reflect an increase to 21 programs serving 673 students. Analysis of the number of prospective school librarians enrolled in multi-purpose programs could not be made as the table provided no breakdown for these programs beyond the total enrollment.²

The 1969-1971 update of the directory utilized a modified instrument which eliminated the information describing the type of program offered by each institution, thus precluding continued analysis. A recommendation was made, however, that subsequent surveys should be structured to identify the focus of single-purpose programs.³

Concurrent with the growth of single-purpose programs, questions as to their role and function began to appear in the professional literature, spear-headed initially by leaders active in the American Library Association Library Education Division. Based upon the 1951

²Frank L. Schick, North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, 1966-1968 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969), pp. 44-51.

³Frank L. Schick, North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, 1969-1971 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1972), p. 20.

Standards for Accreditation and reinforced by positions taken by these leaders, single-purpose programs were not recognized by the Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association as being acceptable for accreditation until 1963 when the overwhelming demand for school librarians became a practicality to be faced and when pressures from school library education leaders were successfully exerted, resulting in a revision of policy which permitted single-purpose programs to be accredited, providing they met other criteria.⁴

From the 1963 revision to the 1972 Standards for Accreditation⁵ which reiterated accreditation for single-purpose programs, to the present time, questions have continued to arise concerning the role and function of the single-purpose program. Although these questions are frequently posed, it is a matter of concern to this writer that there has been no published research examining the products of the two different programs: single- and multi-purpose.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The researcher, therefore, undertook an exploratory

⁴Sarah R. Reed, "A Reinterpretation of Standards," American Library Association Bulletin, 57:247, March, 1963.

⁵American Library Association, Standards for Accreditation (Chicago: The Association, 1972), pp. 3-4.

study of graduates of the two types of school librarianship programs with respect to but one vital element of professionalism, continuing education. The study attempted to determine if the form of professional education, single- or multi-purpose, had any impact upon perceptions and actions pertaining to continuing education in its various forms.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Other variables, such as family responsibilities, employment situation, availability and quality of continuing education activities, and personal motivation which may have an impact on attitudes toward and pursuance of continuing education activities were considered to be beyond the scope of this study and, therefore, were not examined.

Due to a lack of a composite of physical resources, chiefly including time, financial and other assistance, and the intended scope of a departmental research paper, the study queried only 100 subjects from but one single-purpose and one multi-purpose program, those being in the state of Iowa.

ASSUMPTION OF THE STUDY

A basic assumption underlying the study was that the library school faculty members of single- and multi-purpose programs are not only aware of the significance of continuing education, but also put forth concerted effort toward

alerting and stimulating their students to actively pursue continuing education activities.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Utilizing the survey technique with random samples from graduates of a single-purpose and a multi-purpose program, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the two groups in degree of involvement in continuing education.
2. There is no significant difference between the two groups in degree of importance placed upon continuing education.
3. There is no significant difference between the two groups in the disparity between the degree of involvement and the degree of importance.
4. There is no significant difference between the two groups in the form of continuing education pursued or viewed as most desirable.

Continuing education, for the purposes of this study, refers to those activities, formal or informal, which contribute to an individual's professional knowledge and mastery of skills, leading toward increased effective performance.

The degree of involvement in continuing education, the degree of importance placed upon continuing education, and the disparity between involvement and importance are statistical derivatives of weighted scores assigned each response of each multiple-choice statement of the survey

instrument. Further explanation of the statistical treatment may be found in the Analysis of Data chapter of the study.

The exigency of continuing education has long been recognized within the profession of librarianship, but it was not until Stone's 1968 doctoral dissertation, subsequently published in part by Scarecrow Press, that the first published intensive research study was done. The population used for this study was selected exclusively, however, from graduates of accredited library schools and encompassed all areas of librarianship.⁶

Since Stone's study, the profession has indicated a need for sustained research into this vital area. In so doing, both Kortendick⁷ and the Continuing Library and Information Science Education (CLENE) Final Report⁸ have identified the important function of the library school in stimulating their students toward continuing education.

The crucial need for continuing education is doubly significant for school librarians in view of their dual

⁶Elizabeth W. Stone, Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1969), pp. 24-27.

⁷James J. Kortendick, "Continuing Education for Librarians," Targets for Research in Library Education, ed. Harold Borko (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), p. 153.

⁸Elizabeth W. Stone et al., Continuing Library and Information Science Education, Final Report, U.S., Educational Resource Information Center, ERIC Document, ED 100 312, 1974.

roles in library science and education; consequently, the function of the library schools, whether they be single- or multi-purpose, in alerting their school librarianship students to this need is a matter of utmost concern and importance.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature pertaining to single-purpose vs. multi-purpose programs (sometimes referred to as specialized vs. general library education) has reflected two very distinctive characteristics throughout the years: 1) It is rich in commentary, which lends itself to description but not to evaluation, and 2) It is seriously lacking in published research efforts. The literature reviewed in this section, therefore, is a manifestation of these characteristics.

Historically, statements regarding specialized vs. general education for librarianship are virtually as old as library education evaluation. Williamson's 1921 and 1923 reports indicated school librarianship as one of six areas of needed specialization.¹ This was reiterated by Reece in 1936.² Wheeler, however, refuted the concept of specialization on the premise that ". . . few students or admission officers can predict either abilities or work

¹C.C. Williamson, "Training for Library Work," pp. 129-32 and "Training for Library Service," pp. 91-95, The Williamson Reports of 1921 and 1923 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971)

²Ernest J. Reece, The Curriculum in Library Schools (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), p. 97.

preference."³

These early statements were made within the context of the then prevalent multi-purpose programs and the issue, for the most part, laid idle until the emergence and subsequent rapid growth of graduate single-purpose programs, many of which were involved in the preparation of school librarians. The early and mid-1960's was the era during which the advocates of single-purpose programs became most vocal in their demand for acknowledgement and for opportunity for accreditation by the American Library Association. Mahar, in 1961, stated that "For school librarianship, the tendency in library education to ignore the highly auxiliary nature of this specialization and its internal relationship with a complex, compulsory, and massive system of education has created critical problems."⁴ On this basis, she advocated specific standards for school library programs, irrespective of single- or multi-purpose status.⁵

This and similar attempts to instigate separate standards prompted action by two units of the American Library Association: the Committee on Accreditation (C.O.A.) and the Library Education Division (L.E.D.)

Douglas, then president of L.E.D. and Reed, in

³Joseph L. Wheeler, Progress and Problems in Education for Librarianship (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1946), pp. 66-67.

⁴Mary Helen Mahar, "The Accommodation of Specialization," Library Quarterly, 31:365, October, 1961.

⁵Ibid., pp. 366-67.

reporting that the C.O.A. and L.E.D. would be undertaking the consideration of separate standards, indicated that their main concern was ". . . whether the concept of a common core of knowledge for all librarians, regardless of type of work - a concept upon which present accrediting standards are based - is now to be abandoned by the profession."⁶

Contained within the same issue of the same periodical was a debate on specialized vs. general library education. Jackson, president of the Special Libraries Association, summarized his belief in specialization by stating that ". . . diffused generalization of the past can no longer be afforded. . . ."⁷ Speaking in favor of general education, Rothstein based his argument upon ". . . the 3 prime objectives of any profession - unity, flexibility, and mobility.", subsequently concluding that "You cannot have both specificity and mobility, and I consider the latter the greater prize."⁸

One month prior to the 1962 American Library Association convention which was to take under consideration, then reject, separate standards for school library programs,

⁶Robert R. Douglas and Sarah R. Reed, "Library Education Today and Tomorrow," American Library Association Bulletin, 56:292, April, 1961.

⁷Eugene Jackson and Samuel Rothstein, "Should Library Schools Produce Specialists or Generalists?" American Library Association Bulletin, 56:320, April, 1962.

⁸Ibid., p. 322.

Gaver issued the first public proclamation for reinterpretation of the present standards, allowing accreditation of single-purpose programs, stating:

It would appear to me that if such a school applied for ALA accreditation and met standards in all respects except the offering of course work in other special areas, it would be worthy of accreditation.⁹

The following year, 1963, guided by an unpublished in-house study, the L.E.D. recommended to C.O.A. that single-purpose programs be eligible for accreditation.¹⁰ The subsequent acceptance of this recommendation and the revision of C.O.A. policy thereby ensuring that single-purpose programs were eligible for accreditation were reported in the literature, although these reports noticeably lacked commentary.

The American Library Association C.O.A., as late as 1970, continued to discuss and question ". . . the matter of single-purpose programs which appear to fall within the ALA's area of responsibility, and are eligible for evaluation under the Standards for Accreditation but which do not

⁹Mary Helen Mahar, ed., The School Library As a Materials Center, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 001 318, October, 1961, p. 79.

¹⁰American Library Association Library Education Division Newsletter, 45:2, March, 1963.

use the traditional library terminology."¹¹ Also of interest, during the following year, the Junior Members Round Table urged ". . . that library schools specialize in one type of librarianship - medical, school, etc."¹²

As recently as 1973, Krikelas and Monroe identified the necessity for research investigating specialized library programs. Their review of the literature includes but one relevant research study; however, it was an examination of the curriculum.¹³

Throughout this literature review can be discerned the expression of a variety of opinions, but a lack of published research examining the products of these two forms of school library education: single- and multi-purpose programs.

Continuing education appears to be a prime target of interest within many professions; and, while research efforts are readily available, none investigate the unique characteristics of professional preparation. Library professional literature pertaining to continuing education is similar in characteristics to that of single- and multi-purpose programs literature; however, there are two

¹¹American Library Association, Proceedings (Chicago: The Association, 1971), p. 166.

¹²"Update ALA Accreditation Urge Junior Members," Library Journal, 96:577, February 15, 1971.

¹³James Krikelas and Margaret E. Monroe, "General vs. Specialized Library Education," Targets for Research in Library Education, ed. Harold Borko (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), pp. 40-42.

research studies which are of some relevance to the proposed study.

Stone's 1968 study was primarily concerned with motivational factors which encouraged or discouraged librarians to engage in continuing education. Peripheral to the stated purpose, however, was an examination of the responses of 151 graduates of accredited library schools to an open-end question concerning recommendations to various groups within the profession regarding responsibility for continuing education. Included among these groups were library schools which the respondents felt should be held responsible for the following areas: 1) content of continuing education, 2) MLS curriculum content, and 3) conveying the value of continuing education.¹⁴ The third area is the one which the proposed study intends to further investigate in relationship to the graduates of single- and multi-purpose programs.

In a periodical article, Stone synthesized data from her dissertation to compare responses of school librarians with those of academic, public and special librarians. Her findings disclosed that the school librarians, graduates of accredited programs, seek continuing education methods which are both old and unsuccessful; such as, professional reading; involvement in professional associations,

¹⁴Elizabeth W. Stone, Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1969), p. 181.

conferences and workshops; and, promotion of new materials. On the other hand, school librarians exhibited more interest and involvement than the other librarians in the following vital elements of continuing education: promotion of increased assessibility of books and libraries; and, promotion of legal support for intellectual freedom and financial assistance for libraries.¹⁵

Under the sponsorship of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, a study of continuing education was undertaken, resulting in the establishment of CLENE which is to be a "service and resource facility designed for all levels of personnel in the library and information science field."¹⁶ Among the many considerations under the auspices of CLENE was identification of possible responsibilities of library schools in the issue of continuing education. Contained within these responsibilities was "Alerting students to their need for life-long education and their responsibilities for continuing their education."¹⁷

In general, the literature cited in this review indicates a decided interest in the subject areas of the

¹⁵Elizabeth W. Stone, "Continuing Education: Avenue to Adventure," School Libraries, 18:40-42, Summer, 1969.

¹⁶Elizabeth W. Stone et al., Continuing Library and Information Science Education, Final Report, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100 312, 1974, pp. 3-55.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 2-82.

proposed study. Research efforts in assessing graduates of single- and multi-purpose programs; and, in the area of continuing education are very limited. The present study is an attempt to generate quantitative insights into these much discussed topics.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

POPULATION

The population for the study consisted of listings of 230 graduated school librarians provided by the Head of the Department of Library Science, University of Northern Iowa and the Administrative Assistant of the School of Library Science, University of Iowa.

Two random samples of 50 each were drawn from the numbered population list of currently employed school librarians who graduated in the years 1969-1974 from:

- a. The University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, a non-accredited single-purpose program, and
- b. The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, an accredited multi-purpose program.

School librarians, for the purposes of this study, refers to those with a master's degree with a major in school library science who are certified by the state in which they are employed.

INSTRUMENTATION

A questionnaire, (see Appendix A) excerpted and adapted from one developed by Stone for her study

investigating continuing education, was sent on April 14, 1976 to each member of the randomly selected sample, accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix B) and a post-paid, addressed return envelope. A three-week period was observed before sending a follow-up letter (see Appendix C) to non-respondents. Another three-week period was allowed, establishing May 27, 1976 as the cut-off date for reception of questionnaires to be analyzed.

The instrument was composed of three sections, each designed to elicit information on one aspect of the relationship between continuing education and professional preparation. The first section of the questionnaire listed twenty-one continuing education activities commonly pursued on an individual basis. These items covered four major areas: 1) extra-library service, such as speaking to community groups and the promotion of new materials; 2) personal activities, such as reading in the professional literature; 3) formal coursework undertaken to enhance professional abilities; and, 4) public promotion, such as financial support for libraries and legal support of intellectual freedom.

Group functions was the subject of the second section of the instrument and was comprised of thirteen statements pertaining to activities: 1) inside the library, 2) outside the specific library, but library oriented, and 3) within community groups.

These first two sections of the data-gathering

instrument were structured to measure the respondent's present degree of involvement in each of the thirty-four continuing education activities as well as his perception of the degree of importance each item should be accorded. Subjects indicated their responses on a pair of three position scales accompanying each statement. Sections one and two of the instrument also provided two each write-in responses.

The final section of the instrument related specifically to the respondent's perception of the library school's responsibility in continuing education for the practicing school librarian. This section concluded with an open-ended question soliciting recommendations for action to be taken by leaders in graduate library education within the two institutions, the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa.¹

Stone's validation of the instrument encompassed reading in the literature of questionnaire development, as well as seeking advice from practicing librarians and professional literature prior to the development of the first draft. Throughout a series of 12 revisions, 2 pretests were employed to further refine the instrument.²

For the purposes of the present study, only one

¹Elizabeth W. Stone, "A Study of Some Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians" (PhD dissertation, American University, 1968), pp. 441-42, 444-45.

²Elizabeth W. Stone, Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1969), pp. 29-30.

section, which emphasized continuing education activities, was used. Several items such as "Staff associations for all employees in my library" were eliminated as they were felt to be inappropriate to school librarianship. Also, several items were modified to address themselves more adequately to school librarians. For example, the item which investigated involvement and importance in employees unions was reworded to read "Educators' associations or unions."

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Eighty-one percent of the 100 questionnaires were returned: 38 from the University of Iowa (U.I.) sample and 43 from the University of Northern Iowa (U.N.I.) sample. Five U.I. returns and one U.N.I. return were removed for the following reasons: a) not employed as a school librarian, and b) moved, left no forwarding address.

The gathered data were then separated into two groups: 42 school librarians from the single-purpose program and 33 from the multi-purpose program.

Each of the four responses to the activities listed on the instrument, items 1-21 and 24-36, was weighted in both degree of involvement and degree of importance as follows:

- 3 = greatest involvement/importance
- 2 = average involvement/importance
- 1 = little involvement/importance
- 0 = no response, indicating no involvement or importance

Disparity scores were derived by subtracting the involvement score from the importance score. These weighted ratings were then summed to yield weighted scores, allowing ranking of each item by magnitude of score in two columns: degree of involvement and degree of importance. Weighted scores were also determined for each questionnaire. Two write-in

responses (items 22-23) at the conclusion of the individual activities section and 2 (items 37-38) at the conclusion of the group activities section will be analyzed narratively later in this chapter.

Hypotheses 1,2 and 3 were tested through the analysis of variance technique to reveal any statistical differences between the two groups in degree of involvement, importance and disparity. The hypotheses were analyzed by evaluating the F-ratios at the .05 level of confidence ($F_{.05}=3.09.$)¹

The first hypothesis tested was: There is no significant difference between the two groups in degree of involvement in continuing education. The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Group Means and Standard Deviations
for Degree of Involvement

Group	N	Mean	S.D.
U.I.	33	52.45	7.24
U.N.I.	42	54.17	14.55

¹N.M. Downie and R.W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 215-24, 316.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
ANOVA for Degree of Involvement

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	1	54.17	54.17	0.27
Within groups	74	15036.01	203.19	
Total	75	15090.18		

df = degree of freedom
SS = sum of squares
MS = mean squares

$$F_{.05} = 3.09$$

Results of the F-test reveal no significant difference between the two groups, thus the null hypothesis is retained, indicating that the two samples may be considered parts of a single homogeneous population since the within group variance about their means exceeds the variance between the groups.

Tables 3 and 4 display the group means and standard deviations, and the ANOVA for hypothesis 2 which stated: There is no significant difference between the two troupes in degree of importance placed upon continuing education.

Table 3

Group Means and Standard Deviations
for Degree of Importance

Group	N	Mean	S.D.
U.I.	33	64.79	7.24
U.N.I.	42	66.62	8.16

Table 4

ANOVA for Degree of Importance

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	1	61.97	61.97	0.32
Within groups	74	14247.42	193.37	
Total	75	14309.39		

No statistically significant difference resulted from the analysis of variance; therefore, the null hypothesis must be retained.

The third hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the two groups in the disparity between the degree of involvement and the degree of importance, was next treated, as follows:

Table 5
Group Means and Standard Deviations
for Disparity

Group	N	Mean	S.D.
U.I.	33	12.64	3.55
U.N.I.	42	12.45	10.77

Table 6
ANOVA for Disparity

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	1	.63	.63	2.17
Within groups	74	215176980.10	2907797.03	
Total	75	215176980.73		

The F-test indicates no significant difference between the two groups, thus the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

The fourth and final hypothesis, there is no significant difference between the two groups in the form of continuing education pursued or viewed as most desirable, was analyzed via the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient (ρ)² which is a measure of relationship between two variables. Mean scores of both groups for each of the 34 items were ranked and ρ was then calculated, yielding the following results:

Table 7
Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient
For Total of All Items
Representing Involvement and Importance

Involvement	Importance
$\rho = 0.90^*$	$\rho = 0.92^*$

* $t_{.001} = .5541$ for $df = 32$ ³

As ρ far exceeds the level of significance, the null hypothesis must be retained. In view of the relatively high correlation, further statistical investigation of this hypothesis was conducted in an item-by-item analysis utilizing the "student" t-test⁴ technique. Table 8 displays the results of the involvement t-test.

²Ibid., pp. 122-3.

³Ibid., p. 318.

⁴Ibid., p. 179.

Table 8
Involvement Item-by-Item t-tests

Item	t	U.N.I. \bar{x} N=42	U.I. \bar{x} N=33
1	0.20	1.10	1.06
2	1.88*	1.45	1.12
3	1.04	1.86	1.64
4	-0.18	2.36	2.39
5	1.20	2.17	1.91
6	-1.25	1.55	1.79
7	-0.22	2.45	2.48
8	0.79	2.24	2.09
9	-0.67	2.07	2.15
10	0.36	0.93	0.88
11	0.94	0.81	0.70
12	0.91	1.10	0.94
13	0.97	0.79	0.67
14	0.70	0.76	0.67
15	1.11	1.33	1.06
16	1.27	1.86	1.52
17	0.71	1.86	1.70
18	-0.25	2.00	2.06
19	-0.44	1.48	1.58
20	-0.60	1.31	1.42
21	-1.12	1.55	1.79
24	-0.90	1.93	2.12
25	-0.32	2.02	2.09
26	1.00	2.07	1.85
27	-0.68	1.76	1.91
28	-2.24*	0.90	1.30
29	-1.73*	1.79	2.12
30	-2.10*	1.86	2.21
31	1.85*	1.33	0.94
32	1.79*	1.79	1.39
33	1.01	1.00	0.79
34	0.11	1.24	1.21
35	1.55	1.98	1.61
36	1.03	1.02	0.82

*Significant, one-tailed $t_{.05}$

$30df = 1.671^5$

⁵Ibid., p. 318.

Within the Individual Activities section of the instrument, significance occurred in but one item (Item 2) wherein the single-purpose sample (U.N.I.) showed greater involvement in recruitment for the profession of librarianship. The Group Activities section, Library Oriented, but Outside My Own Library subsection, revealed the greatest differences and accounts for the major portion of the lack of perfect correlation of rho. The multi-purpose sample (U.I.) displayed greater involvement in these items:

28. Alumni associations of my library school.
29. Library and/or educational conventions and/or meetings.
30. Workshops, seminars, institutes . . .

The following 2 items, numbers 31 and 32, Small voluntary study and/or discussion group. and Non-library/educational associations respectively, are ones in which the U.N.I. sample showed significantly more involvement.

Both samples showed the greatest involvement in Item 7, Reading professional literature in library science and Item 4, Promotion of new materials and equipment.

Items in which the least degree of involvement occurred, within both samples are:

10. Writing for the profession.
11. Editing for the profession.

Table 9 presents the results of the t-test for importance.

Table 9
Importance Item-by-Item t-tests

Item	t	U.N.I. \bar{x} N=42	U.I. \bar{x} N=33
1	-0.77	1.55	1.70
2	1.96	1.93	1.61
3	1.63	2.24	1.94
4	0.44	2.45	2.36
5	0.55	2.55	2.45
6	0.17	2.12	2.09
7	-1.32	2.57	2.73
8	0.61	2.48	2.39
9	0.12	2.29	2.27
10	-0.51	1.48	1.58
11	0.68	1.21	1.09
12	0.43	1.64	1.55
13 ^P	2.18*	1.19	0.79
14	1.42	1.12	0.85
15	0.63	1.62	1.45
16	0.93	2.07	1.82
17	-0.48	1.83	1.94
18	-1.02	2.21	2.42
19	0.10	2.48	2.45
20	0.20	2.29	2.24
21	-0.72	2.26	2.39
24	-0.55	2.33	2.42
25	-0.45	2.38	2.45
26	-0.33	2.21	2.27
27	-0.51	2.14	2.24
28	-0.01	1.45	1.45
29	-0.10	2.07	2.09
30	-0.97	2.40	2.58
31	1.23	1.79	1.52
32	1.25	1.88	1.64
33	1.25	1.12	0.88
34	-0.57	1.48	1.51
35	1.28	1.95	1.67
36	1.16	1.50	1.24

*Significant, one-tailed $t_{.05}$

$30df = 1.671^6$

⁶Ibid., p. 318.

Significance occurred but once in this treatment wherein the U.N.I. sample placed more importance upon Item 13, Entertaining visiting foreign librarians. Item 7 was accorded the same intensity of importance as involvement; however, Item 4 was displaced in the importance t-test by Item 5, Working for the increased accessibility of books and libraries.

In general, both the involvement and importance t-tests reaffirmed the homogeneity which exists between the two groups.

Items 22-23 and 37-38 allowed for write-in responses for individual activities and group activities, respectively, which were not listed within the questionnaire. Response rate to these items was very low and analysis of these responses revealed that many pertained to items listed on the questionnaire. Relevant responses to the individual activities write-in portion were:

- a) Teaching library related courses in a junior college (U.I.)
- b) Teaching courses and workshops (U.N.I.)
- c) Cataloging the church library (U.N.I.)
- d) Gifted student special project (U.N.I.)

Only one pertinent group activity was noted: NCA evaluation team (U.I.)

The concluding question of the instrument which sought continuing education recommendations for library schools also evoked little response. Table 10 presents

a composite of pertinent responses, in which categories were established by the researcher.

Table 10

Composite Recommendations
to Library Schools
for Continuing Education Activities

Number of Responses	<u>U.I.</u> Activity	Number of Responses	<u>U.N.I.</u> Activity
6	Management/administrative a. time b. budget and school finance c. goal-setting d. decision-making e. government programs	4	Management/administrative a. time b. budget c. political internal forces in education d. personnel selection
1	Visitation to other IMC's	3	Visitation to other IMC's
1	Communication skills	1	Communication skills
4	Current awareness programs in education	1	Current awareness programs in education and media
1	Methods for developing community relations with public libraries	2	Post-graduate work a. greater variety and specialization b. correspondence courses
		2	Library school faculty activities a. strive for state funds to support continuing educa- tion b. recruitment and encourage- ment to those in the field to pursue continuing educa- tion c. greater involvement in the field

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The present study sought to determine if the form of school librarian graduate professional education, single-purpose or multi-purpose, had any impact upon perceptions and actions pertaining to continuing education.

Although a search of the literature revealed many descriptive references to single-purpose vs. multi-purpose approaches, there were no published research studies probing products of these two forms of professional education. Similarly, the literature of continuing education was rich in commentary but lacking in published research findings with but one notable exception which was supportive of and lent direction to the present investigation, Stone's 1968 dissertation, A Study of Some Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians.

The data-gathering instrument, excerpted and adapted from Stone's questionnaire, was designed to elicit information concerning twenty-one individual and twelve group activities which were perceived to have a direct relationship to professional growth and continuing education. The instrument was structured to measure the respondent's

present degree of involvement in each activity as well as his perception of the degree of importance each item should be accorded. Space was allotted for two write-in responses each at the conclusions of both the individual and group activities sections. In conclusion, the survey instrument posed an open-ended question soliciting recommendations to library schools in developing future opportunities for continuing education.¹

The questionnaire was sent to two random samples drawn from currently employed school librarians who graduated in the years 1969-1974 from a single-purpose program, the University of Northern Iowa (N=50) and a multi-purpose program, the University of Iowa (N=50.) Eighty-one percent response to the instrument was attained with 75 percent being applicable to analysis.

Analysis of the generated data may be summarized as follows:

I. Implementation of the analysis of variance treatment revealed no statistically significant difference between the two groups, single-purpose and multi-purpose in:

- a) degree of involvement in continuing education, b) degree of importance placed upon continuing education, and
- c) disparity between the degree of involvement and the degree of importance.

¹Elizabeth W. Stone, "A Study of Some Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians" (PhD dissertation, American University, 1968), pp. 441-42, 444-45.

II. Based upon the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups in the form of continuing education pursued or held as most valuable. Item-by-item analysis, employing the t-test statistic, however, did reveal seven items to be significantly different: six in involvement and one in importance.

III. Response rate to the four write-in provisions was relatively low and contained no similarities either between or within groups; and, while response rate to the open-end concluding question of the instrument was also sparse, the recommendations set forth to their library schools were closely parallel, particularly within the following areas: management/administrative functions, desires for visitation programs to other school libraries, communication skills, and current awareness programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present exploratory study seem to indicate that, for these two samples, the form of professional preparation has no impact upon perceptions and actions pertaining to continuing education activities. This is not intended to imply that differences cannot or do not exist in other areas of professionalism or in the graduate school preparation; however, analysis of the factor under consideration revealed a statistically high degree of homogeneity between the two samples. Nor, under

any circumstances, can these results be considered generalizable to any other population.

The on-going concern for the unique preparation of school librarians, particularly as to the role and function of school library single-purpose programs which has been expressed throughout the professional literature can now, however, be statistically responded to in part within the delimitations of this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations for further study set forth herein evolve from the two-prong nature of the present study, single-purpose vs. multi-purpose programs and continuing education, and are thus presented.

A. Single-purpose vs. multi-purpose programs:

1. Replication studies may be made of the present study, utilizing a larger sample. *participation*
2. Content areas of the two school librarianship professional preparations may be investigated to determine continuing education emphasis contained therein.
3. Research similar to the present study may be undertaken, controlling variables which were not under consideration; such as, age, marital and family status, area of residence, and availability of continuing education activities.

B. Continuing education for school librarians:

1. Further investigation of a larger sample, encompassing not only single- and multi-purpose program graduates but also those from a bachelor degree program.
2. Needs assessments should be elicited from practicing school librarians.
3. Continuing education opportunities ^{could} may be ^{provided in school situations} provided with research efforts being concentrated upon: a) those seeking vs. those not seeking participation, and b) the disparity between involvement and importance.
4. Theoretical formulations ^{of} of continuing education activities should be developed to determine those activities which may produce the greatest degree of relevance and success in terms of their impact upon the school library and the school librarian as an integral and contributing part of the school and the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Library Association Library Education Division Newsletter, 4-82, August, 1950-September, 1975.
- American Library Association. Proceedings. Chicago: The Association, 1951-1971.
- American Library Association. Standards for Accreditation. Chicago: The Association, 1972.
- Borko, Harold, ed. Targets for Research in Library Education. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.
- Douglas, Robert R. and Sarah R. Reed. "Library Education Today and Tomorrow," American Library Association Bulletin, 56:292, April, 1962.
- Downie, N.M. and R.C. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. 3d ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Drexel Library Quarterly, 3, 1967.
- Jackson, Eugene and Samuel Rothstein. "Should Library Schools Produce Specialists or Generalists?" American Library Association Bulletin, 56:320-22, April, 1962.
- Journal of Education for Librarianship, 1-15, 1960-1975.
- Library Trends, 20, July, 1971.
- McJenkin, Virginia. "Continuing Education for School Librarians," American Library Association Bulletin, 61: 272-75, March, 1967.
- Mahar, Mary Helen. "The Accommodation of Specialization," Library Quarterly, 31:365-67, October, 1961.
- _____, ed. The School Library As a Materials Center. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 001 318, 1964.
- Pomohac, Gertrude C., ed. Education for Librarianship. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 054 825, 1970.
- Reece, Ernest J. The Curriculum in Library Schools. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

- Reed, Sarah R. "A Reinterpretation of Standards," American Library Association Bulletin, 57:247, March, 1963.
- Rothstein, Samuel. "Nobody's Baby; a Brief Sermon on Continuing Professional Education," Library Journal, 90:2226-27, May 15, 1965.
- Schick, Frank L. North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, 1966-1968. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.
- _____. North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, 1969-1971. Chicago: American Library Association, 1972.
- School Library Manpower Project. Curriculum Alternatives. Chicago: American Library Association, 1974.
- Stone, Elizabeth W. "Continuing Education: Avenue to Adventure," School Libraries, 18:37-46, Summer, 1969.
- _____. "Continuing Education in Librarianship: Ideas for Action," American Libraries, 1:543-53, June, 1970.
- _____, et al. Continuing Library and Information Science Education, Final Report. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100 312, 1974.
- _____. Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1969.
- _____. "Librarians and Continuing Education," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 11:64-71, Summer, 1970.
- _____. "A Study of Some Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians." PhD dissertation, American University, 1968.
- Sullivan, P.A. "Staff Development: A Continuing Theme with Variations," School Media Quarterly, 1:179-200, Spring, 1973.
- "Upgrade ALA Accreditation Urge Junior Members," Library Journal, 96:577, February 15, 1971.
- Voight, M.J., ed. Advances in Librarianship. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Wheeler, Joseph L. Progress and Problems in Education for Librarianship. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1946.

Williamson, C.C. The Williamson Reports of 1921 and 1923.
Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971.

Woodworth, Mary L., ed. The Identification and Examination
of Areas of Needed Research in School Librarianship,
Final Report. U.S., Educational Resources Information
Center, ERIC Document 018 243, November, 1967.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

YOUR ACTIVITIES CONCERNING CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Below are listed some **INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES** that have been claimed to have a relation to continuing education and professional growth. You are asked to react to each activity in 2 ways:

1. **How important is each activity to you?** That is, how deeply are you involved in the expenditure of time, energy, and effort? Please **CHECK** in **Column A** the symbol that best describes your involvement.

2. How important do you feel each activity **SHOULD BE TO YOU PERSONALLY** in order to achieve your maximum potential in the area of continuing education and professional growth? Please **CHECK** the symbol that best describes how important each item **should be** to you.

DIRECTIONS: In completing this section, please **CHECK** the bracket beneath the symbol which best describes your reaction in **BOTH** columns **A** and **B**. If an item has no importance to you or if you have not been involved in it at all, leave the bracket that pertains to it blank.

IN COLUMN A — How important is each activity to you?

I am very
much involved

I am somewhat
involved

I have little
involvement

IN COLUMN B — How important **SHOULD** each activity be to you for maximum growth?

It should of major
importance to me

It should be fairly
important to me

It should be of little
importance

A
INVOLVEMENT

B
IMPORTANCE

INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO MY CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Extra Library Service Outside My Library

- Speaking to community groups.
- Recruitment for the profession of librarianship.
- Assistance to other librarians in other projects related to the profession (off-the-job).
- Promotion of new materials and equipment.
- Working for the increased accessibility of books and libraries.
- Support of national promotional campaigns on the behalf of reading, books, and libraries.

Personal Activities, such as

- Reading professional literature in library science.
- Reading professional literature in education.
- Visiting other libraries.
- Writing for the profession.
- Editing for the profession.
- Carrying out research in library science or in the educational field.
- Entertaining visiting foreign librarians.

Formal Course Work for

- A Ph.D. in library science or in a related subject area.
- A Master's in a related subject field.
- Certification requirements.
- Salary increment.
- Enrichment purposes.

	A	B	
	INVOLVEMENT	IMPORTANCE	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
1.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
2.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
3.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
4.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
5.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
6.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
7.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
8.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
9.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
10.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
11.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
12.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
13.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
14.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
15.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
16.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
17.	[] [] []	[] [] []	
18.	[] [] []	[] [] []	

A
INVOLVEMENT

B
IMPORTANCE

19. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 20. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 21. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 22. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 23. [] [] [] [] [] [] []

Legislative Promotion of
 Financial support for school libraries.
 Legal support of intellectual freedom.
 Librarians' and teachers' tenure, retirements, etc.

Other Individual Activities

Now that you have indicated your involvement and importance in individual activities, please indicate the MEASURE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN GROUP ACTIVITIES IN TWO WAYS.

IN COLUMN A — What IS the extent of your participation in each group activity?

I am a leader (would include holding office, teaching, being chairman of committees, etc.)

I am an active member (would include regular attendance, membership on committees, etc.)

I am a member, but not active

IN COLUMN B — How important do you feel each GROUP ACTIVITY SHOULD BE for maximum growth?

It should be of major importance to me

It should be fairly important to me

It should be of little importance

A
INVOLVEMENT

B
IMPORTANCE

GROUP ACTIVITIES RELATED TO MY CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

In My Library

- In-service (on-the-job) training programs.
 Committees on library goals, procedures, policies, etc.
 Educators' associations or unions.

Library Oriented, but Outside My Own Library

- Library and/or educational associations.
 Alumni associations of my library school.
 Library and/or educational conventions and/or meetings.
 Workshops, seminars, institutes pertaining to:
 a. more efficient daily operation of your library
 b. the use and maintenance of audiovisual software and hardware
 c. innovative trends in education
 d. innovative trends in library science.
 Small voluntary study and/or discussion group. (May meet regularly or occasionally.)
 Non-library/educational associations.
 Honor societies (Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Delta Kappa, etc.)

24. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 25. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 26. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 27. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 28. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 29. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 30. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 31. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 32. [] [] [] [] [] [] []
 33. [] [] [] [] [] [] []

A
INVOLVEMENT

B
IMPORTANCE

- 34. [] [] []
- 35. [] [] []
- 36. [] [] []

- [] [] []
- [] [] []
- [] [] []

Community Activities, such as
 Community service clubs.
 Church groups.
 Political clubs.

Other Group Activities

- 37. [] [] []

- [] [] []

- 38. [] [] []

- [] [] []

Think now of the conditions and factors relative to your continuing education and professional growth activities as a whole. John Lorenz has put forth the thesis that society has a right to look to the various professions themselves for effective planning and action in developing opportunities for continuing education.

Suppose that the faculty of your library school asked you to develop recommendations for action, and suppose further that you were asked to consider and suggest way-out ideas as well as those which seem practical and appropriate for present conditions as you see them. What recommendations would you address to them?

Thank you for your time and effort in assisting me. And, please feel free to add any further comments. They will be welcomed!

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER

Department of Library Science
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls IA 50613
April 15, 1976

I am a candidate for the Master of Arts degree with a major in library science at the University of Northern Iowa and have become very interested in the continuing education and professional growth of school librarians.

Continuing education doesn't refer exclusively to formal course work but rather encompasses a composite of activities which contribute to professional knowledge and mastery of skills, leading toward increasingly effective performance. In view of school librarians' dual role in library science and education, the matter of continuing education becomes even more significant. Currently, increased emphasis upon continuing education has been evidenced through the recent establishment of a national service and resource organization, CLENE, as well as through concerted efforts upon meaningful activities on the state, regional and local levels.

The enclosed questionnaire is an important part of my study in that I am seeking your professional opinions regarding your involvement and interests in continuing education, as well as your recommendations for future opportunities. Of course, your responses will be confidential and will be tabulated with the responses of others.

I am aware that you are very busy; however, could you please spare a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire?

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Respectfully yours,

Marilyn M. Norton

APPENDIX C
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

700 W. Ridgeway, ro. 423
Waterloo IA 50701
May 6, 1976

The end of the school year is rapidly approaching and I'm sure it is an especially busy time for you; students and faculty have last-minute "rush" projects, and your usual activities continue to demand your attention.

And, to further compete for your valuable time, I'm writing to inquire about the questionnaire on continuing education which I sent you several weeks ago. As I indicated at that time, your professional opinions are eagerly sought.

Should our communications cross in the mail, please accept my apologies.

Thanks, again, for your cooperation and assistance.

Respectfully yours,

Marilyn M. Norton