# School Library Media Specialists' Perceptions of Practice and Importance of Roles Described in Information Power

**Anne McCracken**, **Library Program Specialist/Project Manager, Fairfax County Public Schools, Virginia**

*To determine if practicing school library media specialists perceive they have been able to implement their roles as described in* Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs *(1988) and* Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning *(1998), a survey was developed by the researcher. The survey further sought to determine if school library media specialists perceive it is important to assume a leadership role in the use of instructional technology. The survey was distributed to a random sample of 1,000 school library media specialists. Analysis of the 505 returned surveys indicates that school library media specialists perceive they are unable to fully implement their roles in practice. The most frequent barriers to full implementation were lack of time, including lack of time to plan with teachers; lack of adequate funding; lack of interest and support of classroom teachers; use of a fixed schedule; lack of clerical staff; and too many schools or students to provide for. Elementary school library media specialists who use flexible scheduling perceive they are able to practice more roles than library media specialists who use either combination or fixed scheduling.*

Research demonstrates that there is a correlation between student achievement and the presence of a well-funded school library media center with a professional library media specialist. Where school library media centers are better funded, academic achievement is higher, whether schools are rich or poor and whether adults in the community are well or poorly educated. Among school and community factors that determine academic achievement, the size of the library collection and the presence of a professional library media specialist is second only to the absence of at-risk conditions of poverty and low educational achievement among adults (Lance, Welborn, and Hamilton-Pennell 1994). Research also demonstrates that students in schools with strong library media programs score higher on tests for reading and basic study skills (Didier 1984; Yoo 1998) and a correlation between academic achievement and the use of the school library (Koga and Harada 1989). Students in schools with library media specialists not only read more, they enjoy reading more (Krashen 1993). The presence of a school media center with a library media specialist also contributes to students' positive self-perception (Hopkins 1989).

Research also indicates that, despite the positive impact of the library media specialist, many education professionals do not have a clear understanding of the library media specialist's role. Principals, teachers, and library media specialists themselves share many misconceptions about the role (Dorrell and Lawson 1995; Horton 1989; Naylor and Jenkins 1988; Ceperley 1991). Even though library media specialists have been characterized as "instructional leaders,

curriculum developers, and resource consultants par excellence" (Craver 1986, 183), they suffer from actual and perceived isolation from other aspects of the instructional process (Naylor and Jenkins 1988). Some professionals have questioned if the different occupational titles library media specialists have assumed in the last 30 years (librarian, teacher-librarian, and library media specialist) were legitimate attempts to define the role of the library media specialist, overcome an unfavorable stereotype, or provide a more comforting self-image (Wilson 1979).

Rapid advances in technology have increased the confusion over the library media specialist's role. One professional has stated that "working with young people in library media centers in times of tremendous social, educational, and technological change is like attempting to maintain balance while running across a series of tightropes in the midst of a tornado" (Vandergrift 1997, 28). Others state that unless librarians distinguish their role, particularly in relation to information technologies, they may disappear from schools (Yates 1997).

Misunderstandings among educators, including library media specialists, exist despite the description of the library media specialist's role in professional literature and in statements published by professional organizations. In 1988 the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) published *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs*. This landmark publication defined the role of the library media specialist as teacher, information specialist, and instructional consultant. In 1998 AASL and AECT published *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*. It defined the library media specialist's role as teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator.

## Research on the Perceptions of the Roles of School Librarians

In addition to documenting the value of school libraries, research shows misunderstandings regarding the role of the school librarian. A review of Craver's research conducted from 1950 to 1984 revealed that the instructional role of the school librarian had changed only slightly. Craver concluded that there is a lag of at least 10 years between the role being prescribed in the literature and that being practiced (1986). A review of the literature since 1984 reveals little change (Pickard 1993).

Differing perceptions among librarians, principals, and teachers about the role of the school librarian can be a significant barrier to implementing change. Naylor and Jenkins (1988) researched the evaluation process of school librarians by principals in North Carolina. They found that school principals did not have a clear understanding of the school librarian's role but that librarians themselves did. They concluded that this provided school librarians a valuable opportunity to define their role. This lack of understanding about the school librarians' role was demonstrated in research conducted by Ervin in 1989. She found that the majority of school librarians surveyed in South Carolina agreed with the roles specified in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988), but that they were able to practice them only occasionally. The main barrier to further implementation was lack of time and understanding of their role by teachers and principals.

This confusion over the role of the school librarian was echoed in other research studies. A survey of principals and library media specialists in Alberta revealed that principals and library media specialists both viewed the information specialist role to be of primary importance. The survey also demonstrated that principals and library media specialists have different perceptions of the importance of library media specialist's involvement with curriculum and instruction (Hauck and Schieman 1985). A 1987 survey of teachers and principals in Kansas revealed that both groups had generally positive views of school library media specialists, but that the two groups viewed the roles of the library media specialist differently (Hortin 1989). In 1995 secondary-school principals in Missouri were surveyed (Dorrell and Lawson, 1995) to determine if they thought it was important to practice the roles prescribed for school librarians in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988): information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. The results of the survey revealed that principals held a more traditional view of the role of the school librarian. The principals put the most importance on the information specialist role, selecting materials, and providing reference services to students; of less importance were the teaching and consultation roles (Dorrell and Lawson 1995).

A 1988 statewide survey of library media specialists in Nevada found that library media specialists viewed themselves as instructional leaders (Master and Master 1988). Survey results revealed that library media specialists were particularly involved in language arts, social studies, and science programs in a support capacity. The survey also found that school principals set the tone for the reception of the library media specialist by the school staff. Similar results on the role of the school librarian in supporting education reform were found in Kentucky (Shannon 1996). Shannon found that librarians were active members of their school. They served on school committees, provided training in the use of technology and library resources to teachers, and looked for opportunities to show teachers how they could support their teaching. One of the primary barriers to school librarians taking a more active role in instruction was lack of understanding on the part of school administrators about the role of the school librarian.

Research also demonstrates that many times school librarians do not perceive the instructional consultant role prescribed in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988) as being of primary importance. A survey of librarians and principals in Arizona (30% response rate) revealed that librarians and principals both rated the instructional role of the school librarian as being low in priority (Schon 1991). Johnson found that Illinois school librarians did not regard the instructional consultant role prescribed in *Information Power* (1988) as highly important. The librarians viewed their role as providing information and support to teachers and students.

Even when librarians perceive an instructional role as being important, they infrequently practice that role. In 1993 Pickard researched the instructional role practiced by school librarians in DeKalb County (Georgia) public schools. She found that, although the majority of the librarians perceived the instructional role as important or very important, fewer than 10% indicated that they practiced the role to a great or very great extent. Many of the librarians viewed the prescribed role of an instructional leader and innovator as belonging to the instructional lead teacher and assistant principal for instruction rather than the librarian.

In 1994 Van Deusen and Tallman conducted research to determine if scheduling method affects the teaching and consultative role practiced by school librarians. They found that the consultative

role is generally practiced at a low level. In the majority of cases in which it was practiced at a high level, flexible scheduling was used for the school library. They also found that more planning and teaching with classroom teachers occurred when a flexible schedule was used.

In 1996 Putnam surveyed 296 elementary school librarians who were ALA members on their perceptions of the role of the school librarian. She found that school librarians practice the instructional consultant role less than they thought they should. Librarians who used a flexible schedule placed more emphasis on instructional consulting than those who used a fixed schedule. A survey of school librarians in Georgia showed similar results (Jones 1997). The survey found widespread agreement across all instructional levels that participation in the curriculum development process is important. However, few librarians acknowledged such involvement to any appreciable extent.

In order to determine how well school librarians are able to realize the mission and objectives of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988), McCarthy (1997) studied 48 school library programs in New England. She found that the school librarians were strongly committed to the mission and objectives. However, no school had fully implemented all the guidelines. Of the librarians, 58% thought that *Information Power* was not realizable in their school. The main barriers were lack of support from administrators (for budget, scheduling, staff, and resources) and from teachers (for collaboration and integration).

# Purpose of the Study

This study sought to determine if practicing library media specialists perceive that they have been able to implement the 1988 and 1998 national standards and if they think it is important to implement the standards at their school. The study also examined the role library media specialists perceive they should practice—and do practice—in relation to instructional technology. The study considered the following descriptive variables:

- Level of school (elementary or secondary)
- Number of years of professional experience as a library media specialist
- Number of years experience as a classroom teacher
- Amount of available technology
- Type of scheduling used (flexible, fixed, or a combination)
- Reported practices and views of library media specialists

Correlations were determined between the descriptive variables and views of library media specialists. The full research questions are provided in appendix.

If library media specialists perceive it is important to implement the standards, and that they have been to implementing the standards in practice, the profession will be in a strong position to educate teachers and principals about the importance of their role and its effect on student achievement. It is also important for university educators and for those developing continuing education programs to know where misunderstandings exist so that they may improve the education of future and practicing librarians.

# Method

An extensive review of the literature on the role of the library media specialist was conducted, including *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988), *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998), and similar research (Pickard 1993; McIntosh 1994; Lai 1995). A survey was designed based on items selected from this review. The survey statements were designed to determine (1) if librarians perceive the roles described for them in national standards to be important and (2) if they are practicing those roles in their schools.

The survey consisted of 46 statements from four major categories. The following four major categories were used in the survey:

- Roles unique to *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988): instructional consultant.
- Roles unique to *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998): program administrator and instructional partner.
- Roles in both *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988) and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998): teacher and information specialist.
- Use of technology

Respondents were asked to rate the statements using two scales. The Theoretical Role Scale asked the respondents to indicate the degree to which they perceived a statement to be important as a role for library media specialists. The question prompting the response was "Is this important to you?" A practical scale asked respondents to respond based on the extent to which they perceived they practice the activity described in the statement. This question was "Do you practice this?" A Likert-type scale of five levels was used for responses to both scales. The responses are 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent, 4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent. Using the same response set for the theoretical and practical scale permits direct comparisons of responses to both scales for a given statement.

Two open-ended questions were asked at the end of the survey to attempt to determine what barriers library media specialists face as they attempt to change and expand their role and what factors promote and support an expansion of their role. The open-ended questions were (1) What factors promote your ability to expand your role? and (2) What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role? The instructions for the open-ended questions asked the respondents to reply in lists and phrases.

The survey began with a series of descriptive questions. The descriptive information requested includes the number of years of experience as a library media specialist and as a classroom teacher, the amount and kinds of technology available in the school library media center, the presence of an automated cataloging and circulation system, the grade level of the school where the library media specialist is employed, and the type of scheduling used in the library media center (i.e., fixed, flexible, or a combination).

A pilot study was conducted to verify the clarity of the questions and to identify problems. The pilot survey was administered to a group of 80 library media specialists attending the Virginia

Educational Media Association's Leadership Conference. Respondents were asked to identify any questions that were unclear. The wording of the survey was modified, where necessary, for content and clarity.

## Data Collection and Analysis

The survey was administered to a random sample of 1,000 library media specialists in the United States. Market Data Retrieval (MDR), an educational marketing firm, provided a simple random sample of 1,000 names and school addresses of library media specialists in kindergarten through 12th grade in public schools. Two mailings, the first in October 1999 and the second to all nonrespondents in November 1999, yielded a total of 505 usable returned surveys (surveys that were only partially completed were not used).

The mean was computed for the responses to the practical and theoretical scale for each survey statement grouped according to four major categories used in the survey (see tables 1 through 6). Responses to the open-ended questions survey (What factors promote your ability to expand your role? and What barriers do you face as you attempt to expand your role?) were examined to determine what common factors promote and hinder the library media specialist in the change and expansion of their role in schools. Responses to the open ended questions were categorized and frequency of response noted (tables 7 and 8).

**Table 1. Instructional Consultant**

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** |
| Assist teachers in determining type of assessment to be used in evaluating student work, especially when learning alternatives include various types of media | 2.182 | 3.150 |
| Assist teachers in incorporating information skills into the curriculum | 3.523 | 4.439 |
| Assist teachers in evaluating and modifying learning activities based on feedback gained from observation and interaction with students | 2.711 | 3.525 |
| Serve as members of grade level, building, and district curriculum development teams and participate in curriculum design and assessment projects | 3.008 | 4.018 |
| Assist teachers in the development of unit objectives that build viewing, listening, reading, and critical thinking skills | 2.572 | 3.66 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Assist teachers by analyzing learner characteristics that will influence design and use of media in an instructional unit | 2.358 | 3.236 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*
*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent.*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

## Table 2. Instructional Partner

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** |
| Work closely with teachers in designing authentic learning tasks | 2.657 | 3.619 |
| Work collaboratively with other faculty to analyze students' learning needs, particularly as they relate to information literacy | 2.914 | 3.897 |
| Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to develop curricular content that integrates information literacy skills | 2.929 | 4.026 |
| Promote information literacy skills to teachers and other staff as integral to subject matter learning in all areas | 3.598 | 4.269 |
| Work with teachers to design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice | 2.939 | 3.970 |
| Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to plan instructional activities | 2.982 | 4.029 |
| Work closely with teachers in assessing student work. | 2.061 | 2.883 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*

*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent.*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

**Table 3. Program Administrator**

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** |
| Develop and implement a mission statement, goals and objectives, policies, and procedures that reflect the goals and objectives of the school. | 3.747 | 4.238 |
| Communicate regularly with principals and other administrators about program plans, activities, and accomplishments. | 3.907 | 4.441 |
| Manage space, equipment, resources, and supplies for the full range of library media programs and services. | 4.432 | 4.659 |
| Integrate the Information Literacy Standards for Student Learning into all formal documents related to the library media program. | 2.707 | 3.592 |
| Inform teachers and others of program resources, activities, and services. | 4.259 | 4.259 |
| Promote the library program throughout the local community. | 3.028 | 3.859 |
| Develop and maintain an effective advocacy program that demonstrates the value of the library program to a broad audience. | 2.994 | 4.089 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*
*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent .*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

**Table 4. Teacher**

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** |
| Promote competency in information literacy across the curriculum. | 3.719 | 4.396 |
| Maintain current and in-depth knowledge about the characteristics of students and teachers, and about ways of matching individual needs with appropriate materials. | 3.507 | 4.075 |
| Teach students to understand the characteristics of each particular medium in which information and ideas are presented. | 3.479 | 4.121 |
| Develop and promote specific plans for incorporating the Information Standards for Student Learning into day-to-day curricular and instructional activities. | 3.380 | 4.123 |
| Identify and assess the staff's learning needs in areas related to information, and provide appropriate professional-development opportunities. | 2.774 | 3.766 |
| Provide instruction for parents to assist them in sharing, reading, learning, listening, and viewing experiences with children. | 2.247 | 3.402 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*
*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent .*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

**Table 5. Information Specialist**

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** |
| Build collections that contain resources that meet the goals and objectives of the curriculum and the interests of students. | 4.630 | 4.891 |
| Assist students and staff in identifying appropriate information resources through comprehensive reference service and such vehicles as bibliographies and resource lists. | 3.915 | 4.465 |
| Guide and assist teachers in evaluating and selecting appropriate informational and instructional resources. | 3.707 | 4.267 |
| Encourage the widest possible use of program resources and services by making them available throughout the school and through remote access. | 3.499 | 4.174 |
| Information Standards for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources. | 2.964 | 3.699 |
| Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of the library profession regarding intellectual freedom, confidentiality, the rights of users, and other intellectual property concerns | 4.341 | 4.578 |
| Work with teachers to ensure students develop higher level thinking skills for the organization, evaluation, and use of information and ideas. | 3.113 | 4.085 |
| Facilitate access to resources outside the school by networking with other information agencies, borrowing or renting specialized materials, and using electronic networks that expand access to information. | 3.194 | 3.954 |
| Organize all library resources for effective and efficient use through such methods as cataloging, classifying, and arranging all elements of the collection. | 4.653 | 4.846 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*

*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent.*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

## Table 6. Use of Technology by the School Library Media Specialist

| Survey Statement | Mean Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|
| **Practical Scale** | **Theoretical Scale** | |
| Remain current on all issues related to the use of information and information technology. | 3.798 | 4.543 |
| Model and promote the effective uses of technology for teaching and learning | 3.883 | 4.420 |
| Guide and assist teachers in the use of new media and technologies for teaching and learning. | 3.634 | 4.236 |
| Evaluate and assess the impact of specific technologies on instruction. | 2.717 | 3.475 |
| Serve on the school's technology planning team. | 3.659 | 4.420 |
| Provide instruction in use of online and CD-ROM databases. | 3.709 | 4.352 |
| Provide instruction in Internet searching and evaluation of Internet sites. | 3.281 | 4.251 |
| Assist students in the creation of web pages. | 1.432 | 2.374 |
| Offer an ongoing staff development program in the use and integration of information technologies. | 2.552 | 3.727 |
| Serve as technology coordinator for the school | 2.438 | 2.988 |

*Practical Scale = the perception of how frequently role is practiced.*
*Theoretical Scale = how important role is perceived to be.*
*Response scale: 1= not at all, 2= to a small extent, 3= to a moderate extent,*
*4= to a great extent, 5= to a very great extent .*
*N = 505 Surveys conducted October/November 1999*

**Table 7. Most Frequent Responses to the Question "What factors promote your ability to expand your role?"**

| Factors listed in rank order | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Supportive principals and administrators | 134 |
| Supportive faculty | 85 |
| Use of new technology and Internet access | 83 |
| Professional development opportunities | 49 |
| My own abilities and willingness to move forward | 45 |
| Adequate funding | 43 |
| Clerical Support | 38 |
| Technology staffing and support at the school | 27 |
| Flexible schedule | 25 |
| Parent volunteers | 21 |
| Ability to serve on school and district committees | 12 |
| Meetings with other librarians and professional associations | 11 |
| Student interest | 9 |
| District Media/Library services support | 8 |
| A public relations program for the library | 8 |
| Knowledge of curriculum | 3 |

*N = 505; survey conducted October/November 1999*

**Table 8.Most Frequent Responses to the Question "What barriers do you face as you attempt to expand your role?"**

| Factors listed in rank order | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Lack of time | 124 |
| Lack of adequate funding | 105 |

| | |
|---|---:|
| Lack of support and interest by teachers | 67 |
| Fixed schedule | 56 |
| Lack of clerical support | 54 |
| Insufficient professional staff | 48 |
| Lack of administrative support | 33 |
| Shortage of technology and lack of Internet access | 27 |
| Lack of knowledge about how to use technology | 21 |
| Lack of support to keep technology working | 20 |
| Physical space of library inadequate | 18 |
| Lack of district library/media coordinator | 6 |
| Lack of professional development | 5 |
| Power struggles with technology coordinator | 4 |

*N = 505; survey conducted October/November 1999*

## Survey Respondents

Table 9 summarizes the descriptive information. Library media specialists in elementary schools accounted for half of the respondents. Thirty percent of respondents had no experience as a classroom teacher, but slightly more than half of respondents had 11 or more years as a school librarian.

**Table 9. Characteristics of Survey Respondents**

**Descriptive Characteristic**

| **Years experience as a classroom teacher** | **No.** | **%** |
|---|---:|---:|
| None | 156 | 30.9 |
| 1 to 5 | 131 | 25.9 |
| 6 to 10 | 90 | 17.9 |
| 11 or more | 128 | 25.3 |

**Years experience as a school library media specialist**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Less than one full year | 17 | 3.4 |
| 1 to 5 | 120 | 23.7 |
| 6 to 10 | 112 | 22.2 |
| 11 or more | 256 | 50.7 |

**School grade level of current position**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary school | 254 | 50.3 |
| Middle school | 103 | 20.4 |
| Secondary/High school | 120 | 23.8 |
| K–12 school | 28 | 5.5 |

*N = 505; survey conducted October/November 1999*

The survey found that fixed scheduling is dominant in elementary schools—slightly more than half of the elementary school respondents use this method (see table 10). Approximately 40% use a combination of fixed and flexible scheduling. Fixed scheduling is used less in middle and high schools. Flexible and combination scheduling is dominant in middle schools, where approximately 48% use flexible scheduling and an equal share use a combination of fixed and flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling is also dominant in high schools. Eighty-four percent of high schools use flexible scheduling; only 4% used fixed scheduling.

**Table 10. Type of Scheduling Used**

| Level of School | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| **Elementary School** | | |
| Fixed | 130 | 53.9 |
| Flexible | 20 | 7.9 |
| Combination | 97 | 38.2 |
| **Middle School** | | |
| Fixed | 5 | 4.8 |

| | | |
|---|---:|---:|
| Flexible | 50 | 48.6 |
| Combination | 48 | 46.6 |
| **Secondary/High School** | | |
| Fixed | 4 | 3.3 |
| Flexible | 101 | 84.2 |
| Combination | 15 | 12.5 |
| **K–12 school** | | |
| Fixed | 4 | 14.3 |
| Flexible | 2 | 7.1 |
| Combination | 22 | 78.6 |

*N = 505; survey conducted October/November 1999*

More than seven in ten school library media centers had the majority of the technology listed in the survey (see table 11). The technology most available in high and middle schools is Internet access. Ninety-nine percent of high schools, 95% of middle schools, and 84% of elementary schools provide access. Videocassette players were the next most common technology in elementary schools. Eighty-seven percent of elementary schools, 94% of middle and high schools had access to a video cassette player in the library media center.

**Table 11. Technology in School Library Media Centers**

| Type of Technology | No. | % |
|---|---:|---:|
| **Automated Circulation** | | |
| Elementary schools | 197 | 77.5 |
| Middle schools | 90 | 87.4 |
| Secondary/high schools | 104 | 86.7 |
| K–12 schools | 19 | 67.9 |
| All schools | 410 | 81.2 |
| **Online Catalog** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 153 | 60.2 |
| Middle schools | 80 | 77.7 |
| Secondary/high schools | 101 | 84.2 |
| K–12 schools | 19 | 67.9 |
| All schools | 353 | 69.9 |
| **TV Studio** | | |
| Elementary schools | 54 | 21.3 |
| Middle schools | 39 | 37.8 |
| Secondary/high schools | 45 | 37.5 |
| K–12 schools | 6 | 21.4 |
| All schools | 144 | 28.5 |
| **Video Cassette Player** | | |
| Elementary schools | 223 | 87.8 |
| Middle schools | 97 | 94.2 |
| Secondary/high schools | 112 | 94.2 |
| K–12 schools | 27 | 96.4 |
| All schools | 459 | 90.9 |
| **Videodisc Player** | | |
| Elementary schools | 116 | 45.6 |
| Middle schools | 65 | 63.1 |
| Secondary/high schools | 69 | 57.5 |
| K–12 schools | 12 | 42.8 |
| All schools | 262 | 51.2 |

**Computer with CD-ROM drive**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 220 | 77.5 |
| Middle schools | 100 | 87.4 |
| Secondary/high schools | 117 | 86.7 |
| K–12 schools | 25 | 67.9 |
| All schools | 462 | 81.2 |

**E-mail Access**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 204 | 80.3 |
| Middle schools | 92 | 89.3 |
| Secondary/high schools | 106 | 88.3 |
| K–12 schools | 25 | 89.3 |
| All schools | 427 | 84.5 |

**Internet Access**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 214 | 84.3 |
| Middle schools | 98 | 95.1 |
| Secondary/high schools | 119 | 99.2 |
| K–12 schools | 25 | 89.3 |
| All schools | 456 | 90.3 |

**Computer with Word Processing Software**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 180 | 70.9 |
| Middle schools | 97 | 94.2 |
| Secondary/high schools | 110 | 91.2 |
| K–12 schools | 24 | 85.7 |
| All schools | 411 | 81.4 |

**Video Editing Equipment**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 20 | 7.9 |
| Middle schools | 18 | 17.5 |
| Secondary/high schools | 31 | 25.8 |
| K–12 schools | 2 | 7.1 |
| All schools | 71 | 14.1 |

*N = 505; survey conducted October/November 1999*

However, there were a few exceptions. Only 60% of elementary school library media centers had an online catalog, although 77% had an automated circulation system. TV studios and editing equipment were not present in a majority of schools at any level. Of high school library media centers, 37% had a TV studio, although only 25% had video-editing equipment. Videodisc players were also less common, present in 45% of elementary schools, in 63% of middle schools, and in 57% of high schools.

# Findings

## The Relation between Perception and Practice of a Role

Research question 1 asked, "If a school library media specialist perceives a role to be important, are they more likely to practice that role?" Results indicate that library media specialists regard all roles described in both *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988) and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998) to be more important than they are able to implement in practice.

## The Primacy of the Teacher and Information Specialist Roles

Question 2 asked, "Will library media specialists perceive the roles of teacher and information specialist to be more important than the roles of instructional consultant, instructional partner, and program administrator?" Question 3 asked, "Will library media specialists perceive they *practice* the roles of teacher and information specialist to a greater extent than the roles of instructional consultant, instructional partner, and program administrator?" Library media specialists perceive the role of information specialist to be the most important role, followed by the roles of program administrator, teacher, instructional partner, and instructional consultant. The library media specialists report that they practice the roles in the order of their perceived importance.

## Perceived Importance and Practice of the 1988 and 1998 Roles

Question 4 asked, "To what extent do library media specialists perceive themselves as having implemented the roles described in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988)?" Question 5 asked, "To what extent do library media specialists perceive the importance of the roles described for them in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988)?" The roles are information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. Questions 6 and 7 sought the same response to the 1998 *Information Power* publication. These roles are information specialist, teacher, instructional partner, and consultant.

A comparison of the mean response rate for both the theoretical scale (perceived importance) and the practical scale (perceived implementation) found in tables 1 to 5 indicate that the roles of information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant are perceived to be practiced to different degrees. The role of information specialist is perceived to be most important and practiced to a greater degree than any other role. Responses for the theoretical scale were 3.5 or higher (table 5). The practical scale had a mean of 2.9 or higher. This indicates library media specialists perceive the information specialist role to be important and practiced to a moderate extent, a great extent, or a very great extent.

The role of program administrator is perceived to be second in importance and practice. All statements for the program administrator role (table 3) were rated 3.5 or higher on the theoretical scale. All program administrator statements were rated 2.7 or higher on the practical scale. The role of teacher is rated third in importance and practice. The mean response to statements for the teacher role were 3.4 or higher on the theoretical scale and 2.2 or higher on the practical scale (table 4). The roles of instructional partner and instructional consultant are rated fourth and fifth in both levels of importance and practice (tables 1 and 2).

Library media specialists perceive that the following factors are important in helping them expand their roles: supportive administrators and teachers; use of new technology, including the Internet; professional development opportunities; their own abilities and attitudes; adequate funding; and clerical support (table 7).

Library media specialists perceive the following factors to be barriers in expanding their role (table 8): lack of time, including lack of time to plan with teachers; lack of adequate funding; lack of interest and support of classroom teachers; use of a fixed schedule; lack of clerical staff; and too many schools or students to provide for as the library media specialist (i.e., many library media specialists cover several schools or they are the only library media specialist at schools with more than 1,000 students).

## Perceived Importance and Practice of Technology Instruction

Research question 8 asked, "To what extent do library media specialists perceive themselves as having integrated technology into their practices?" Research question nine asked, "To what extent do library media specialists think it is important to integrate technology into their practices?

Most school libraries have access to the Internet and a computer for student use. However, high school library media centers have more technology than middle or elementary schools. Middle

school library media centers have access to more technology than those at the elementary school level.

Respondents believe it is important to use technology in their practices as a library media specialist (table 6). The more technology a library media specialist has access to in the media center, the more important the library media specialist perceives the use of technology. The greater the amount of technology the library media specialist has access to, the greater extent the library media specialist perceives they use technology.

## The Correlation between Descriptive Variables and Perceptions and Practices

The final research question asked, "Is there a correlation between descriptive variables and the reported practices and views of library media specialists?" As earlier discussed, the variables addressed in this study were level of school (elementary or secondary); the number of years of professional experience as a library media specialist; the number of years of experience as a classroom teacher; the amount of available technology; and the type of scheduling.

The study found no significant differences in the perceptions of library media specialists at different levels with regard to the importance of the roles of instructional consultant, program administrator, instructional partner, and teacher. There is, however, a significant difference in the perceptions of the importance of the information specialist role. Library media specialists at the elementary level perceive the role of information specialist to be less important than those at the middle and high school levels.

There was no correlation between the number of years of experience as a library media specialist and the effect on the perception of importance of the roles of the library media specialist or on the perception of the importance of the use of technology.

This study does show that there is a correlation between the type of scheduling used and the ability to practice the roles as described in *Information Power*. Elementary school library media specialists who use flexible scheduling perceive they are able to practice more roles than library media specialists that use either combination or fixed scheduling. Those who use fixed scheduling perceive they are able to implement fewer roles than those who use either combination or flexible scheduling.

# Discussion

The results of this survey indicate that library media specialists feel they are unable to practice any role to the degree that they feel they should. Without exception, each role was perceived to be more important than library media specialists perceive they are able to implement in practice. This survey further sought to identify the barriers to appropriate implementation of roles.

## Perception and Practice of Roles

The role of information specialist—finding information in print resources and using nonprint resources—has been the dominant role of the library media specialist since its inception. The

results of this study indicate that library media specialists still perceive it to be their most important role. They also perceive that they practice that role more than any other role.

Library media specialists perceive the role of program administrator—managing the school library—to be next in importance. They also perceive that they practice that role to a greater degree than any other role except information specialist. Next in importance are the roles of teacher, instructional partner, and instructional consultant. These findings are consistent with research that has been conducted in the past on the practices of library media specialists.

These findings are frustrating to many leaders in the profession who advocate that library media specialists take a more active role in planning and administering instruction in coordination with classroom teachers. A 1963 report by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *The School Library as Materials Center,* noted that library media specialists are "overly concerned with books" (5). The report also stated that library media specialists need to become more involved with helping teachers teach all aspects of the curriculum and in teaching with teachers as part of the team.

*Information Power:* Guidelines for School Library Media Programs (1988) described the role of instructional consultant. A review of literature indicates that the role of instructional consultant was practiced less than the other roles identified in the publication, those of information specialist and teacher. *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998) described a role of instructional partner, not an instructional consultant. This study demonstrates that library media specialists perceive the role of instructional partner to be more important than that of instructional consultant. However, library media specialists perceive that the role of instructional partner is still practiced less than any other role described in *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998).

## Lack of Time to Implement Roles

This study indicates several possible reasons why library media specialists do not embrace instructional roles to a greater degree. One of the primary reasons is lack of time. In response to the open-ended question "What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?," the reason cited most often was lack of time. One library media specialist wrote:

> I need to say this to someone—the questions in this survey indicate that I should be doing all of these wonderful things, keep up with current research and practice and do wonderful PR [public relations]! When am I to do this? Unless I work until 10:00 P.M., all weekend and all summer, it would be impossible to be the superwoman that all the academics and policymakers seem to think I should be. Real-life schools are understaffed and underfunded and all of these supposed to do's mean nothing.

Written comments indicated that librarians feel overwhelmed by the lack of time and the number of responsibilities they have. There were many comments such as "I wish I had the time to be the person your form reflects" and "Can anyone do everything on your form?" Library media specialists clearly perceive they do not have the time to perform all the duties described for them in *Information Power*. This finding is consistent with the prior research by McCarthy (1997) described earlier in this paper.

Closely related to lack of time is the lack of professional and clerical staffing. Many library media specialists noted that they were the only professional library media specialist for several schools. Many also noted that they had little or no clerical support. Adequate professional and clerical staffing is essential if the library media specialist is to perform all the roles described in *Information Power*.

## Lack of Resources

Lack of time and shortage of clerical help were not the only resources library media specialists said they were lacking. The second most cited barrier was lack of resources, primarily funding to purchase materials and equipment. In particular, the highly ranked role of information specialist requires comprehensive and current information resources. Such resources, print and nonprint, are expensive.

Many library media specialists noted that they do not receive the funding necessary to purchase resources that adequately support the curriculum. For instance, the advent of CD-ROM and online materials has created an additional category of resources for which most school library media centers were not given additional funding. Library media specialists noted that they did not have funding to purchase needed equipment, especially computers and other technologies. Comments such as "technology is expensive" and "cannot upgrade technology" were frequently made. Other respondents gave specific examples of funding levels and sources to demonstrate that existing funding was inadequate. Comments such as "I have no funding except for PTA gifts" and "for the past six years I received only $4 per student for books and nonprint materials" were often made.

## Expectations of Principals and Teachers

Library media specialists are also prevented from taking a more active role in instruction because of the perceptions and expectations of teachers and principals. As discussed above, prior research demonstrates that, despite the positive impact of the presence of a library media specialist, many education professionals do not have a clear understanding of the role of the library media specialist (Haycock 1995). In response to the open-ended question "What factors enable you to expand your role?" the two reasons cited most often were support of administrators and teachers. The positive benefits that can result from a good relationship with teachers and principals is evident in responses such as "I once worked under an administrator who expected promotion and program. I rode that wave for all it was worth" and "positive projects with a few teachers show the others the possibility that the library offers."

Frustration caused by this confusion was also evident in the responses to this survey. In response to the question "What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?" the third most cited barrier was lack of interest and support by teachers. Frequent comments included "most teachers have a traditional view of the librarian's role—it is challenging to get them to view me as a teacher, too," "teachers aren't eager to collaborate—or don't always see the need to do library projects," and "teachers are set in their ways and do not want to cooperate." Lack of administrative support was also noted as a barrier to expanding the role of the library media specialist. One respondent noted, "The administration does not consider how important the library is to developing a solid and well-rounded curriculum that promotes maximum learning."

Other respondents were more pessimistic: "Administrators think all we do is check out books" and "administrators have little or no interest in the library program."

Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (1993) note that change cannot be forced from the outside. The success of any change or innovation depends on the choices made by teachers as they move throughout the school day. Many of the changes called for in *Information Power* cannot take place without the understanding by teachers and principals of the role of the library media specialist. Full implementation of the roles described in *Information Power* will also require that library media specialists and teachers have the time to develop relationships that support an instructional partnership. Giorgis and Peterson (1996, 477) stated, "Creating an environment in which teachers and librarians can work together requires time, dedication, and the willingness to take risks."

## Impact of Scheduling Practices

The type of scheduling used, particularly in elementary schools, has a strong impact on the roles the library media specialist is able to implement. Use of a fixed schedule was the fourth most common barrier to fulfilling perceived roles. Survey responses also indicate that elementary library media specialists who use a flexible schedule perceive they are able to implement more roles than those who use either a fixed or combination schedule. Those elementary library media specialists that use a fixed schedule perceive they are able to implement fewer roles than those who use a flexible or combination schedule. In response to the open-ended questions, many library media specialists indicated that they were told they must use a fixed schedule in order to provide planning time for teachers or because teachers requested a scheduled library time. Several library media specialists felt they were used as "babysitters." In addition, library media specialists cited the use of a flexible schedule as a factor that enables them to expand their roles.

The finding that the flexible schedule enables the library media specialist to assume more instructional roles is consistent with prior research. Van Deusen and Tallman (1994) conducted a research project to determine if the type of scheduling used affects the teaching and instructional consultant role practiced by library media specialists. They found that the instructional consultant role is practiced at a low level. In the majority of cases where it was practiced at a high level, flexible scheduling was used for the school library. They also found that more planning and teaching was done with classroom teachers when a flexible schedule was used.

## Impact of Technology

The introduction of technology into the school library media center, accompanied by the rapid advances and changes in the technology since its introduction, have had a profound impact on the library media specialist. Little research has been done on this topic. Studies conducted in the 1980s demonstrated that computers were being increasingly used in school libraries but not always to their full potential. By the mid-1990s many library media specialists were taking a leadership role in school technology use. This role is advocated by many leaders in the field. *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998, 54) calls for library media specialists to be "a primary leader in the school's use of all kinds of technologies—both instructional and informational to enhance learning." Yates (1997, 2) warns that if library media specialists do not define for themselves a leadership role with respect to the use of technology they may "disappear from schools."

The results of this study show that many school library media centers have been equipped with at least one of each type of the technology resources asked about in the survey, as shown in table 11. Approximately 70% of respondents indicated that they had seven or more of the types of technology listed in the survey. Ninety percent of school library media centers had Internet access.

The use of technology was the third most cited factor enabling respondents to expand their roles. Many library media specialists made comments such as "I have an avid interest in technology" and "becoming a technology leader enables a new respect from staff and students." Several library media specialists noted that students are eager to use the new technologies. In response to the question "What barriers do you face as you attempt to expand your role?" factors related to technology were often cited. The factors included lack of technology—especially Internet access—lack of knowledge about how to use technology, and lack of technical support. While the survey indicated that library media centers had access to different types of technology, the lack of adequate technology resources to meet the needs of students and teachers is a frustration.

Despite the overall positive reactions of many library media specialists to the use of technology, some concerns were noted. There were several comments such as "Why do we keep pushing technology and forgetting literature?" and "No mention of literature. *Why!!?? Only technology, technology, technology.*" Clearly some library media specialists view technology as diminishing their role with regard to literature and books.

## Attitudes of Library Media Specialists

In response to the question "What factors enable you to expand your role?" the fifth most commonly cited factor was the attitude of the individual respondent. The personal factors cited include:

- My own input and willingness to move forward
- My own continued interest in my own learning
- My willingness to try new things
- My own creativity
- Determination
- My desire to serve
- Lack of fear of change
- Having a clear idea and plan about what is best to do to benefit others
- Genuine enjoyment of helping staff and students

The number of responses citing the attitudes and inner strength of library media specialists reflects positively on the profession of library media specialists. Clearly, many library media specialists entered the profession with a desire to serve and support both students and teachers. When facing pressures to expand their role, they draw upon their own resources and focus on meeting the needs of others in the school.

The positive impact that a library media specialist with a strong desire to serve can have in a well-funded and supported school library is evident in the comments of one respondent:

I started the media center in this school and my principal more or less turned me loose and said to do what it takes. As a result I have an efficient library, well-organized and much used by teachers and students. The inviting atmosphere—plants, classical music, cute uncluttered décor—are very inviting. I run a TV show, am the main technology teacher, and I am turned to with computer questions often. I have a great relationship with the teachers and paraprofessionals, which can make all the difference in the world.

# Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study have yielded valuable quantitative and qualitative data regarding the perceptions of library media specialists regarding their roles and practices. Further research needs to be performed in order to determine what factors will enable library media specialists to fully implement the roles described for them in *Information Power*. Such research could address the following areas:

1. Administer the survey developed for this research to principals and teachers.

2. Compare the roles that principals and teachers perceive to be important for library media specialists, as well as the roles they perceive library media specialists are implementing. Library media specialists have traditionally suffered from isolation. It is important that we understand the perceptions of library media specialists, but also of other education professionals. The first step in creating more collaborative relationships is learning the viewpoint of others.

3. Perform more qualitative research on the practices of library media specialists.

4. Further investigate how some library media specialists are able to implement more roles than others. The responses to the open-ended questions revealed that some library media specialists are succeeding and thriving, while others are drowning in a sea of frustration. It is difficult to discover the cause for the differences in views through the use of surveys and other quantitative methods. Face-to-face and group interviews with library media specialists, and the principals and teachers with whom they work, would provide revealing information.

5. Perform research that combines the use of quantitative data on funding and support to library media specialists (i.e., library materials funding, professional and clerical staffing, available equipment, and facilities) and quantitative or qualitative data on the implementation of the various roles in *Information Power*.

6. Explore correlations between the instructional impact of the library media specialist and the support provided to the specialist. This research reveals that library media specialists do not practice the roles in *Information Power* to the degree they desire. It also reveals that lack of sufficient resources is a frustration of many library media specialists. Documenting the relationship between support and impact would be useful information to those seeking increased funding for school library media programs.

# Appendix

**Research Questions**

1. If a library media specialist perceives a role to be important, are they more likely to practice that role?

2. Will library media specialists perceive the roles of teacher and information specialist (roles found in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988) and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998)) to be more important than the roles of instructional consultant, instructional partner, and program administrator?

3. Will library media specialists perceive they practice the roles of teacher and information specialist (roles found in both *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* [1988] and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* [1998]) to a greater extent than the roles of instructional consultant, instructional partner, and program administrator?

4. To what extent do library media specialists perceive themselves as having implemented the roles described for them in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988)?

5. To what extent do library media specialists perceive the importance of the roles described for them in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988)?

6. To what extent do library media specialists perceive themselves as having implemented the roles described for them in *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998)?

7. To what extent do library media specialists perceive the importance of the roles described for them in *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (1998)?

8. To what extent do library media specialists perceive themselves as having integrated technology into their practices?

9. To what extent do library media specialists think it is important to integrate technology into their practices?

10. Is there a correlation between descriptive variables (level of school [i.e., elementary or secondary]; the number of years of professional experience as a library media specialist; the number of years of experience as a classroom teacher; the amount of available technology; the type of scheduling that the librarian uses (flexible, fixed, or a combination); and the reported practices and views of library media specialists?

# Works Cited

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. 1988. *Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs.* Chicago: American Library Association.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. 1998. *Information power: Building partnerships for learning.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Ceperley, P. E. 1991. *Information needs 2000: Results of a survey of library media specialists.* Charleston, Wva., Appalachia Educational Lab: ERIC Document ED 340 393.

Craver, K. W. 1986. The changing instructional role of the high school library media specialist: 1950–1984. *School Library Media Quarterly* 14, no. 4: 183–91.

Didier, E. 1984. Research on the impact of school library media programs on student achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Librarians, Atlanta, Ga. ERIC Document ED 279 340.

Dorrell, L. D., and L. V. Lawson. 1995. What are principals' perceptions of the school library media specialist? *NASSP Bulletin* 79, no. 2: 72–80.

Ervin, D. 1989. The effect of experience, educational level, and subject area on the philosophical acceptance, the perceived assumption, and the perceived barriers to implementation of the instructional and curricular role of the school library media specialist. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of South Carolina. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 50(09A), 2767.

Giorgis, C. G., and B. Peterson. 1996. Teachers and librarians collaborate to create a community of learners. *Language Arts* 73, no. 8: 477–82.

Hauck, P. and E. Scheiman. 1985. *The role of the teacher-librarian in Alberta schools.* ERIC Document ED 262 788.

Haycock, K. 1995. Research in teacher-librarianship and the institutionalization of change. *School Library Media Quarterly* 24: 227–32.

Hopkins, D. M. 1989. Elementary school library media programs and the promotion of positive self-concepts: A report of an exploratory study. *Library Quarterly* 59, no. 2: 131–47.

Hortin, J. A. 1989. Principals' and teachers' attitudes toward Kansas school library media programs. *School Library Media Quarterly* 17, no. 2: 98–100.

Johnson, J. A. 1993. The school library media specialist as instructional consultant. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Illinois at Carbondale. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 54(08A), 2869.

Jones, A. C. 1997. An analysis of the theoretical and actual curriculum development involvement of Georgia school library media specialists. Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State Univ. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 58(08A), 2890.

Koga, S., and T. Harada. 1989. Academic achievement and the school library: An international study. Research and professional paper presented at the annual conference of International Federation of Library Associations, Paris, France, August 19–26. ERIC Document ED 323 230.

Krashen, S. 1993. *The power of reading: Insights from the research.* Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.

Lai, Y. 1995. The attitudes of public elementary school teachers and school library media specialists in three east Tennessee counties toward the instructional consultant role of the school library media specialist. Doctoral disseratation, Univ. of Tennessee. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 56(08A), 2986.

Lance, K. C., L. Welborn, and C. Hamilton-Pennell. 1994. *Impact of school library media centers on academic achievement.* Denver, Colo.: Colorado Department of Education.

Master, L., and N. L. Master. 1988. *A 1988 statewide survey of Nevada school librarians' self-perceptions as instructional leaders in their schools.* ERIC Document ED 300 016.

McCarthy, C. A. 1997. A reality check: The challenges of implementing information power in school library media programs. Research and professional paper presented at the annual conference of International Association of School Librarianship, Vancouver, BC, July 6–11. ERIC Document ED 412 958.

McIntosh, C. 1994. The evolution of the role of the K–12 public school library media specialist. Doctoral dissertation, Spalding Univ. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 55(04A), 783.

Naylor, A. P., and K. Jenkins. 1988. An investigation of principal's perceptions of library media specialists performance evaluation terminology. *School Library Media Quarterly* 16, no. 2: 234–43.

Pickard, P. W. 1993. The instructional consultant role of the school library media specialist. *School Library Media Quarterly* 21, no. 2: 115–21.

Putnam, E. 1996. The instructional consultant role of the elementary-school library media specialist and the effects of program scheduling on its practice. *School Library Media Quarterly* 25, no. 1: 43–49.

Schon, I. 1991. The role of school library media specialists. *School Library Media Quarterly* 19, no. 4: 228–33.

Shannon, D. M. 1996. Education reform and school library media programs: Perceptions of Kentucky's school library media leaders. *School Library Media Quarterly* 25, no. 1: 35–41.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1963. The school library as materials center. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Deusen, J., and J. I. Tallman. 1994. The impact of scheduling on curriculum consultation and information skills instruction. *School Library Media Quarterly 23*, no. 1: 17–37.

Vandergrift, K. 1997. Dancing on tightropes in the midst of the tornado. *Knowledge Quest* 26, no. 1: 28–34.

Wilson, P. 1979. Librarians as teachers. *Library Quarterly* 49, no. 2: 147.

Yates, B. 1997. Our patch vs. their patch: Information technology and literacy in schools. Information rich but knowledge poor. Research and professional paper presented at the annual conference of International Association of School Librarians, Vancouver, BC, July 6–11. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 412 957.

Yoo, J. H. 1998. The educational impact of the school library. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 736.

Zemelman, S., H. Daniels, and A. Hyde. 1993. *Best practice*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.