This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1980 by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
London, England

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-9589

GOULD, Dana Grove, 1936-
A STUDY OF THE CURRENT ROLE AND STATUS OF THE PARAPROFESSIONAL AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS.

University of Southern Mississippi, Ph.D., 1974
Library Science

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



© 1975

DANA GROVE GOULD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

University of Southern Hississippi

A STUDY OP THE CURRENT ROLE AMD STATUS OF THE PARAPR0FE3SI0NAL AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS

BY

Dana G. Gould

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Southern Mississip
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of **Doctor** of Philosophy

Approved:

J. L. Carson, Jr.
Director
Sidney Weatherford
Edgar H Bedenbaugh
Lee Jones
M. Ray Karnes
Robert van Aller
Dean of the Graduate School

August, 1974

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge the aid of those persons without whom it is doubtful that this document would have been completed. First of all, sincere thanks are given to the committee members; Dr. Bedenbaugh, Dr. Carson, Dr. Jones, Dr. Karnes, and Dr. Weatherford. A special word of appreciation is offered to Dr. Carson for his advice, patience, and understanding not only in the preparation of this research, but throughout my study at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Acknowledgement is also extended to Mrs. Carolyn Carter for reading and making suggestions which resulted in an improved final draft.

Last, but certainly not least, appreciation must be expressed to my family. Betty's continuing efforts in typing, reading, and encouraging the author, indeed, are greatly responsible for the completion of this research. Thanks are, likewise, due to Cynthia, Gary, and Kenneth for their understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem Purpose of the Study Assumptions Definition of Terms Delimitations Justification Organization of the Study	
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
	Summary	
III.	METHODOLOGY	25
	Selection of Subjects Data Collection Treatment of Data	
IV.	ANALYSES OF THE DATA	30
	Introduction Demographic Variables Chi Square Findings Job Descriptions Comments Advantages and Disadvantages Library Technical Assistant Classification of Paraprofessional Role of Librarian General Conclusion	

Chapter Page

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 62

Summary of Findings
Supplemental Findings
Conclusions
Recommendations For Further Study

. . . . . .

APPENDIX A 71

APPENDIX B 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY 83

LIST OF TABLES

1. Libraries Included in Study by State and Type . . . 26
2. Responses Received from Libraries by State and Type 28
3. An Intercorrelation Analyses Between the Demographic Variables and Administrators' Responses 33
4. Highest Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Administrators' Responses 35
5. Analyses of Chi Square Data of Significant Job Description Tasks 37
6. Analyses of Chi Square Data of Nonsignificant Job Description Tasks 40
7. Percentages from High to Low of Paraprofessional Job Functions by Library Type 45
8. Analyses of Chi Square Data Regarding the Advantages of a Strong Paraprofessional Structure 52
9. Analyses of Chi Square Data Regarding the Disadvantages of a Strong Paraprofessional Structure 54
10. Analyses of Chi Square Data Regarding the Training of the Library Technical Assistant . . . 56
11. A Comparison of the Library Administrators Responses Regarding Mr. Dawson's Statement on the Role of the Librarian 61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the founding of the first school of Library Economy at Columbia College in 1887 by Melvil Dewey, library training was obtained by working in libraries on an apprenticeship-type program. The trainee was instructed in all aspects of library operations, and no distinction was made between clerical and professional duties. Even with the founding of the library training program at Columbia, no effort was made to distinguish duties. In a circular sent to prospective students, Dewey stated:

> The School of Library Economy confines itself strictly to its peculiar work, and makes no attempt to give general culture or make up deficiencies of earlier education. . . . This school is rather a short and purely technical course. . . . Not only are the limits of subjects studied closely drawn, but in their treatment the school is more a systematic apprenticeship in which every effort is made to advance the learner rapidly rather than to serve the master's interest by keeping him a pupil without salary as long as possible.[1]

It was not until 1923, when Charles C. Williamson published his report, that the concept of professional and clerical duties in libraries was differentiated. In this report Williamson recommended:

---

[1]C. Edward Carrol, The Professionalization of Education For Librarianship (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1970), p. 37.

> Library schools should confine themselves to training of the professional type. Training of the clerical type will be provided through the so-called training classes conducted by libraries.[1]

Despite some improvement as a result of this report, the studies of the 1940's still emphasized the need for more training in professional skills and less in mere techniques.

In the decade of the 1960's the literature again struck at the need for a strong delineation between professional and nonprofessional duties. In fact, this era brought with it a clamour by many librarians for a stronger and more recognized paraprofessional structure in the library organization, including not only clerks but also library technicians and library associates.

Few, if any, librarians would have denied the value of the paraprofessional to the library operations, but the literature of the past decades has indicated that there was much disagreement over just which duties were professional and which were not. With the changing role of the librarian, some professionals have called for a new and more professional image through the elimination of some duties long held as "sacred cows". The emphasis, therefore, has been not only on the improvement of training in library schools but on redefinition, by librarians, of their duties.

A report of the Interdivisional Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Education and the Library Administration divi-

---

[1] The Williamson Reports of 1921 and 1923: Including "Training For Library Work (1921)" and "Training For Library Service (1923)" (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971), p. 136.

sions, which was approved by the executive boards of both divisions in 1968, indicated some of the turmoil which existed at that time:

> Little constructive guidance appears in the literature for an agency desiring to employ subprofessional library staff. Duties and classification and qualification standards for employees under the professional level vary between areas and institutions. Local recruitment and training of this group is generally accepted. Recognition of need for development of additional levels of library service has been advanced by some authorities who advocate special training of nonprofessional staff to relieve the employing library of part of the in-service training and to improve competence of the employees. Advocates of these additional types of library staff envision the professional librarian's duties as becoming more truly professional as qualified assistants assume greater responsibility for library procedures.[1]

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the duties of the library paraprofessional, the advantages and disadvantages of such a category of employees, and the employment prospects of the trained library technical assistant as conceived by library administrators of large public junior college, state university, and metropolitan public libraries in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Purposes of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to survey library administrators of large public junior college, state university, and metropolitan public libraries in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas to determine the

---

[1] "The Subprofessional or Technical Assistant; A Statement of Definition," American Library Association Bulletin 62 (April 1968): 387-388.

duties that a paraprofessional can perform, the opportunities of employment for the junior college trained technician in these states, and the advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure within the organization of a library.

The specific purposes of this study included the following:

1. To determine if library administrators of large public junior college, state university, and metropolitan public libraries agreed on the type of duties that a paraprofessional can perform.

2. To determine if library administrators preferred hiring a junior college trained technician or conducting an in-service training program.

3. To determine if library administrators of large public junior college, state university, and metropolitan public libraries agreed on the advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional.

4. To determine if certain demographic variables were significantly correlated with the library administrator's conception of the role of the paraprofessional.

More specifically this study examined the following questions:

1. What are the duties of paraprofessionals as conceptualized by library administrators of the three types of libraries?

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessionals as conceived by library admin-

istrators of the three types of libraries?

3. What type of training for library technicians is preferred by library administrators of the three types of libraries?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the conception of the duties of paraprofessionals and the demographic variable, age?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the conception of the duties of paraprofessionals and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the viewed advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional and the demographic variable, age?

7. Is there a significant relationship between the viewed advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

8. Is there a significant relationship between preference of training for library technicians and the demographic variable, age?

9. Is there a significant relationship between type of training preferred for library technicians and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

Assumptions

In this study it was assumed that there were a number

of duties which were already considered by librarians as being paraprofessional tasks. The duties chosen for this study were those which were not established as being purely paraprofessional. It was also assumed that a person can become a technician or associate by in-service as well as by academic training.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are helpful in understanding this study. In the case of a definition known by two popular terms, the alternate term is shown in parenthesis immediately following the major one. In such cases, the terms are used interchangeably throughout the study.

Associate: Categories assuming "a need for an educational background like that represented by a bachelor's degree from a four-year institution of higher education in the United States. Assignments may be such that library knowledge is less important than general education."[1]

Clerk: Classifications not requiring "formal academic training in library subjects. The assignments in these categories are based upon general clerical and secretarial proficiencies. Familiarity with basic library terminology and routines necessary to adapt clerical skills to the library's needs is best learned on the job."[2]

---

[1]American Library Association, Library Education and Manpower Statement (June 30, 1970), p. 5.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

Council on Library Technology (COLT): A national organization founded in 1967 and concerned with the training, employment, and job descriptions of library technical assistants.

Large Junior College: A two year college that has a total enrollment of 3,000 to 12,000 students and a full time enrollment of at least 1,000 students.

Librarian: "The title carries with it the connotation of 'professional' in the sense that professional tasks are those which require a special background and education."[1]

Library Administrator: The individual who is immediately responsible for the total operations of the library.

Library Technical Assistant (Library Technician): "A person who has certain specifically library-related skills--. . . the performance of whose duties seldom requires him to call upon a background in general education."[2]

Metropolitan Public Library: A library system that serves a population of 150,000 to 500,000 people.

Paraprofessional: An individual who performs duties of a supportive nature in a library.

Tex-Tec: The course of study developed for Texas Junior Colleges and lower divisions of senior colleges to train library technical assistants.[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 3.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

[3]Louis Shores, "Middlemanship - New Careers For Libraries," Catholic Library World 42 (May-June 1972): 544.

University: An institution of higher learning offering a graduate degree and having a total enrollment of 3,000 to 12,000 students.

Delimitations

The findings, inferences, and conclusions reached in this study were limited in their application as follows:

1. Since there is agreement that in small libraries it is extremely difficult to separate professional and non-professional duties, this study was limited to libraries large enough to utilize all three categories of paraprofessionals: clerk, library technician, and associate.

2. This study was limited to library administrators only. No other librarians were surveyed.

3. This study was limited to the states of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

4. This study was limited to public junior colleges with a total enrollment of from 3,000 to 12,000 students and a full time enrollment of at least 1,000. The Community and Junior College Directory, 1973 was used to determine enrollment.[1]

5. This study was limited to state universities with a total enrollment of at least 3,000 and not more than 12,000 students. The College Blue Book, 14th edition, was used to

---

[1]Community and Junior College Directory, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973).

to determine the enrollment.[1]

6. This study was limited to metropolitan public libraries serving a population of 150,000 to 500,000 people. The American Library Directory, 28th edition, was used to determine the population served.[2]

Justification

Although this study does not provide a library administrator with a complete manual of all the duties of a paraprofessional, it does supply examples as selected by other administrators. These examples furnish some insight into a better definition of the roles and functions of the paraprofessional. In fact, Richard DuCote, in speaking at the Second Annual Conference of the Council on Library Technology in May 1968, noted that much of the confusion and dissention that existed concerning paraprofessionals was a result of the lack of clearly defined roles and functions of both professionals and paraprofessionals. He further noted that, over the past twenty years, little progress had been made in this area of clarification.[3]

One of the major obstacles in clarifying the roles exists in the delineation of jobs; that is, which are professional and which are paraprofessional. Since the increased

---

[1]College Blue Book, 4 vols., 14th ed. (New York: CCM Information Corporation, 1972), U.S. Colleges Tabular Data.

[2]Helaine Mackeigan, comp., American Library Directory, 1972-1973, 28th ed. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1972).

[3]Rhua Heckart, ed., Progress and Prospect (Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1968), p. 10.

emphasis on paraprofessionals in the 1960's, little research has been done to distinguish the duties except for the government job descriptions written in 1966. In fact, Dean Louis Shores, a strong proponent of the paraprofessional, in answering a letter requesting a copy of the job descriptions for the Texas training program of Tex-Tec, stated in his letter of May 7, 1973:

> You will note in Tex-Tec that we relied pretty largely on the federal civil service survey, Civil Service GS 1411. From these we roughly sketched some job descriptions but they are all in rough notes and I do not believe they would be of much assistance to you now. It seems to me this is one of the areas for needed investigation. (See Appendix A)

This study also provided some insight into the acceptance of the library technical assistant in the states surveyed. The number of training programs for library technical assistants has grown rapidly over the past several years and the interest in this level of paraprofessional is evident by the founding of the Council on Library Technology in 1967. However, the library technical assistant is still not totally accepted without opposition. Dr. Lester Asheim expressed concern in 1968 that technicians may be trained for positions for which there are no appropriate jobs available.[1] There is evidence that this could even be true today.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. The first

---

[1]Ibid., p. 9.

or introductory chapter includes a short introduction, a statement of the problem, purposes of the study, assumptions, definition of terms, delimitations, and a justification of the study.

The second chapter is a review of the literature, including previous studies, related books and periodical articles, and ERIC documents. This chapter covers three basic areas of review:

1. Job descriptions and the need for further distinction between professional and paraprofessional duties.

2. Arguments, pro and con, over the training of library technicians in junior or community colleges.

3. Advantages and disadvantages, as advocated by librarians, of the category of employees referred to as paraprofessional.

Chapter three describes the methods and procedures used in the determining of the population surveyed, the collection of data, the validation of the instrument, and the statistical methods used in the study.

The fourth chapter is a presentation and analyses of the data as collected from the questionnaire.

Chapter five summarizes the study, draws conclusions and makes recommendations for further studies concerning the use of paraprofessionals in libraries.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Since the Williamson study of 1923, there has been much emphasis placed on distinguishing between those duties requiring a knowledge of the philosophy, theory, and purposes of librarianship and those which do not. This study was sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and is considered an important document concerning the training of librarians. In the foreword to this report, Henry S. Pritchett, Acting President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, said:

> As a whole, therefore, the problem [training for library service] is one which a single, inclusive study of this character may do much to illuminate; and it is believed that Dr. Williamson's report will prove to be of decisive value in clarifying a situation which was not so difficult as it was neglected.[1]

The major purpose of the report was to present existing conditions in the professional schools as they related to the training of librarians. Moreover, Dr. Williamson tried to point out the strengths and weaknesses of the library schools, and in the first chapter he categorized library work into two types, which he referred to as "profes-

---

[1] The Williamson Reports of 1921 and 1923: Including "Training For Library Service [1923]," p. "Foreword."

sional" and "clerical". He observed that, "Library administrators appear to be making little or no effort to keep these two types of work distinct."[1] He further defined the existing problem of inadequate salaries by noting:

> Until the distinction between clerical and professional workers is sharply made and adhered to the demand for adequate salaries for the professional group will prove ineffective because they will be economically impossible. A careful appraisal of the duties actually performed by many workers for whom professional salaries are demanded will show that they are often in large part clerical and not worthy of higher remuneration. Until library work is so organized that professional workers devote all their time and energy to professional tasks--tasks which workers with less adequate general and technical equipment cannot perform without permanent damage to library service, it is not worth while to expect librarians to be paid on a professional basis.[2]

Dr. Williamson continued saying that professionalization would eliminate the recruitment problem for library schools. He, therefore, recommended that library schools concentrate on professional training and let libraries conduct the training of clerks.

In the first chapter of this report, the author, likewise, proclaimed several advantages for the shedding of clerical tasks by librarians, advantages which are today being used to promote a strong paraprofessional structure within the library. First of all, librarians could project a more professional image and demand better salaries. Secondly, library education could be improved, and finally, the caliber of candidates recruited for library school would be upgraded.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 4.

[2]Ibid., p. 9.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York also financed later studies pertaining to library training such as the one done in 1936 by Ralph Munn,[1] a 1942 study by Keyes D. Metcalf,[2] and in 1946 the Wheeler report.[3] The Munn study, like the Williamson Report, noted that students, graduates, employers, and educators accused library schools of placing too much stress on details and methods and not enough on philosophy, purposes, and outside community contacts.

The Wheeler report maintained that library school curriculums nad improved, but there was still criticism of too much attention to details and methods. However, Wheeler asserted that the major problem involved library administrators who wanted graduates who could ". . . drop into vacancies and be immediately versed in all routine methods of a given library and satisfied to perform these routines."[4]

Ernest J. Reece, in discussing the recruitment of superior graduates to library schools, again pointed out the adverse effect of professionals doing too many routine tasks:

---

[1]Ralph Munn, Conditions and Trends in Education For Librarianship, quoted in C. Edward Carrol, Professionalization of Education, p. 112.

[2]Keyes D. Metcalf, Program of Instruction in Library Schools, quoted in C. Edward Carrol, Professionalization of Education, p. 112.

[3]Joseph L. Wheeler, Progress and Problems in Education For Librarianship (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1946).

[4]Ibid., p. 54.

> Other possible deterrents are less widely admited but even more serious. They include the conspicuous position of mechanical routines in libraries: . . . and the limited opportunity for professionally trained persons to function at a level befitting their capacities, to bear an appropriate measure of responsibility, to undertake interesting and creative work, and to advance in rank and compensation."[1]

Naturally, one of his recommendations for overcoming these deterrents was that libraries free their professional staff of lay duties.

In 1948 the Subcommittee of the American Library Association on Personnel Administration prepared a list of duties which it determined were professional and duties which were nonprofessional. Further efforts to distinguish between professional and nonprofessional were made in 1952 by the California Library Association's Library Development Committee.

Although recognizing the work of the American Library Association, the California committee thought that additional efforts should be made. This failure to separate duties is a "major hindrance to library development."[2]

Despite efforts to persuade librarians to perform fewer nonprofessional duties, Hart and Griffith's study of California public librarians in the early 1960's revealed that, of those responding to the questionnaire, there was an average of from seventeen to thirty four percent of the working

---

[1]Ernest J. Reece, The Task and Training of Librarians (New York: King's Crown Press, 1949), pp. 67-58.

[2]Edward A. Wight, "Separation of Professional and Nonprofessional Work in Public Libraries," California Librarian 14 (September 1952): 29-32.

day spent on nonprofessional duties.[1] The percentage was even higher among department heads and branch librarians.

The mid 1960's focused even more closely on the problem when there arose an acute shortage of librarians. In order to solve this problem, suggestions were made to increase the number of library schools and the size of existing ones. A stronger recruitment program was also urged. However, all of these would require several years before any results would be apparent.

The attention, therefore, centered on a better utilization of paraprofessionals. Mr. Jerold Orne even claimed that three-fourths of all library work required less than a graduate degree from an accredited library school,[2] while Mr. Ralph Ellsworth admitted that in all large university libraries an embarrassingly large percentage of the time of the professional staff is wasted.[3]

A stronger statement calling for a re-definition of duties in university libraries was made by Mr. Robert Downs and Mr. Robert Delzell:

> For University librarians the matter of definition of duties is of fundamental importance in the achievement and maintenance of academic or faculty status. An essential first step in gaining proper recognition of librarians as members of the academic staff is making a clear distinction and separation between professional and clerical duties in libraries. The most valid

---

[1]Eugene O. Hart and William J. Griffith, "Professional or Clerical?," Library Journal 86 (September 1, 1961): 2758-2759.

[2]"Library Education and the Talent Shortage," Library Journal 91 (April 1, 1966): 1763.

[3]Ibid., p. 1765.

> objection to the acceptance of librarians into academic circles is that in some libraries there are alleged to be too many routine, nonprofessional jobs carried on by "professional" staff members.[1]

Another library administrator, Ervin Gaines, warned against librarians becoming too involved in trivial matters, and expressed this opinion:

> In our larger institutions I believe that we ought to strive mightly to reduce the number of professionals and to assign them to the key posts where the greatest judgment and managerial skills are demanded. In this way their full talents will be kept in play at all times.[2]

Although the 1960's appeared to be offering the same arguments as the preceeding decades, several factors made the need for distinguishing duties more real: first of all, the demand by patrons for more library services, and secondly, the rapid expansion of libraries caused by the knowledge explosion. In addition, the United States Government provided funds not only for materials, but also for the building of new and the expansion of old buildings. All of these created a need for more librarians who were not available.

Similarly, the early 1960's marked the beginning of many new junior college programs for the training of library technical assistants. This idea was not entirely new because J. Periam Danton, in his 1946 study, advocated just such a program. He recommended the following:

> The first and lower of these services, which we might call the technical or sub-professional service, would be frankly intended to train that large mass of strictly

---

[1]Robert B. Downs and Robert F. Delzell, "Professional Duties in University Libraries," College and Research Libraries 26 (January 1965): 31.

[2]"Library Education and the Talent Shortage," p. 1771.

> technical workers which the profession needs. The program for this training would be incorporated in the last year of junior college terminal education and probably would not need to consume more than one-half of that year. The curriculum would be technical and elementary.[1]

Even though a few junior colleges had instituted programs before 1960, most of the programs were begun after that date. These new courses of study, comprising both one and two year programs, have been received with mixed emotions. The Joint Ad Hoc Committee of the American Library Association's Library Administration and Library Education divisions hailed the development of this new middle group of employees as a real step forward. They could not only help solve the manpower problem, but they could also further relieve the professional librarian of routine duties.

Rose W. Kinzer, assistant librarian at Odessa College, claimed that sixty percent of all library work could be done by a well trained nonprofessional staff. Moreover, she contended that only large libraries could provide a strong in-service training program. Yet even then this approach was expensive and less comprehensive than a two year junior college program.[2]

Dr. Louis Shores, one of the strongest current proponents of the library technical assistant and a noted figure in library education, states his enthusiasm as

---

[1]J. Periam Danton, Education For Librarianship: Criticisms, Dilemmas, and Proposals (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1969), pp. 24-25.

[2]Rose W. Kinzer, "A Discussion of the Library Aide or Clerk: His Status and Training," Junior College Journal 32 (December 1961): 220-221.

follows:

> After a decade of endeavor in the junior college phenomenon I am more convinced than ever that this middle group of workers will enhance our library service. I am excited because for the first time the professional librarian has an opportunity to become a professional, to assume the high role in our society for which we are destined.[1]

As noted earlier, not all people share the enthusiasm of Dr. Shores and the proponents of the training of the library technician in the junior college. Karl Nyren takes a rather strong position against this training, and his opinion is that:

> no one in his right mind is going to pay for a (watered-down library) education that will enable him to run a charging machine, paste pockets, or type library cards. It just doesn't pay enough and none of it is that difficult to learn. I can't imagine what advocates of a program like this are thinking of--unless it is the mentally retarded.[2]

Others argue along with Roger McDonough that trained technicians are not what are needed, but rather individuals with a four year liberal arts degree. The technician can be trained in the library.

One of the recent chief opponents of the academic trained technician is Mr. Samuel Sass. He refers to these technicians as "Instant librarians", since he thinks many will be hired to fill professional vacancies for economical reasons.[3] He contends that these junior college programs do a disservice to the library profession, because the junior

---

[1]Louis Shores, "Library Technician: A Professional Opportunity," Special Libraries 59 (April 1968): 241-242.

[2]"Library Education and the Talent Shortage," p. 1766.

[3]Samuel Sass, "Library Technicians--Instant Librarians?," Library Journal 92 (June 1, 1967): 2122-2126.

colleges are being allowed to solve a manpower problem that library leaders themselves are not sure how to solve. He continues his argument by claiming that junior college programs are poorly prepared without adequate counseling of professional librarians and with the employment of poorly trained teachers. Mr. Sass maintains, too, that the students as a whole in the junior college are substandard to those in a four year school. This argument is based on a quote from a speech made by a Massachusetts community college president who in 1967, while addressing a convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, stated, "They [junior college students] are less bright."[1]

Despite his opposition to junior college trained technicians, Mr. Sass does recognize the need for a nonprofessional staff. Some of his claims concerning these training programs are probably well founded, but the publishing of the United States Civil Service Commission's job descriptions have done much to strengthen the two year curricula.[2] These descriptions, consisting of seven grades for the paraprofessional group, provide a solid foundation upon which to build a program of study. They are the foundation upon which Tex Tec was based,[3] and Peter Spyers-Duran has called the GS 1411 descriptions the single most influential development in the library

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]U.S. Civil Service Commission, Position-Classification Standards: 1966.

[3]See letter, appendix A.

paraprofessional movement.[1] Their importance in the development of curricula cannot be denied, but there is still much confusion over the proper role of the paraprofessional.

Much of the dislike for junior college programs seems to culminate in the fear that a great surplus of librarians will result. As long as they are trained within the library, the librarians can control what they learn and what they do, and thus, protect their jobs.

Many professionals, including Edwin E. Williams and Dr. Lester Asheim, refute this stand. Basically Mr. Williams said, in 1945, that acceptance of low grade work such as filing or typing by librarians is a failure to use their natural talents and training, and, therefore, downgrades the profession. Dr. Asheim, in discussing the American Library Association's policy statement, states his position:

> Either we believe that professionals should do professional work, or we don't. I hope we are not saying that, if professionally qualified personnel are willing or forced to take inadequate pay and assignments for economic reasons, the official policy of the Association should therefore be that poor pay and staff misuse are okay . . . from the economic standpoint, better qualifications are what are needed to compete in a tightening job market.[2]

There has now appeared an economic crisis in libraries and the demand for professional librarians has diminished. The rising cost of operations without adequate increases in budgets has caused administrators to curtail

---

[1]Peter Spyers-Duran, A Review of Curriculum Development For Library Technicians in Junior Colleges, ED 071 653, p. 10.

[2]Lester Asheim, "Implications of the Policy of Library Education and Manpower," Tennessee Librarian 24 (Winter 1972): 11.

hiring. There has, likewise, been a reduction in the number of new libraries being founded. These and other reasons have resulted in a shift of emphasis from developing an adequate manpower to a more efficient management of libraries.

However, this crisis has not changed the need for re-defining duties, but rather has probably increased it. Library administrators must now find ways to provide needed services with little or no increase in funds. This situation, in turn, has placed much greater attention on a strong para-professional organization as evidenced by the founding of the Council on Library Technology to coordinate the role, training, recruitment, and employment of library technicians.

Canada, too, is wrestling with this problem of distinguishing duties. John Marshall reports that fifty percent of the delegates to the 1966 Conference of the Canadian Library Association, which focused on library education, wished to discuss the problem of better utilization of the professional staff rather than education as such.

In the late 1960's the American Library Association's Office For Library Education began working on a manpower statement which was adopted by the Council of the Association in June 1970.[1] Besides calling for three levels of paraprofessionals in libraries--the clerk, the library technical assistant and the associate--the statement endorsed the community college as the educational agency to offer degree

---

[1]American Library Association, Library Education and Manpower Statement (June 30, 1970).

programs in the training of library technical assistants.

In 1971 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare sponsored an institute at the University of Denver, Graduate School of Librarianship on the Utilization of Library Manpower. The institute dealt with the problem of job descriptions for paraprofessionals. The director of the project, John T. Eastlick, stated:

> Participants operated on the premise that most jobs in libraries are too small and require too little effort on the part of employees. The full capabilities of the incumbent of a job are not utilized.[1]

The increase in the number of junior college technician programs seems to be an indication of the stronger acceptance of the changing concept in library personnel. Dr. Asheim summarized this mood:

> While the current manpower shortage may have underlined the need, the amelioration of the manpower situation is not the primary goal of the program. The training of technical assistants, the introduction of a middle service at the bachelor's level and the reassignment of duties from the professional staff to the nonprofessional--all of these are meant to increase the quality of professional performance and to raise standards, not lower them. If we can relieve the librarian of technical tasks, we can demand more of him as a librarian. It is this end we have in view. The constant improvement of library service overall--and not just the maintenance of library service at its present level.[2]

---

[1]John T. Eastlick, ed., Library Job Descriptions (Denver: University of Denver, ED 057 827, 1971), p. "Preface".

[2]Lester E. Asheim, "Education and Manpower For Librarianship: First Step Toward a Statement of Policy," American Library Association Bulletin 62 (October 1968): 1105-1106.

SUMMARY

The decade of the seventies can bring a changing role for librarians. Dr. John Dawson sees this role as one of planning and selecting materials and courses of action. It will also include training, supervising, and inspiring the nonprofessional staff; in short, it will be a role of library-managers or bibliothecal specialists.

For this role to change to one of a more professional nature, there must first be a re-definition of duties. Archie L. McNeal's words may be even truer today than when written in 1956:

> Whatever the reason for keeping such a high ratio of professionals, it seems likely that librarians facing financial pressures may need to scrutinize carefully the nature of personnel required to perform the duties of each position. Proper job analysis and classification of positions are essential to such a survey.[1]

---

[1]Archie L. McNeal, "Ratio of Professional to Clerical Staff," College and Research Libraries 17 (May 1956): 219.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the procedures used in selecting the subjects and collecting the data as well as the methods used in treating the data.

Selection of Subjects

Since there were only two junior colleges in the five states chosen for this study with an enrollment of over twelve thousand students, the maximum size of the institutions selected was limited to prevent greater distortion in the sizes of the staffs. It was likewise necessary to set minimum requirements to insure a staff large enough to support a strong paraprofessional organization. Therefore, for this study junior colleges and universities were limited to institutions with a total enrollment of from 3,000 to 12,000 students. In addition, junior colleges were required to have a full time enrollment of at least one thousand students. This requirement was included because at least one junior college had a sufficient total enrollment to be included but had a very small full time enrollment, resulting in a very small library staff. This problem did not exist among universities.

Public libraries included in the study served a population of 150,000 to 500,000 people, thereby providing a

similar size staff to that of the universities.

No private institutions were included in the study because there were no private junior colleges large enough or private institutions equivalent to a public library. Eight private universities met the criteria, but the majority of these were concentrated in Texas. Their inclusion would only have increased the number of universities surveyed, resulting in over half the institutions coming from one category.

As noted in Table 1, by using the delimitations set forth a total population of seventy-six library administrators were surveyed. The Community and Junior College Directory, 1973 was used for enrollment figures for junior colleges; the College Blue Book, 14th edition, for universities; and the American Library Directory, 1972-1973, for public libraries. The table also indicates that a comparison by states is not feasible, since some states have only one subject in each category.

TABLE 1

LIBRARIES INCLUDED IN STUDY BY STATE AND TYPE

State	Jr. College	University	Public	Total
Alabama . .	2	5	3	10
Florida . .	11	3	5	19
Louisiana .	1	8	3	12
Mississippi	1	6	1	8
Texas . . .	11	13	3	27
Total . . .	26	35	15	76

Data Collection

The instrument used to survey the administrators was a product of the researcher. The job descriptions were based primarily on the United States Civil Service Commission's Position-Classification Standards: GS 1410 Librarian Series, GS 1411 Library Technician Series, and GS 1412 Technical Information Service Series. Some duties were also taken from the related literature. Duties chosen were primarily those which the literature indicated were not commonly accepted as either professional or paraprofessional. The remaining parts of the questionnaire--advantages and disadvantages of the paraprofessional category and the training of the library technical assistants--were taken from the related literature.

The instrument was checked for face validity by conducting a pilot study. Twenty library directors from institutions meeting the criteria of those used in the study were randomly selected from the states of Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The library administrators were sent the instrument with a letter requesting that they answer the questions, note any questions which were not clear, and make suggestions for improving the instrument. Of the twenty, twelve responded.

The instrument was also given to ten additional librarians who were not being surveyed in the study to obtain enough data to insure that the methods of treating the data were satisfactory. Of the ten, eight responded. The two-phase pilot study, therefore, consisted of a total of twenty subjects and the results were used to revise the questionnaire.

After revision, the questionnaire was mailed on January 29, 1974, to those selected participants from the five states. On February 15, 1974, a follow-up letter, a second questionnaire, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to each administrator who had not responded.

Of the seventy-six library directors surveyed, a total of fifty-nine eventually responded--a 78 percent return (see Table 2). Of those returning the questionnaire, one junior college director returned the instrument but refused to answer the questions. Two failed to include their age, but their responses were included.

TABLE 2

RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM LIBRARIES BY STATE AND TYPE

State	Jr. College	University	Public	Total
Alabama . .	2	3	3	8
Florida . .	10	3	3	16
Louisiana .	1	5	3	9
Mississippi	1	5	1	7
Texas . . .	8	10	1	19
Total . . .	22	26	11	59
Percentages	.847	.742	.733	.776

Treatment of Data

The statistical approach chosen for this study was primarily twofold. For the three parts of the questionnaire labeled "job descriptions," "advantages and disadvantages," and "library technical assistants," chi square was the statis-

tical technique employed to analyze the data. For this purpose a three by two cell distribution was devised for the two parts designated "job descriptions" and "advantages and disadvantages". In these cells the obtained and expected frequencies were recorded by types of libraries. In the third section of the questionnaire concerned with the training of library technical assistants, a three by three cell distribution was necessary to accommodate the no opinion answers received. In all cells the percentages of yes and no answers were computed by types of libraries to provide further information about the returns. On those questions that were significant the X^2 was calculated to account for the percentages of X^2 by types of libraries. All were tested at the .05 level of significance.

With the demographic variables, an intercorrelation matrix was used to determine the relationship of the variable with the responses to each question. The mean and standard deviation of each variable were also computed. Percentages were calculated on the responses to the question relating to the role of the librarian. Only an approximate ratio of full time paraprofessional to professional employees was calculated, since some respondents included student assistants in the part time figures and others did not. No real meaningful analysis could be made of the answers to the questions in the miscellaneous section relating to the existing paraprofessional structure and the preferred changes in the structure.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Introduction

Presented in this chapter is the statistical analysis derived from the data collected from the questionnaire. These data are divided into three general categories: job descriptions, advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure within the library organization, and training of the library technical assistant. Some generalizations are likewise made concerning the classification of paraprofessionals and the role of the librarian.

As stated in Chapter 3, the statistical approach for this study was twofold. An intercorrelation matrix was used to determine the relationship that existed between the demographic variables--age and number of years a library director--and the responses to each question. Chi square was used to denote the relationship between the perception of duty and library type.

Demographic Variables

A noteworthy item derived from the data pertaining to the demographic variables, age and number of years a library director, was the mean of each variable. The mean of the variable age was 45.44, while that of the number of years a

director was 9.17. The standard deviations were 8.94 and 6.68 respectively.

As stated in Chapter 1, a specific purpose of this study was to determine if certain demographic variables were significantly correlated with the library administrator's conception of the role of the paraprofessional. More specifically, this purpose posed the questions of whether or not there was a significant relationship between these two sets of factors: the demographic variables, age and number of years a library administrator, and the administrators' conception of the duties of the paraprofessional; the advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure and the preference of training for library technicians.

In defining correlation one author stated:

> Correlation, as the word itself suggests, is an interrelation between two or more sorts of conditions or events. We call these events variables. . . .[1]
>
> Although correlational research seldom shows what factor is responsible for a relationship between two variables, it is nevertheless a valuable method of measuring these relationships.[2]

In measuring relationships between variables a value is calculated between plus one and minus one: a minus figure simply indicating an inverse or negative relationship between variables. The closer to one (whether plus or minus) the value is, the higher the relationship and the closer to zero the lower the relationship.

---

[1]Janet T. Spence and others, Elementary Statistics, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968), p. 113.

[2]Ibid., p. 116.

Consequently, an examination of the effects of the demographic variable, age, indicated a very low relationship in nearly all cases. The highest relationship was between the variables themselves at .5155. The next two highest relationships were between the variable and the question of whether or not a strong paraprofessional structure would result in a surplus of librarians (-.3859); and between the variable and the technical assistant question recording a similar value of -.3216. Questions 18, 24, 19, and 5 concerning the advantages, registered values between .2502 and .2038. All other questions had values between .0000 and .1976. There was a total of twenty-seven questions with a negative or inverse relationship.

With the other demographic variable, number of years a library director, the findings resembled those of age. As can be observed in Table 3, the highest relationship is again between the two variables (.5155). The next highest relationship existed between this variable and the technical assistant question with a value -.4763. One other question had a value greater than .3000 and that was the second one under advantages, which concerned improved library service (-.3233). On five questions (16, 2, 18, 32 and 1 of the disadvantages), there were values between .2643 and .2033; all others had a value below .2000. A total of twenty-five questions exhibited a negative relationship.

TABLE 3

AN INTERCORRELATION ANALYSES BETWEEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES

Question	Product Moment Correlation	
	Age	Years A Director
Job Descriptions		
1. Conduct tours	-.0606	-.0477
2. Explain card catalog	-.0785	-.2323
3. Compile reading lists	-.1603	-.1445
4. Give book talks	-.1694	.0303
5. Maintain bulletin boards	-.0566	-.0517
6. Plan and design displays	.0795	.2298
7. Supervise inventories	.1414	.0954
8. Interlibrary loan	-.0194	-.1719
9. Supervise small branch	-.1010	-.0840
10. Replacement of materials	-.0084	-.0178
11. Accept small gift collections	-.1393	-.1551
12. Prepare bibliographies	-.1505	-.0152
13. Verify entries	-.0037	.0254
14. Maintain circulation statistics	.0450	.0897
15. Catalogue simple materials	-.0314	-.1054
16. Catalogue materials using LC cards	.0360	-.2643
17. Catalogue materials without LC cards	.0225	-.0324
18. Deal with patrons on lost materials	-.2502	-.2349
19. Answer simple reference questions	.2299	-.0519
20. Organize and maintain vertical files	-.0346	-.1138
21. Revise filing	.1574	.0596
22. Check order cards for duplicates	.0000	.0000
23. Order LC cards	-.0561	.1224
24. Withdraw materials lost or damaged	.2485	.1725
25. Index local materials	-.0034	.0822
26. Select materials for purchase	.0793	.0197
27. Assign cutter numbers	-.0098	-.0050
28. Collect and record fines	-.0566	-.0517
29. Assist patrons in selecting books	-.0396	.0385
30. Prepare abstracts	.0763	.0019
31. Inventory and order supplies	.1888	-.0032
32. Maintain periodical checklists	-.0752	-.2099

TABLE 3--Continued

Question	Product Moment Correlation	
	Age	Years A Director
Advantages		
1. Free librarian of routine duties	-.0452	-.1552
2. Improve library service	-.0012	-.3233
3. Upgrade graduate studies	-.1976	-.1167
4. Combine work and study	.1715	.1918
5. Improve recruitment	.2038	.1868
6. Higher ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals	-.1023	-.0940
Disadvantages		
1. Hiring paraprofessionals in place of professionals to save money	.0768	.2033
2. Surplus of librarians	-.3859	-.1180
3. Doing professional tasks	-.1599	.0385
Library Technical Assistant		
Preference of training	-.3216	-.4763
Age	1.0000	.5155
Years a Director	.5155	1.0000

As shown in Table 4, it can be concluded that there were six occurrences, three apiece, upon which each of the variables, age and number of years a director, had a relationship of .3000 or above. Two of these were the same: the relationship between the variables, themselves, and the technical assistant question. Age also had a similar relationship with one of the disadvantages questions; whereas, the other variable had a comparable relationship with one of the advantages questions. All other questions recorded a value of .2643 or less.

TABLE 4

HIGHEST RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES

Question	Product Moment Correlation	
	Age	Years A Director
Years a Director	.5155	1.0000
Age	1.0000	.5155
Library Technical Assistant	-.3216	-.4763
Improved Library Service	--	-.3233
Surplus of Librarians	-.3859	--

It was also interesting to note that there was absolutely no relationship (.0000) between the two variables and question 22, the checking of order cards with other orders for possible duplication. This result could be accounted for by noting that all administrators responding agreed that checking of order cards was a paraprofessional job. Question 22 was the only one upon which there was one hundred percent agreement.

Chi Square Findings

In analyzing the responses of the library administrators to each question by type of library, some rather interesting results were notable. First of all, six questions (2, 12, 23, 25, 30, and the training of the library technician) were statistically significant; their statistical significance was due to the fact that the X^2 obtained for these questions was higher than the table value, meaning that obtained frequencies were significantly different from what might be

expected based on chance variation alone.

In regard to these six questions, the conception of the duty was dependent 95 percent or more of the time on the category of library; the other 5 percent, or less, variation being due to chance. Consequently, there was a significant difference among groups in their responses to each of the six. On the questions which were not significant, the conception of the duty was independent of the library type.

Of the six questions that were significant, five (2, 12, 23, 25, and 30) were from the first section of the instrument on job descriptions, as shown by Table 5, and the other question concerned the acceptance of the junior college trained technician. Furthermore, as can be noted by observing Table 5, the frequencies of observed and expected yes and no responses, the percentage of both observed positive and negative responses, the X^2 by type of library, the percentage of X^2 accounted for by each category of library, and the probability are provided for each of these questions. For example, on question 2, the explaining of the card catalog, the probability was .02, which meant that chance accounted for 2 percent of the variation in responses. Moreover, the public library directors recorded 5 positive responses (45 percent) and 6 negative ones (55 percent); whereas, the expected frequencies were 5.31 and 5.69 respectively. The actual X^2 value accounted for by this category of directors was .034 of the total X^2 (7.734), or .4 percent of this value. To obtain significance on the first two general categories or section of the instrument, a table value of 5.991 or higher for X^2 was needed.

TABLE 5

ANALYSES OF CHI SQUARE DATA OF SIGNIFICANT JOB DESCRIPTION TASKS*

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	Percent of X^2	P
2. Explain card catalog									
Pub.	5	45	5.31	6	55	5.69	.035	00.4	
Jr. Col.	15	71	10.14	6	29	10.86	4.508	58.3	
Univ.	8	31	12.55	18	69	13.45	3.191	41.3	
Total							7.734	100.0	.0207
12. Prepare bibliographies									
Pub.	4	36	2.84	7	64	8.16	.633	05.1	
Jr. Col.	10	48	5.43	11	52	15.57	5.183	41.8	
Univ.	1	04	6.72	25	96	19.28	6.571	53.1	
Total							12.390	100.0	.0025
23. Order Library of Congress cards									
Pub.	9	82	10.62	2	18	.38	7.171	80.8	
Jr. Col.	21	100	20.28	0	0	.72	.749	08.5	
Univ.	26	100	25.10	0	0	.90	.931	10.7	
Total							8.851	100.0	.0121

*All questions have 2 degrees freedom; table value equals 5.991. P=.05 level of significance.

TABLE 5--Continued

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	Percent of X^2	P
25. Index local materials									
Pub.	7	64	3.03	4	36	7.97	7.156	81.0	
Jr. Col.	4	19	5.79	17	81	15.21	.767	08.7	
Univ.	5	19	7.17	21	81	18.83	.908	10.3	
Total							8.831	100.0	.0123
30. Prepare abstracts									
Pub.	5	45	1.90	6	55	9.10	6.136	77.4	
Jr. Col.	3	14	3.62	18	86	17.38	.129	01.6	
Univ.	2	8	4.48	24	92	21.52	1.661	21.0	
Total							7.926	100.0	.0189

Of these five questions in the job descriptions section which were significant, the greatest differences between observed and expected frequencies were in public libraries on questions 23, 25, and 30. On question 23, the ordering of Library of Congress catalog cards, the public library accounted for 81 percent of the X^2, while on the other two questions of indexing materials and preparing abstracts this category accounted for 81 percent and 77 percent respectively.

On question 2, explaining the card catalog to users, the junior college recorded the highest variation accounting for a total of 58 percent of the X^2. However, on this question the university level accounted for a total of 41 percent. Fifty-three percent of the X^2 was accounted for by the university category on question 12, the preparing of bibliographies, while the junior college provided a total of 42 percent.

Job Descriptions

Since there were five duties which were statistically significant, there were twenty-seven which were not; that is, the conception of the duty was independent of the library type. Table 6 shows the observed and expected frequencies of the yes and no responses by library category, percentages of observed frequencies, X^2, and the probability of the twenty-seven questions not statistically significant. As this table indicates, the directors' conception of the duties described in questions 1, 9, and 16 differed.

TABLE 6

ANALYSES OF CHI SQUARE DATA OF NONSIGNIFICANT JOB DESCRIPTION TASKS*

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
			1. Conduct tours					
Pub.	5	45	6.64	6	55	4.36		
Jr. Col.	16	76	12.67	5	24	8.33		
Univ.	14	54	15.69	12	46	10.31		
Total							3.681	.1570
			3. Compile reading lists					
Pub.	4	36	3.41	7	64	7.59		
Jr. Col.	8	38	6.52	13	62	14.48		
Univ.	6	23	8.07	20	77	17.93		
Total							1.404	.5003
			4. Give book talks					
Pub.	4	36	2.84	7	64	8.16		
Jr. Col.	7	33	5.43	14	67	15.57		
Univ.	4	15	6.72	22	85	19.28		
Total							2.733	.2543
			5. Maintain bulletin boards					
Pub.	11	100	10.62	0	0	.38		
Jr. Col.	20	95	20.28	1	5	.72		
Univ.	25	96	25.10	1	4	.90		
Total							.514	.7769
			6. Plan and design displays					
Pub.	9	82	8.72	2	18	2.28		
Jr. Col.	17	81	16.66	4	19	4.34		
Univ.	20	77	20.62	6	23	5.38		
Total							.167	.9194
			7. Supervise inventories					
Pub.	7	64	7.59	4	36	3.41		
Jr. Col.	13	62	14.48	8	38	6.52		
Univ.	20	77	17.93	6	23	8.07		
Total							.1404	.5003

*All questions have 2 degrees freedom; table value equals 5.991. P=.05 level of significance.

TABLE 6--Continued

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
8. Interlibrary loan								
Pub.	11	100	8.91	0	0	2.09		
Jr. Col.	17	81	17.02	4	19	3.98		
Univ.	19	73	21.07	7	27	4.93		
Total							3.646	.1599
9. Supervise small branch								
Pub.	6	55	3.98	5	45	7.02		
Jr. Col.	6	29	7.60	15	71	13.40		
Univ.	9	35	9.41	17	65	16.59		
Total							2.160	.3406
10. Replacement of materials								
Pub.	3	27	1.52	8	73	9.48		
Jr. Col.	3	14	2.90	18	86	18.10		
Univ.	2	8	3.59	24	92	22.41		
Total							2.499	.2864
11. Accept small gift collections								
Pub.	1	9	1.14	10	91	9.86		
Jr. Col.	4	19	2.17	17	81	18.83		
Univ.	1	4	2.69	25	96	23.31		
Total							2.917	.2314
13. Verify entries								
Pub.	11	100	9.67	0	0	1.33		
Jr. Col.	17	81	18.47	4	19	2.53		
Univ.	23	88	22.86	3	12	3.14		
Total							2.480	.2892
14. Maintain circulation statistics								
Pub.	11	100	10.43	0	0	.57		
Jr. Col.	19	90	19.91	2	10	1.09		
Univ.	25	96	24.66	1	4	1.34		
Total							1.504	.5240
15. Catalogue simple materials								
Pub.	9	82	7.59	2	18	3.41		
Jr. Col.	17	81	14.48	4	19	6.52		
Univ.	14	69	17.93	12	31	8.07		
Total							5.036	.0791

TABLE 6--Continued

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
16. Catalogue materials using LC cards								
Pub.	5	45	5.31	6	55	5.69		
Jr. Col.	11	52	10.14	10	48	10.86		
Univ.	12	48	12.55	14	52	13.45		
Total							.224	.8939
17. Catalogue materials without LC cards								
Pub.	4	36	2.46	7	64	8.54		
Jr. Col.	5	24	4.71	16	76	16.29		
Univ.	4	22	5.83	22	78	20.17		
Total							1.993	.6290
18. Deal with patrons on lost materials								
Pub.	8	73	7.40	3	27	3.60		
Jr. Col.	13	62	14.12	8	38	6.88		
Univ.	18	67	17.48	8	33	8.52		
Total							.469	.7941
19. Answer simple reference questions								
Pub.	7	64	7.21	4	36	3.79		
Jr. Col.	12	57	13.76	9	43	7.24		
Univ.	19	73	17.03	7	27	8.97		
Total							1.327	.5201
20. Organize and maintain vertical files								
Pub.	7	64	7.78	4	36	3.22		
Jr. Col.	18	86	14.84	3	14	6.16		
Univ.	16	62	18.38	10	38	7.62		
Total							3.603	.1634
21. Revise filing								
Pub.	6	55	6.26	5	45	4.74		
Jr. Col.	13	62	11.95	8	38	9.05		
Univ.	14	57	14.79	12	43	11.21		
Total							.338	.8455
22. Check order cards for duplicates								
Pub.	11	100	11.00	0	0	0		
Jr. Col.	21	100	21.00	0	0	0		
Univ.	26	100	26.00	0	0	0		
Total							1.000	.000

TABLE 6--Continued

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
24. Withdraw materials lost or damaged								
Pub.	9	82	8.72	2	18	2.28		
Jr. Col.	17	81	16.66	4	19	4.34		
Univ.	20	77	20.62	6	23	5.38		
Total							.167	.9194
26. Select materials for purchase								
Pub.	2	18	.95	9	82	10.05		
Jr. Col.	2	10	1.81	19	90	19.19		
Univ.	16	62	17.48	10	38	8.52		
Total							2.981	.2241
28. Collect and record fines								
Pub.	11	100	10.62	0	0	.28		
Jr. Col.	20	95	20.28	1	5	.72		
Univ.	25	96	25.10	1	4	.90		
Total							.514	.7769
29. Assist patrons in selecting books								
Pub.	5	45	3.41	6	55	7.59		
Jr. Col.	7	33	6.52	14	67	14.48		
Univ.	6	31	8.07	20	69	17.93		
Total							1.890	.6088
31. Inventory and order supplies								
Pub.	11	100	10.24	0	0	.76		
Jr. Col.	21	100	19.55	0	0	1.45		
Univ.	22	93	24.21	4	7	1.79		
Total							5.288	.0697
32. Maintain periodical checklists								
Pub.	11	100	9.29	0	0	1.71		
Jr. Col.	19	90	17.74	2	10	3.26		
Univ.	19	73	21.97	7	27	4.03		
Total							5.176	.0737

A further look at the actual responses to all the questions provided some answers to the first question posed in this study concerning the duties of the paraprofessional as conceived by library administrators. There was agreement by the administrators of all three types of libraries on twenty-seven duties; eighteen classified as paraprofessional and nine professional. In addition to the eighteen duties upon which there was agreement, there were other tasks classified by a majority (51 percent or greater) of the directors of one or two categories of libraries as nonprofessional. In Table 7 nonprofessional duties have been ranked by percentages from high to low and library type. From the data it can be observed that public library directors conceived questions 9 and 25, supervising small branches and indexing, as paraprofessional; whereas, junior college and university directors characterized conducting tours of the library as nonprofessional. In addition, junior college administrators stated that explaining the card catalog and cataloging materials using Library of Congress catalog cards represented paraprofessional tasks.

Therefore, public library administrators classified twenty tasks, junior college twenty-one tasks, and university directors nineteen tasks as nonprofessional. Consequently, it would appear from these results that a paraprofessional task in one type of library might be classified as professional in another type.

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGES FROM HIGH TO LOW OF PARAPROFESSIONAL JOB FUNCTIONS BY LIBRARY TYPE

Question	Percent
Public	
5. Maintain bulletin boards	100
8. Interlibrary loan	100
13. Verify entries	100
14. Maintain circulation statistics	100
22. Check order cards for duplicates	100
28. Collect and record fines	100
31. Inventory and order supplies	100
32. Maintain periodical checklists	100
6. Plan and design displays	82
15. Catalogue simple materials	82
23. Order LC cards	82
24. Withdraw materials lost or damaged	82
18. Deal with patrons on lost materials	73
7. Supervise inventories	64
19. Answer simple reference questions	64
20. Organize and maintain vertical files	64
25. Index local materials	64
9. Supervise small branch	55
21. Revise filing	55
27. Assign cutter numbers	55
Junior College	
22. Check order cards for duplicates	100
23. Order LC cards	100
31. Inventory and order supplies	100
5. Maintain bulletin boards	95
28. Collect and record fines	95
14. Maintain circulation statistics	90
32. Maintain periodical checklists	90
20. Organize and maintain vertical files	86
6. Plan and design displays	81
8. Interlibrary loan	81
13. Verify entries	81
15. Catalogue simple materials	81
24. Withdraw materials lost or damages	81
27. Assign cutter numbers	81
1. Conduct tours	76
2. Explain card catalog	71

TABLE 7--Continued

Question	Percent
7. Supervise inventories	62
18. Deal with patrons on lost materials	62
21. Revise filing	62
19. Answer simple reference questions	57
16. Catalogue materials using LC cards	52
University	
22. Check order cards for duplicates	100
23. Order LC cards	100
5. Maintain bulletin boards	96
14. Maintain circulation statistics	96
28. Collect and record fines	96
31. Inventory and order supplies	93
13. Verify entries	88
6. Plan and design displays	77
7. Supervise inventories	77
24. Withdraw materials lost or damages	77
8. Interlibrary loan	73
19. Answer simple reference questions	73
32. Maintain periodical checklists	73
20. Organize and maintain vertical files	71
15. Catalogue simple materials	69
18. Deal with patrons on lost materials	67
27. Assign cutter numbers	62
21. Revise filing	57
1. Conduct tours	54

Comments

Although some duties were marked as paraprofessional in nature, the comments next to the questions on the instrument further indicated the reluctance of some administrators to fully accept some duties as paraprofessional without reservations. Perhaps their comments were made because the degree to which the duty is to be performed was not defined in the instrument. In the U.S. Civil Service GS 1410 series under the "functions performed by professional librarians,"

it stated:

> Duties of the 'professional librarian' are those whose adequate performance involves the ability to exercise judgment based on an understanding of the principles of library service. . . . This understanding implies a wide knowledge of library science philosophy and methodology, specific library techniques and procedures.[1]

The American Library Association's Library Education and Manpower Statement similarly declared:

> The title 'Librarian' carries with it the connotation of 'professional' in the sense that professional tasks are those which require a special background and education on the basis of which library needs are identified, problems are analyzed, goals are set and original and creative solutions are formulated for them, integrating theory into practice, and planning, organizing, communicating, and administering successful programs of service to users of the library's materials and services.[2]

Therefore, to better understand whether certain duties can be performed by a paraprofessional, it appears advantageous to determine if an understanding of the principles, philosophy, and theories of library science is necessary. If so, then the point at which this knowledge is necessary must be determined. The duty can be classified nonprofessional up to this point.

This study did designate tasks both requiring and not requiring a knowledge of these principles and philosophy of library science. Tasks, of which performance by a paraprofessional were questionable, were included as well. However, it would seem that even more specific job descriptions are needed,

---

[1]U.S. Civil Service Commission, Position-Classification Standards, GS 1410 Librarian Series, p. 8.

[2]American Library Association, Library Education and Manpower Statement, p. 3.

but it is doubtful that the development of these can be done by questionnaire alone.

The above position is in agreement with Dr. Ernest B. Jaski who listed five basic techniques which can be utilized in compiling data for job descriptions: (1) observation, (2) interview, (3) questionnaire, (4) log, and (5) a combination of these. In discussing these techniques he concluded:

> Generally, the job analyst should not rely upon only one method of data collection. The best combination of techniques appears to be that of observation and interview.[1]

It certainly seems that, although the GS 1411 series has been helpful in the defining of paraprofessional tasks, these descriptions are not enough. First of all, these descriptions are rather general and apply to all types of library paraprofessionals. However, from the responses to the questions presented on the instrument in this study, administrators of the three types of libraries conceptualize some duties differently; that is, the administrators of one type might characterize the duty as paraprofessional and the other two as professional. If the remarks of one public librarian are true of other public libraries, then in studying the duties of the paraprofessional it would appear that the type of library ought to be considered. This librarian stated:

> . . . I have serious doubts about the value of paraprofessional training. Most of the tasks a technical assistant would be trained for are being eliminated. . . . through automation and commercial processing.

---

[1]Noel R. Grego and Sister Mary Chrysanta Rudnik, eds., Job Description and Certification For Library Technical Assistants (Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1970), p. 9.

It is also important to note that in discussing job descriptions Dr. Jaski noted that the specific purposes the descriptions are to be used for should be kept in mind when gathering data. The job analyst must be aware of these purposes so he will know the type of information he must obtain to meet these needs. Dr. Jaski then stated:

> For example, if the form will be used to familiarize new employees with their jobs, it will be necessary sufficiently to describe all of the duties and responsibilities so that both the employee and employer have no difficulty in understanding what is expected of the position. If, on the other hand, the description will be used to clarify relationships between jobs, the job analyst must examine all of the existing relationships and indicate clearly what they are.[1]

By the first type of descriptions the administrator knows what competencies can be expected of the employee. It should also allow for individual goals to be set. The setting of goals is important as Bernard C. Stinner noted:

a. Mere listing of duties, responsibilities and relationships is not enough.

b. The description must be concise yet fully explain the job content.

c. Recognition should be given to the task itself so that some purpose is defined, some goal or objective set for the individual.[2]

The value of the Federal Civil Service descriptions cannot be denied, but it would also appear that they are of the second type as defined by Dr. Jaski and are concerned more with relationships than what is expected of the position. In

---

[1]Ibid., p. 8.

[2]Dorothy T. Johnson, ed., Job Descriptions and Salaries For Library Technicians (Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1970), p. 6.

fact, under examples for the GS 2-7 of the GS 1411 series, it states that "these are illustrative and not all inclusive."[1] Furthermore, these job descriptions were adopted in 1966 and probably need updating in light of the changes since that time.

Advantages and Disadvantages

Although none of the advantages and disadvantages were statistically significant, an examination of the responses to this section (see Table 8 and 9) reveals some illuminating results concerning the question proposed in Chapter 1 regarding the administrators' conceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure within the library. For example, as shown in Table 8 by the responses to questions 3 and 5 under advantages, there is some question as to whether or not a strong paraprofessional structure within the library can improve library education. On question 3, there was a marked difference in responses by one of the three types: only junior college directors gave a slight edge to the proposal that a strong paraprofessional program would help in upgrading graduate studies. Although the other two types of libraries responded negatively, there was not enough variation between each type to be entirely convincing. A similar situation existed with question 5 which involved the improvement of candidates to library schools. However, on this question public libraries tended to favor yes; whereas, junior colleges and universities slightly favored the no answer. There was

---

[1]U.S. Civil Service Commission, Position-Classification Standards, GS 1411 Library Technician Series, p. 27.

agreement on question 6 that the paraprofessional structure could provide economy by a higher ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals, but the edge among public library administrators was only slight. This slight edge may be due to the present ratio existing in those libraries canvassed. There was no indepth analysis or statistical treatment applied to determine the mean ratio of paraprofessional to professional employees by types of libraries, but the number of full time professional employees revealed that public libraries do have the highest ratio among the institutions surveyed. These administrators may believe perhaps that an increase in ratio is less possible than the administrators of the academic libraries. In fact, one public library recorded three full time professionals and thirty full time nonprofessionals. Most of the public library administrators recorded an approximate ratio of three paraprofessionals to one professional. However, the academic libraries generally have a lower ratio with some having a one to one situation. A conclusive analysis on this subject is not possible since part time employees need to be considered, and some respondents appear to have included student assistants while others did not.

TABLE 8

ANALYSES OF CHI SQUARE DATA REGARDING THE ADVANTAGES OF A STRONG PARAPROFESSIONAL STRUCTURE *

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
			1. Free the librarian from routine duties					
Pub.	11	100	10.81	0	0	.19		
Jr. Col.	21	100	20.64	0	0	.36		
Univ.	25	96	25.55	1	4	.45		
Total							1.252	.5398
			2. Improve library service					
Pub.	7	64	8.72	4	36	2.28		
Jr. Col.	19	90	16.66	2	10	4.34		
Univ.	20	79	20.62	6	21	5.38		
Total							3.333	.1874
			3. Upgrade graduate studies					
Pub.	4	36	4.93	7	64	6.07		
Jr. Col.	11	52	9.41	10	48	11.59		
Univ.	11	42	11.66	15	58	14.34		
Total							.870	.6534
			4. Combine work and study					
Pub.	9	82	9.67	2	18	1.33		
Jr. Col.	20	95	18.47	1	5	2.53		
Univ.	22	85	22.86	4	15	3.14		
Total							1.713	.5719
			5. Improve recruitment					
Pub.	6	55	5.31	5	45	5.69		
Jr. Col.	10	48	10.14	11	52	10.86		
Univ.	12	46	12.55	14	54	13.45		
Total							.224	.8939
			6. Higher ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals					
Pub.	6	55	8.34	5	45	2.66		
Jr. Col.	17	81	15.93	4	19	5.07		
Univ.	21	81	19.92	5	19	6.28		
Total							3.369	.1840

*All questions have 2 degrees freedom; table value equals 5.991. P=.05 level of significance.

Of the other advantages--the freeing of librarians from routine duties, the improvement of library service, and a program combining work and study (numbers 1, 2, and 4)--there was strong affirmative agreement among the directors of all three categories. In addition, two respondents included an advantage in the space provided for "other". One stated that a strong paraprofessional structure would provide for greater flexibility and a wider choice of personnel for employment. The other administrator cited "better staff morale by allowing professionals to exercise intellectual powers and/or management skills."

Among the disadvantages, as is apparent from Table 9, There was a concern over the hiring of paraprofessionals in place of professionals in order to save money. Despite various standards which should aid in preventing such hiring practices, the majority of directors agreed that the danger is there, but the public library administrator was less concerned. Surprisingly, the administrators did not see the other two disadvantages as serious problems despite a fear as revealed in the literature. In fact, Dr. Dorsett recorded a fear by some respondents that the concept of the technician endangers the role of the professional librarian in the areas of reference and book advising.[1] Perhaps one of the administrators surveyed in this study summed up the thoughts of most on this question

---

[1]Cora Matheny Dorsett, "Library Technical Assistants: A Survey of Training Programs and Employment in Selected Libraries" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1972), p. 124.

of paraprofessionals doing professional tasks by saying it will happen "only if administrators permit this."

TABLE 9

ANALYSES OF CHI SQUARE DATA REGARDING THE DISADVANTAGES OF A STRONG PARAPROFESSIONAL STRUCTURE*

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	X^2	P
1. Hiring of paraprofessionals in place of professionals to save money								
Pub.	6	55	7.21	5	45	3.79		
Jr. Col.	14	67	13.76	7	33	7.24		
Univ.	18	69	17.03	8	31	8.97		
Total							.757	.6906
2. Strong paraprofessional structure would result in a surplus of librarians								
Pub.	2	18	1.90	9	82	9.10		
Jr. Col.	4	19	3.62	17	81	17.40		
Univ.	4	15	4.48	22	85	21.52		
Total							.118	.9426
3. Technician will be doing professional tasks								
Pub.	3	27	3.41	8	73	7.59		
Jr. Col.	7	33	6.52	14	67	14.48		
Univ.	8	31	8.07	18	69	17.93		
Total							.125	.9389

*P=.05 level of significance.
All questions have 2 degrees freedom; table value equals 5.991.

Therefore, the library directors perceived one of three disadvantages and four out of six advantages as such. The two advantages that were not agreed upon did not really pertain to library operations but rather education. From the results on this section of advantages and disadvantages, it

seemed that administrators readily accept the idea of paraprofessionals within the library organization. It also appeared that economy of operations could result if the directors are correct in their conception of the advantages of the paraprofessional structure.

Library Technical Assistant's Training

As is evident from Table 10, this question on the preference of training of the library technical assistant was statistically significant. A value of 9.488 or greater was needed for significance, and the actual X^2 value was 16.552.

The greatest difference between what was observed and what was expected was recorded in the public library category, accounting for 74.7 percent of the total X^2 value. The probability on this question was .0029, meaning that it was significant below the .01 level. Other findings provided in this table are the observed and expected frequencies of yes, no, and no opinion responses, and the percentages of all three categories of observed frequencies.

TABLE 10

ANALYSES OF CHI SQUARE DATA REGARDING THE TRAINING OF THE LIBRARY TECHNICAL ASSISTANT*

Library	Responses--Yes Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Obs.	Pct.	Exp.	Responses--No Opinion Obs.	Pct.	Exp.
Pub.	3	27	6.64	7	64	2.28	1	9	2.09
Jr. Col.	15	71	12.67	3	14	4.34	3	14	3.98
Univ.	17	65	15.69	2	8	5.38	7	27	4.93

Total X^2=16,552, P=.0029
Pub. Lib. X^2=12.365, Percent of total X^2=74.7
Jr. Col, X^2=1.086, Percent of total X^2=06.6
Univ. X^2=3.100, Percent of total X^2=18.7

*This question has 4 degrees freedom; table value equals 9.488 P .05 level of significance

In addition to being statistically significant, this question proved to be the most controversial. At the outset of the study the question of a library administrator's preference of training for the library technician was raised. These results seemed to bear out the findings of both the Dorsett and Held studies. Dr. Dorsett concluded ". . . opposition remains within the library profession to the formally trained library technical assistant."[1] Dr. Held stated:

> While there is general acceptance of library technicians, there is still considerable controversy over the details of their training in the structure of librarianship.[2]

[1]Cora Matheny Dorsett, "Library Technical Assistants," p. 132.

[2]Charles Holborn Held, "The Status of Library Technicians in the United States" (Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1969), p. 87.

This study revealed that public libraries prefer in-service training; whereas, junior colleges and universities, readily accept the idea of the junior college trained technician. In fact, only two university administrators preferred in-service training over the junior college trained person, and there were only three among the junior college directors. This result is in contradiction to one of the conclusions of the Dorsett study of 1972 which concluded:

> In-service training is the method preferred by a majority of librarians for the orientation of library staff who are to perform paraprofessional tasks.[1]

Although the reason for the difference in findings is not revealed in the study, perhaps improved training programs, an increase in the number of programs, and increased research in this area have caused some changes in opinions since 1972. This difference might also further emphasize that much confusion still exists over the place of the technician in the library organizational structure. Divergence of opinion is further evident when it is observed that Dr. Dorsett found that 85 percent of the administrators and personnel officers believe there is a need for the formally trained technician, and that these administrators would recruit the technician if he were available.

Nevertheless, it is also noteworthy that eleven administrators, of which seven were university and three were junior college, registered no opinion on this question. With these

---

[1]Cora Matheny Dorsett, "Library Technical Assistants," p. 132.

eleven responses, a total of twenty-three out of fifty-eight or 39.6 percent answered this question either no or no opinion. Consequently, the differences between this study and Dr. Dorsett's are, perhaps, not so apparent.

The controversy over training is even more evident in some of the respondent's written comments concerning this question. Two administrators stated that it would depend on the available applicants. Two others stated that, even with junior college trained personnel, in-service training would be required. Still another challenged the wording of the Library Technical Assistant question on the instrument, and asked why anyone would hire an outside person over one that is trained. Perhaps one of the most unusual responses came from a public librarian who checked no to the question of preference of the junior college trained technician, but stated he would contact the junior college to improve the in-service training of existing employees.

Classification of Paraprofessional

Although this study did not consider the question of the acceptance of the levels of technical assistants or associates, the responses to the two questions on the present paraprofessional structure and desired changes revealed that differences do exist in the classification of paraprofessionals. In fact, from some of the responses, it appeared that classification in some institutions may be based primarily on education, rather than on duty. Classification by education is understandable when the difference in emphasis is noted

between performance as stressed by the Federal Civil Service regulations, GS 1411, and the importance of education as emphasized by the American Library Association's policy. When asked about this difference in emphasis at a Council on Library Technology workshop held in February 1971, Dr. Asheim answered:

> Certainly I would not object to the general principle that performance, of course, is the key. The problem, I think, in most employment is you do not yet have the experience of performance. And I gather that you would not want a policy from ALA which states in effect that you should not have any requirements of people -- you ought to hire them and then if they louse things up in six months get rid of them. Obviously, we want something better than that as a definition of what it is that goes on in our libraries. . . . I think our problem is that in stating a policy that is going to be applied across the board to all kinds of libraries across the country not to provide a weapon which makes it possible for a complete downgrading of any qualifications or any kind of performance as the way of going ahead. And a statement that would in effect say, do not have this and do not have that, leave it up to you to decide, is not a policy.[1]

It is possible then that some directors are applying a rather strict interpretation of the American Library Association's policy.

From the respondents' comments, it is also interesting to note the variations in classifications as furnished by two administrators. One of the directors stated that the technician was classified as a librarian I, while the other used this same term to denote the associate. These differences appear to be connected with local civil service position classifications, but it does raise the question of what designations

---

[1]Richard L. Taylor, ed., L T A ' S - - - Their Teachers, Their Training (Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1971), p. 17.

and distinctions are made between professional librarians and paraprofessionals.

A further look at the responses disclosed that there were only fifteen institutions--four public, three junior college and eight university--which had all three levels of paraprofessionals. There was only one administrator in each of the three categories who had only clerks and wished to add the other two levels. However, some administrators indicated that their library had only one level of paraprofessional, called a library technical assistant or technician. One director who indicated a technical assistant level only commented that these people received clerk's pay.

There were five institutions which had one classification of clerk and whose administrators did not wish to add any other categories, although one did desire various levels within the clerk classification. There were other combinations in which only library technical assistants and associates, or clerks and technicians, or clerks and associates were desired. In fact, these two questions yielded fourteen different sets of paraprofessional combinations; thus, conclusions about the classification of paraprofessional were difficult to draw without further information.

Role of the Librarian

Despite general agreement with Mr. Dawson's statement about the role of the librarian (see Table 11), the public library category registered a noteworthy difference. Of the eleven public library respondents, only two agreed, five

generally agreed, and four disagreed. However, the fact that the statement was too general to provide much information was evident in the comments by some respondents who generally agreed with Mr. Dawson, but believed that some important aspects had not been covered. It seems essential that the role of the librarian needs to be examined closely in defining the role of the paraprofessional.

TABLE 11

A COMPARISON OF THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS RESPONSES REGARDING MR. DAWSON'S STATEMENT ON THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARIAN

Library	Agree	Percent	Generally Agree	Percent	Disagree	Percent
Pub.	2	18	5	46	4	36
Jr. Col.	12	57	8	38	1	5
Univ.	8	30	15	58	3	12

General Conclusion

In conclusion it appeared that the library paraprofessional has undergone much the same treatment that this classification of employees has undergone in other professions. Despite general agreement as to the value of paraprofessionals, many view the differentiation of duties and responsibilities by paraprofessionals as detrimental to the profession, while others are convinced that the profession will become more professional by this increased role.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the outset of this study the major purposes were listed and centered on determining how library administrators conceptualized the following: job descriptions, advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure, and the junior college trained technical assistant. More specifically, the purposes were to determine if library administrators of public, junior college, and university libraries agreed on the type of duties that a paraprofessional can perform, and to determine whether or not the administrators agreed on the advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional. A third purpose was to determine if the administrators preferred hiring junior college trained technicians or conducting an in-service training program. A fourth area of study was concerned with the relationship between demographic variables, age and number of years a library administrator, and responses to each question. The relationship was tested through an intercorrelation matrix using the information taken from the instrument.

The analysis of the data regarding the three areas--job descriptions, advantages and disadvantages, and the training of the library technician--was accomplished through chi square and percentages. Through the use of chi square it

was possible to ascertain if the difference between obtained and expected frequencies was significant at the .05 level. Percentages by types of libraries--public, junior college, and university--were used to denote similarities and differences in responses.

These data were secured from public, junior college, and university library administrators in the states of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. The instrument itself was a product of the researcher and was based on the Civil Service GS 1410, 1411, and 1412 series, and the related literature. It was sent to the administrators along with a letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope on January 29, 1974. A follow-up letter, questionnaire, and self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to those not responding on February 15, 1974.

The administrators surveyed in this study were selected according to the size of the population served by the library. Junior college and university library directors included were administrators of libraries serving an enrollment of from 3,000 to 12,000 students. The public library directors included those who were administrators of systems serving a total population of from 150,000 to 500,000 people. These delimitations provided a population of seventy-six directors, of which fifty-nine responded for a total of 78 percent.

Summary of the Findings

The major findings resulting from an analysis of the data provided some answers to the questions posed in Chapter 1.

1. What are the duties of paraprofessionals as conceptualized by library administrators of the three types of libraries?

There were five questions (2, 12, 23, 25, and 30) in the job description section that were statistically significant. That is, on these five questions the difference between obtained frequencies was significantly different from the expected frequencies based on chance variation alone.

In addition on twenty-seven of the thirty-two job description questions, there was a majority of the directors in each category agreeing on the duty as either professional or paraprofessional. In fact, nine duties were conceptualized as professional and eighteen as paraprofessional. Besides the eighteen paraprofessional tasks agreed upon by all three types, there were two other duties conceptualized as nonprofessional by a majority (51 percent or greater) of public librarians, three by junior college, and one by university administrators. Therefore, public library directors characterized a total of twenty duties as paraprofessional, junior college twenty-one, and university administrators nineteen.

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessionals as conceived by library administrators of the three types of libraries?

There was definite agreement among directors of the three types of libraries that a strong paraprofessional structure would accomplish the following: freeing librarians of routine tasks, improving library service, providing parapro-

fessionals the opportunity to combine working in a library and gaining professional education, and providing a higher ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals (although this one was not as readily received). However, they did not perceive that the paraprofessional structure would improve graduate instruction or the type of candidate attending library schools. The administrators perceived only one of the three disadvantages as such, and that was the hiring of paraprofessionals in place of professionals to save money.

3. What type of training for library technicians is preferred by library administrators of the three types of libraries?

Although there was a strong preference among university and junior college directors for hiring the junior college trained technical assistant rather than the in-service trained assistant, public library administrators preferred in-service training. The large number of no opinion responses, eleven, indicated many directors might still have reservations about the junior college trained technician.

4. Is there a significant relationship between the conception of the duties of paraprofessionals and the demographic variable, age?

Of the thirty-two tasks listed, there was a low relationship between the variable age and the directors' conception of each of those duties. The highest relationships existed between the variable and the following three questions: dealing with patrons on lost materials (-.2502), the withdraw-

ing of lost or damaged materials (-.2485), and answering simple reference questions (.2299). All others had relationships between .0000 and .1888, with eighteen of these having an inverse or negative relationship.

5. Is there a significant relationship between the conception of the duties of paraprofessionals and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

There was a low relationship between the variable, number of years a library administrator, and the administrators' conception of the duties on all thirty-two tasks. Here, the highest relationships were recorded between the variable a and these four duties: cataloging of materials using Library of Congress cards (-.2643), dealing with patrons on lost materials (-.2349), explaining the card catalog (-.2323), and maintaining periodical checklists (-.2099). The other twenty-eight duties had relationships between .0000 and .1725, of which fifteen were inverse.

6. Is there a significant relationship between the viewed advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional and the demographic variable, age?

Of the six advantages listed, one, the ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals, had a .2038 relationship. The other five ranged between .0012 and .1976. Among the disadvantages, a strong paraprofessional structure resulting in a surplus of librarians registered a relationship of -.3859. The paraprofessional doing professional tasks recorded a -.1599

relationship and the hiring of paraprofessionals in place of professionals, a .0768.

7. Is there a significant relationship between the viewed advantages and disadvantages of the category of paraprofessional and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

The highest relationship between the variable--number of years as a director--and the advantages and disadvantages of paraprofessional personnel was with question 2 of the advantages, the improvement of library service (-.3233). The next high was between the variable and whether or not a strong paraprofessional structure would result in the hiring of paraprofessionals in place of professionals to save money (.2033).

8. Is there a significant relationship between preference of training for library technicians and the demographic variable, age?

The relationship of the variable age and the preference of training of library technicians recorded a relationship of -.3216. This is one of only two questions in the three sections upon which directors' conception and the variable age had better than a .3000 relationship.

9. Is there a significant relationship between type of training preferred for library technicians and the demographic variable, number of years served as a library administrator?

Of the three major sections, job descriptions, advantages and disadvantages, and preference of training, the

variable--number of years a director--and the preference of training had the highest relationship at -.4763. With either variable (age; number of years a director) and the directors' conception there was no other relationship above -.3859 in the three major sections of the study.

Supplemental Findings

In addition to the above findings, this study revealed that among the three types of libraries, paraprofessionals were classified differently. Some administrators classified all paraprofessionals as clerks, others technicians, and still others had either two or three different categories corresponding to clerks, technicians, and associates. Several library directors even reported that the technician or associate was classified as librarian I.

Library administrators also varied on the desired paraprofessional structure. Some directors preferred just clerks while several administrators desired various classes within this category. Others preferred various combinations of clerks, technicians, and associates.

Conclusions

From the three major areas of study--job descriptions, advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure, and the preference of training of the library technician--the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Among library directors there is agreement upon many duties that can be performed by a paraprofessional.

However, there were some reservations in classifying certain duties as paraprofessional because the degree to which that duty was to be performed was not specified.

2. Library administrators value the paraprofessional within the library organization.

3. Administrators of the three types of libraries agree that a strong paraprofessional structure within the library can be advantageous to the library profession.

4. Despite an apparent general acceptance of the library technical assistant, opposition still exists to this formally trained paraprofessional staff member.

Recommendations For Further Study

Based upon the findings of this study the following recommendations are submitted for subsequent investigation:

1. That a random sample of librarians be surveyed to determine, if they agree with library administrators on the job descriptions, on the advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure within the library, and on the training of the library technical assistant.

2. The evidence of this study strongly suggests the need for a more indepth study using observation, interview, and other techniques to develop more specific job descriptions by type of library than now exist for the three levels of paraprofessionals.

3. Although this study did not specifically investigate the question of classification of paraprofessionals, it seems that further study should be made in this area to deter-

mine how these levels of employees are classified in the various libraries.

4. In view of varied responses to the question of preference within the paraprofessional structure, additional research would be beneficial to determine what changes library administrators would make if free to do so.

5. Since the role of the paraprofessional in libraries appears to be changing, there is a need to further define the role of the professional librarian.

APPENDIX A

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY TALLAHASSEE 32306

Robert Manning Strozier Library

May 7, 1973

Mr. Dana Gould
Southern Station
Box 2433
Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401

Dear Mr. Gould,

Best wishes to you in your Ph.D. request, you have chosen a very promising subject.

You will note in Tex-Tec that we relied pretty largely on the federal civil service survey, Civil Service GS 1⅞. From these we roughly sketched some job descriptions but they are all in rough notes and I do not believe they would be of much assistance to you now. It seems to me this is one of the areas for needed investigation. What I had hoped to do more extensively and sensitively and perhaps you already have was to query libraries of all types about a) positions now filled by paraprofessionals asking for their job descriptions b) positions - clerical or professional now that the library considers could be done by paraprofessionals and job descriptions for these, because as you know one of my strong reasons for advocating the paraprofessional is to relieve the professionals. Also it is my belief that many of the clerical positions could better be filled by paraprofessionals. I would suggest another area for careful study: refined differentiations and delineations of all three - clerical, paraprofessional, and professional.

Best wishes to you and remember me to colleagues and friends at Southern Mississippi.

Sincerely,

Louis Shores
Dean EMERITUS

LS/kb

University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 27
Hattiesburg, Mississippi
39401

Educational Administration
and Supervision

January 14, 1974

Dear Library Administrator:

The Department of Educational Administration at the University of Southern Mississippi is planning to conduct research in the area of the current status of paraprofessionals in libraries.

This is a much needed area of research and your participation is important to its success. Please read and answer all questions on the attached questionnaire. If a question is vague or not clear, please so state. Any other suggestions that you have for clarifying or improving the instrument will be greatly appreciated. All comments can be made on the questionnaire itself. Your responses to the questions will be held in strictest confidence, but will not be included in the actual study. They will be used for eliminating difficulties in the program that is to be used in the research.

Your time and effort are needed to insure the success of this project.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dana G. Gould
Project Investigator

DGG:bng

Enclosure

University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 27
Hattiesburg, Mississippi
39401

Educational Administration
and Supervision

74

January 29, 1974

Dear Library Administrator:

The Department of Educational Administration of the University of Southern Mississippi is conducting a research project that is concerned with identifying duties which can be performed by paraprofessionals in libraries. Mr. Dana G. Gould is the chief investigator.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will take the short time necessary to fill out the questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

J. O. Carson, Jr.

J. O. Carson, Jr. / Professor
Department of Educational
Administration and Supervision

bng

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 27
Hattiesburg, Mississippi
39401

Educational Administration
and Supervision

February 15, 1974

Dear Library Administrator:

Approximately fifteen days ago you received a letter accompanied by a questionnaire regarding a project which is being conducted by the Department of Educational Administration of the University of Southern Mississipoi. The project is concerned with the duties which can be performed by paraprofessionals in libraries. Your participation is important to the success of this study. There is a need for research in this area of the role of the paraprofessional in libraries, and this project can provide insight on this subject.

Your responses will be held in strict confidence. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your earliest reply to Mr. Dana G. Gould, our chief investigator.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

J. O. Carson, Jr.

J. O. Carson, Jr. Professor
Department of Educational
Administration and Supervision

bng

Enclosure

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Much has been written about the use of paraprofessionals in libraries. However, one of the major problems centers on distinguishing which duties are professional and which can be done by a paraprofessional. This questionnaire is seeking to determine what library administrators of large public junior college, state university, and metropolitan public libraries conceive are duties which can be performed by paraprofessionals, and the employment prospects of the paraprofessional in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Questionnaire

CODE_____ Sex: _____Male _____Female

_____ Age.

_____ Number of years a librarian.

_____ Number of years a library director.

In answering the following questions think in terms of paraprofessionals not just as clerks, but as technicians and associates as well.

The American Library Association in its 1970 Library Education and Manpower Statement defines the Library Technical Assistant as follows:

TECHNICAL ASSISTANT

> A Library Technical Assistant (Library Technician) is a person with certain specifically library-related skills-- . . . the performance of whose duties seldom requires him to call upon a background in general education.

ASSOCIATE

> The Associate categories assume a need for an educational background like that represented by a bachelor's degree from a four-year institution of higher education in the United States. Assignments may be such that library knowledge is less important than general education.

Job Descriptions

Place a check mark (/) in the space to the left of the question number of only those duties which you feel should be done by a paraprofessional rather than a professional librarian. Keep in mind the definition of Library Technician and Associate.

____1. Conduct tours of the library.

____2. Explain the card catalog to users.

____3. Compile reading lists.

____4. Give book talks.

____5. Maintain bulletin boards.

____6. Plan and design displays.

____7. Supervise inventories of books and other materials.

____8. Locate, borrow, and return materials borrowed on interlibrary loan.

____9. In charge of small branch or departmental libraries or bookmobiles.

____10. Examine and decide on materials to be discarded or replaced.

____11. Decide on the acceptability of small gift collections.

____12. Prepare bibliographies in specific subjects.

____13. Search to verify entries.

____14. Maintain circulation statistics.

____15. Catalogue fiction, new additions, and other rather simple materials.

____16. Catalogue more difficult materials for which there are Library of Congress catalog cards.

____17. Catalogue more difficult materials without Library of Congress catalog cards but under the supervision of a cataloger.

____18. Deal with patrons who have lost or damaged library materials.

____19. Answer directional and informational questions in reference.

____20. Organize and maintain vertical and other files.

____21. Revise filing.

____22. Check order cards with other orders for possible duplication.

____23. Order Library of Congress catalog cards.

____24. Withdraw from the collection books which are lost, damaged or worn out (removal of catalog cards, etc.).

____25. Index local and other materials that the library has but which are not indexed.

____26. Select materials from book reviews and other lists for acquisition by the library.

____27. Assign cutter numbers.

____28. Collect and record fine money.

_____29. Assist patrons in the selection of books.

_____30. Prepare abstracts.

_____31. Inventory and order supplies.

_____32. Maintain checklists of serials and periodicals.

Advantages and Disadvantages

Based upon the literature there are some advantages and disadvantages of a strong paraprofessional structure. Please check the line to the left of the number if you agree that the statement indicates an advantage. Do the same thing for the disadvantages.

ADVANTAGES

_____1. Free the librarian from routine duties.

_____2. Improve library service.

_____3. Improve library education by upgrading of Graduate programs. (Less technical type training would be included).

_____4. Make it possible for persons of ability and promise to begin working in a library while gaining their professional education in a combination of work and study.

_____5. Improve recruitment of candidates to library schools.

_____6. Provide economy by having a higher ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals.

_____ Other (Please explain).

DISADVANTAGES

_____1. Hiring of paraprofessionals rather than professionals in order to save money.

_____2. Strong paraprofessional structure would result in a surplus of librarians.

_____3. The Library Technical Assistant will be doing professional tasks.

_____ Other (Please explain).

LIBRARY TECHNICAL ASSISTANT

If junior college trained Technical Assistants are available, would you hire these persons in preference to using your own in-service training program?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ No opinion

Miscellaneous

_____ Number of Full Time Professionals employed.

_____ Number of Part Time Professionals employed.

_____ Number of Full Time Nonprofessionals employed.

_____ Number of Part Time Nonprofessionals employed.

Does your library recognize paraprofessional classifications equivalent to Library Technicians and Associates, or just one classification equivalent to clerk? (Check each level you have).

_____ Clerks

_____ Library Technical Assistant

_____ Associates

Does your library recognize the paraprofessional classification of Library Technical Assistant and Associate by salary and/or duty? (If yes, check either salary, duty, or both).

_____ No

_____ Salary

_____ Duty

If your library has only one classification, that of clerk, would you prefer to maintain this one level or to restructure to include the Technician and Associate? (Check each level you desire).

_____ Just Clerk

_____ Clerk

_____ Library Technician

_____ Associate

Mr. John M. Dawson made the following statement in his article "Not Too Academic" (College and Research Libraries, v. 27, January 1966, p. 39):

> Their (librarians) role, as I see it, should be in planning; in the selection of materials and of courses of action; in the training, supervision, revision, and inspiration of the nonprofessional and the student assistant. Librarians, in short, should be librarian-managers or bibliothecal specialists.

Do you agree with Mr. Dawson as to the role of the librarian?

_____ Agree

_____ Generally Agree

_____ Disagree

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Carrol, C. Edward. The Professionalization of Education For Librarianship With Special Reference to the Years 1920-1960. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1970.

College Blue Book. 4 vols. 14th ed. New York: CCM Information Corporation, 1972. Vols.: U.S. Colleges: Tabular Data and Degrees Offered by Colleges and Subjects.

Community and Junior College Directory, 1973. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Danton, J. Periam. Education For Librarianship; Criticisms, Dilemmas, and Proposals. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969.

Grego, Noel R. and Rudnik, Sister Mary Chrysantha, CSSF, eds. Job Description and Certification For Library Technical Assistants. Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1970.

Heckart, Rhua, ed. Progress and Prospect; a Summary of the Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the Council on Library Technology. Toledo, Ohio: Council on Library Technology, 1968.

Johnson, Dorothy T., ed. Job Description and Salaries For Library Technicians; a Summary of Proceedings of the First Regional Workshop. Bethlehem, Pa.: Council on Library Technology, 1970.

Mackeigan, Helaine, comp. American Library Directory, 1972-1973. 28th ed. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1972.

Reece, Ernest J. The Task and Training of Librarians. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949.

Taylor, Richard L., ed. L T A ' S - - - Their Teachers, Their Training. Chicago: Council on Library Technology, 1971.

Wheeler, Joseph L. Progress and Problems in Education For Librarianship. New York: Carnegie Corporation of Technology, 1971.

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

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Boelke, Joanne. Library Technicians, a Survey of Current Developments. University of Minnesota, ED 019 530, September 1968.

Eastlick, John T. Library Job Descriptions. University of Denver, ED 057 827, December 1971.

Schutte, Alfred J. Library Technical Assistant - - a Paraprofessional Training Institute, Interior Report. New Hampshire University, ED 075 033, September 1972.

Spyers-Duran, Peter. A Review of Curriculum Development For Library Technicians in Junior Colleges. University of California, ED 071 653, 1971.

Journals

Asheim, Lester E. "Education and Manpower For Librarianship: First Steps Toward a Statement of Policy." American Library Association Bulletin 62 (October 1968): 1096-1106.

_____. "Implications of the Policy of Library Education and Manpower." Tennessee Librarian 24 (Winter 1972): 7-12.

"Criteria For Programs to Prepare Library Technical Assistants." Special Libraries 60 (April 1969): 253-258.

Dawson, John M. "Not Too Academic." College and Research Libraries 27 (January 1966): 37-39.

Downs, Robert B. and Delzell, Robert F. "Professional Duties in University Libraries." College and Research Libraries 26 (January 1965): 31

Gummere, Richard M., Jr. "Toward a New Breed of Librarians." Wilson Library Bulletin 41 (April 1967): 810-813.

Harlow, Neal. "Misused Librarians." Library Journal 90 (April 1, 1965): 1597-1599.

Hart, Eugene D. and Griffith, William J. "Professional or Clerical?" Library Journal 86 (September 1, 1961): 2758-2759.

Kinzer, Rose W. "A Discussion of the Library Aide or Clerk: His Status and Training." Junior College Journal 32 (December 1961): 220-221.

"Library Education and Manpower." American Libraries 1 (April 15, 1970): 341-344.

"Library Education and the Talent Shortage." Library Journal 91 (April 1, 1966): 1763.

Marshall, John. "Search For Status." Library Journal 91 (November 15, 1966): 5556-5563.

McNeal, Archie L. "Ratio of Professional to Clerical Staff." College and Research Libraries 17 (May 1956): 219-223.

"National Council on Library Technology Formed." Junior College Journal 38 (October 1967): 54.

Sass, Samuel. "Library Technicians--Instant Librarians?" Library Journal 92 (June 1, 1967): 2122-2126.

Shores, Louis. "Library Technician: a Professional Opportunity." Special Libraries 59 (April 1968): 241-242.

_____. "Middlemanship--New Careers For Libraries." Catholic Library World 42 (May-June 1972): 554-549.

Slavens, Thomas P. and Legg, Jean. "Experimenting in Education For Library Associates." Journal of Education For Librarianship 11 (Fall 1970): 182-185.

Slocum, Grace. "Bachelor Librarians: an Interim Training Program." Library Journal 93 (October 15, 1968): 3754-3755.

"Subprofessional or Technical Assistant: a Statement of Definition." American Library Association Bulletin 62 (April 1968): 387-397.

Veit, Fritz. "The Library Technical Assistant: Some General Observations." Illinois Libraries 52 (September 1970): 711-714.

Weber, Dorothy. "The Clerical Staff." Library Trends 3 (July 1954): 52-57.

Wight, Edward A. "Separation of Professional and Nonprofessional Work in Public Libraries." California Librarian 14 (September 1952): 29-32.

Williams, Edwin E. "Who Does What: Unprofessional Personnel Policies." College and Research Libraries 6 (September 1945): 301-310.

Pamphlets

American Library Association. Library Education and Manpower; a Statement of Policy Adopted by the Council, June 30, 1970.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. Position-Classifications Standards. GS 1410 Librarian Series, GS 1411 Library Technician Series, and GS 1412 Technical Information Services Series. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Unpublished Materials

Dorsett, Cora Matheny. "Library Technical Assistants: A Survey of Training Programs and Employment in Selected Libraries." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1972.

Held, Charles Holborn. "The Status of Library Technicians in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1969.

Shores, Louis, Dean Emeritus to Dana Gould. 7 May 1973, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

VITA

Dana Grove Gould, son of Minnie Gaston Gould and the late Gordon T. Gould, Sr., was born July 31, 1936, at Mobile, Alabama.

He attended the public schools at Mobile and holds a Bachelor of Science degree from Spring Hill College with a major in history. He received the Master of Science degree in library science from Louisiana State University and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in educational administration from the University of Southern Mississippi.

His work experience in the field of education includes five years as acquisitions librarian at the University of South Alabama and two years as librarian at Patrick Henry State Junior College in Monroeville, Alabama.

He is a member and past treasurer of the Alabama Library Association and a member of Beta Phi Mu, an international library science honor society.

He is married to the former Betty Neese and has three children, Cynthia, Gary, and Kenneth.