

Library Media Specialists' Self-perception of Their Roles and Responsibilities in
Georgia's Public High Schools

A dissertation submitted
to the Graduate School
Valdosta State University

in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in the Department of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology
of the Dewar College of Education

May 2011

James Thomas Rehberg

M.Ed., Valdosta State University, 1997
B.A., University of Georgia, 1994

© Copyright 2011 James T. Rehberg

All Rights Reserved

FAIR USE

The dissertation is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, revised in 1976). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of the material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

DUPLICATION

I authorize the Head of Interlibrary Loan or the Head of Archives at the Odum Library at Valdosta State University to arrange for duplication of this dissertation for educational or scholarly purposes when so requested by a library user. The duplication shall be at the user's expense.

Signature

I refuse permission for this dissertation to be duplicated in whole or in part.

Signature

This dissertation, "Library Media Specialists' Self-perception of Their Roles and Responsibilities in Georgia's Public High Schools," by James T. Rehberg, is approved by:

**Dissertation
Committee
Chair**

James L. Pate, Ph.D.
Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and
Technology

**Committee
Members**

J. Patrick Biddix, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and
Technology

Dianne C. Dees, Ed.D., MLIS
Assistant Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and
Technology, Library Media Program Facilitator

Barbara J. Radcliffe, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Middle, Secondary, Reading,
and Deaf Education

**Interim Dean of the
Dewar College of
Education**

Julia M. Lee, Ph.D.
Professor Special Education & Communication
Disorders

**Interim Dean of the
Graduate School**

Karla M. Hull, Ed.D.
Professor of Early Childhood and Special
Education

ABSTRACT

This sequential exploratory study was conducted to examine the practical and theoretical levels of professional guideline implementation by library media specialists suggested in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*. This study focused on high school library media specialists in the state of Georgia. An online survey was conducted where participants responded to a Likert survey on both practical and theoretical levels of implementation, supplied demographic data, and answered two open-ended questions. The responses were analyzed and the mean and standard deviation were calculated and used to generate paired t tests, p -values, and Cohen's d values in order to determine significance and effect size.

Results indicated high school library media specialists in the state of Georgia aspire to perform the recommended guidelines to a much higher level than they are able to practically implement them. The results were all determined to be significant, and the Cohen's effect size values suggested a large practical significance. The role of information specialist was revealed as the most fully implemented role while the roles of instructional consultant and instructional partner were the roles least implemented in actual practice. This signified library media specialists continue to perform their traditional role of finding information while struggling to implement the collaborative roles of instructional partner and consultant by teaming with teachers in the classroom.

Respondents listed facilitative factors such as administrative support, teacher cooperation, and additional staffing were beneficial to expanding their professional role while budget cuts, insufficient time, and an absence of administrative support were impediments which prevented them from expanding their professional roles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Conceptual Framework for the Study	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Definition of Terms	6
Methodology	9
Significance of the Study	10
Assumptions of the Study	11
Limitations of the Study	11
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Library Media Specialists and Their Profession	13
History of Library Media Specialist Guidelines	14
History of Library Media Specialist Funding	19
Library Media Specialists' Impact on Student Achievement	22
State Studies on Influence of Library Media Specialist on Achievement	23
Technology in the Media Center	34
Collaboration Among Library Media Specialists and Colleagues	36
III. METHODOLOGY	41
Introduction	41
Research Questions	41

Research Design	42
Population and Sample.....	43
Instrumentation	44
Survey Development.....	44
Instrument Validity and Reliability	46
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis	49
Respondent Demographics	51
IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	56
Research Questions	56
Data Analysis and Findings	57
Research Question 1: Perceived versus Theoretical Roles	58
Research Question 2: Technology.....	69
Research Question 3: Enablers	72
Research Question 4: Barriers.....	78
V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	91
Related Literature	93
Methods.....	97
Limitations.....	100
Results.....	101
Discussion	105
Technology in the Media Center	109
Enablers to Expanding Roles.....	110

Barriers to Expanding Roles	113
Limitations and Future Research	116
Conclusion	119
REFERENCE LIST	121
APPENDICES.....	
Appendix A: Permission Granted to Use Survey Instrument.....	131
Appendix B: Original Survey Instrument Format.....	133
Appendix C: Modified instrument for SurveyMonkey™	140
Appendix D: VSU IRB Protocol Exemption Report	147
Appendix E: Survey Invitation Emails 1, 2, & 3.....	149

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Participants	51
Table 3.2: Years Experience as a Classroom Teacher	52
Table 3.3: Years Experience as a Library Media Specialist	52
Table 3.4: Type of Scheduling	53
Table 3.5: Technology Present in Library Media Centers	54
Table 4.1: Roles Unique to the 1988 Edition of <i>Information Power</i> : Instructional Consultant.....	59
Table 4.2: Roles Unique to the 1998 Edition of <i>Information Power</i> : Instructional Partner	61
Table 4.3: Roles Unique to the 1988 Edition of <i>Information Power</i> : Program Administrator.....	63
Table 4.4: Roles in Both the 1988 and 1998 Editions of <i>Information Power</i> : Teacher.....	65
Table 4.5: Roles in Both the 1988 and 1998 Editions of <i>Information Power</i> : Information Specialist.....	67
Table 4.6: Use of Technology in Library Media Centers.....	70
Table 5.1: Overall Means for Five Roles on both Practical and Theoretical Scales	102
Table 5.2: Overall Means for Technology on both Practical and Theoretical Scales	103

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Pate: Your stewardship allowed me to accomplish an enormous task. Thank you for your patience, time, prodding, resources, and revisions. There is a very small group of people I listen to without reservation or skepticism. You are definitely a member of that group. If you told me to eat glass, I wouldn't think twice. I never had a doubt you would lead me home.

To Dr. Biddix: Thanks for making me use my brain. You have challenged my intellect and prodded my thinking. I am in awe of your command of research and writing. I especially appreciate your tolerance of my more stubborn behaviors. The quality of this dissertation owes a great deal to your input.

To Dr. Dees: You provided the heart to this project. You shared your love of the library and what it means to be a media specialist. I have learned so much from you. Your words of encouragement and depth of knowledge have benefitted me both personally and professionally.

To Dr. Radcliffe: You gave me the courage to be a better writer. Your insight helped me craft a much better product than I could have achieved on my own. I appreciate your insight on writing and your valuable contribution to my dissertation.

To Dr. Anne McCracken, without your kind generosity, this endeavor would not have happened. Thank you.

To Leah Donnelly, Research Services Coordinator for Special Collections & Archives at George Mason University and Pamala J. Doffek, College of Communication & Information at Florida State University's Goldstein Library, I am forever grateful for your research assistance.

To my wife Erin and children, JP and Sophie, thanks for your love, support and sacrifice so I could achieve this goal.

To my friend Gene Starr and his family, without your encouragement, assistance and constant goading, I would never have made it this far. Your friendship has been a blessing and a much more satisfying reward.

To my cohort, I enjoyed your company and learned from your considerable experience. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

And finally, Mrs. Judy Harden. You deserve special thanks. You told me I could do this long before I knew it myself.

DEDICATION

To my parents

Norma Ann Thomas Rehberg and James Franklin Rehberg

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the role of the library media specialist has been a passive one (Everhart, 2000). The library media specialist assisted students in finding and accessing factual information located in the media center resources (American Association of School Librarians [AASL], 1998). Technology, computers, and the introduction of the Internet became fixtures in public schools prompting an evolution in the role of the library media specialist (Michie & Holton, 2005). According to Michie and Holton, today's library media specialist is a curator and purveyor of information literacy.

This change from archivist and collector of materials to an active information resource made the act of accessing and acquiring new and factual information more important to the library media specialist profession (Michie & Holton, 2005). In 1998, the American Library Association and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (ALA & AECT) issued their most recent revision of guidelines for the practice of the profession. In their publication, *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*, the library media specialist is described as an instructional consultant for teachers, teacher of information literacy for students, and library media program administrator.

The focus on information literacy and the mandate library media specialists impart these skills during the normal course of their professional

duties became a cornerstone of the national guidelines put forth by the ALA and AECT (1998). Their guidelines recommend public school students receive instruction in the ethical and practical access of information from a variety of sources with an emphasis on new technologies. Craver (1986) noted a decade passes before most guidelines are widely adopted and put into practice. More than a decade has passed since the last revision of library media specialist guidelines. Based on Craver's recommendations, evidence of the 1998 guidelines should be apparent in today's secondary-level media centers in the state of Georgia.

Statement of the Problem

Guidelines for the library media specialist have been published for public school library media specialists for almost a century (Gann, 1998). Gann cited name changes, standardization of common practices, and quantitative rules for evaluating a media program as examples of the professionalization of the role of library media specialist. Little has been published about how library media specialists believe about the actual and theoretical implementation of the national guidelines furnished to them. This study seeks to identify the role perceptions of practicing high school library media specialists in Georgia and whether they have been able to institute the 1988 and 1998 guidelines found in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*. This study also seeks to discover whether library media specialists implement technology to a great extent in their professional role.

Conceptual Framework for the Study

Even though the role of the library media specialist has changed since its inception, it remains an effective means of helping students achieve improved test scores (Lance & Loertscher, 2003). With jobs, funding, and prestige hanging in the balance, school leaders have been preoccupied with enhancing school effectiveness and increasing student achievement (Scott & Brown, 2009). Studies by Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, and Rodney (1999); Lance, Rodney, and Hamilton-Pennell (2000a); Lance and Loertscher (2003); Hartzell (2002a and 2002b); and Church (2007) indicated the relative disparities between educational leaders' views and library media specialists' views on topics such as time spent collaborating with teachers and the importance of a strong media program, and confirmed the positive contribution made by strong media programs towards achievement by public school children.

Smith (2006) described the roles of library media specialists as those who oversee media budgets; guide programs; build, maintain, and manage collections; archive school histories; and maintain and schedule computer labs, equipment, and technology. Today's library media specialists hold meetings, promote resources, schedule broadcasts, and collaborate with teachers in-house and abroad via distance learning connections. Library media specialists perform these tasks while stretching already meager funding to satisfy all stakeholders, and they continue advocating for their media programs in the face of further budget cuts (Smith, 2006).

The 1998 edition of *Information Power* defined four distinct roles for the library media specialist: teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator (ALA & AECT, 1998). The teacher role provides factual instruction about gathering and assessing information. The instructional partner collaborates with coworkers to prepare lessons, to deliver instruction, and to evaluate student work. The information specialist role is to help patrons locate the information they would find most beneficial while the program administrator organizes, maintains, and manages the collection for optimal use. Additionally, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) described the top priority of the library media specialist as designing programs around stakeholder needs and educating stakeholders about how school libraries could fulfill their needs (ALA & AECT). The AASL describes the critical purpose of the library media specialist and the media program as one which produces information-literate students who independently locate reliable and relevant information (ALA & AECT).

In order to accomplish this top priority, administrators need to comprehend and support the role of the library media specialist in integrating information technology and information literacy in curricula (Ellis & Lenk, 2001). Meeting state guidelines can be achieved by adding information literacy, enhancing learning through technology, and increasing the amount read by students with access to competent media programs (Loertscher & Woolls, 2003). Ellis and Lenk (2009) stated, "Even before the introduction of computer networks, the Internet, and digitized information databases, library media specialists were

typically in the forefront of integrating technology (books, film, video, and audio resources) in the curriculum” (§ 9).

Purpose of Study

The significance of this study was to more clearly define the role of the library media specialist in the twelve intervening years since the publication of the most recent set of guidelines. The study also sought to gauge library media specialists’ self-perception of the emphasis they place on guidelines and how much time they dedicate to each task. High school library media specialists were surveyed to determine how they assign importance to recommended program guidelines and what factors aid or inhibit their professional activities. It further examined their actual and theoretical adoption of these guidelines. The study also investigated the degree to which library media specialists integrate technology into the media center’s mission. Other studies have explored the topic of ideal and actual implementation rates of the guidelines outlined in the two editions of *Information Power* (Ervin, 1989; Johnson, 1993; Jones, 1997; McCarthy, 1997; McCracken, 2000; and Pickard, 1993). These studies surveyed practicing library media specialists for their attitudes and opinions regarding the recommended guidelines for operating a media program. Researchers asked library media specialists to compare what they implemented and practiced (signifying greater importance) to other recommended guidelines were simply seen as ideal and rarely placed into practice (signifying less importance).

Research Questions

Research Question 1. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the following perceived practical and theoretical roles for media specialists as defined by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*: instructional consultant, teacher, information specialist, program administrator, and instructional partner?

Research Question 2. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the perceived practical and theoretical role of technology?

Research Question 3. What assistance do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as necessary to support the practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Research Question 4. What barriers do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as hindering their practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Definition of Terms

Library Media Specialists. A library media specialist is anyone who acts in a certified capacity of a library media specialist in a school setting. They build and manage resources and a reference collection for the staff and students of the school. They may collaborate with teachers and administration to support teaching and the school curriculum.

Teacher. The first library media specialist role defined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of American Library Association's *Information Power*. The library media specialist functions as a collaborator with classroom teachers. In this capacity, the library media specialist locates materials for classroom instruction, communicates information from various resources, participates as a curricular leader, and stays abreast of effective teaching methodologies in a variety of areas.

Instructional partner. The second library media specialist role as defined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of the American Library Association's *Information Power*. The library media specialist collaborates with classroom teachers to present instruction in information literacy and creates new lessons and assessments according to individual needs while also teaching other educators new ways to use technology (ALA & AECT, 1998).

Information specialist. The third library media specialist role defined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of American Library Association's *Information Power*. It recommends library media specialists remain current on all formats, media, and sources of information while also distributing and sharing information with media stakeholders. Library media specialists should also model appropriate strategies and ethics when accessing information.

Program administrator. The fourth library media specialist role defined in the 1998 American Library Association's *Information Power*. The library media specialist as program administrator works with others to outline the policies of the media program, advocates for the program, manages daily tasks such as staff,

budgets, material acquisition and circulation while maintaining a level of program quality.

Instructional Consultant. The fifth library media specialist role defined in the 1988 American Library Association's *Information Power*. This role was deleted from the 1998 edition of *Information Power* and replaced by instructional partner in order to reflect the emphasis on equal partnering with teachers in collaborative efforts.

High school. A high school is a publicly supported secondary school usually consisting of grades 9 through 12 that prepares students for graduation and exit from the public school system.

Media center. A media center is a schoolwide resource supporting the curriculum containing a media collection, consisting not only of books and other printed materials, but other media such as videotapes, audio-recordings, equipment, art, and online resources. This collection is managed by a certified library media specialist who operates the center as a resource for teachers and students.

Instructional technology. Instructional technology is defined as “a complex, integrated process involving people, procedures, ideas, devices, and organization for analyzing problems and devising, implementing, evaluating, and managing solutions to those problems in situations in which learning is purposive and controlled” (Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1977, p. 411).

Collaboration. Collaboration includes the teaming of efforts by educators in different roles such as that of media specialist or classroom teacher to deliver instruction.

Methodology

This study collected data from library media specialists in the field through an online survey. The survey was adapted from McCracken (2000). The original survey was followed closely while removing some outdated technology and replacing it with newer, more contemporary technology. Email addresses were collected from available school Web sites which listed the library media specialists and their email addresses. From the possible 336 public school systems in Georgia, 381 high schools were located, 432 library media specialists were found, and 386 email addresses were gathered. Invitations were mailed to 386 addresses with six emails returned undelivered. Three hundred eighty emailed invitations were assumed delivered to the correct party unless otherwise noted. Three invitations containing a link to the survey asking library media specialists to participate in the study were sent out over a period of 13 days with the survey available online for a period of 21 days. The survey consisted of five questions to establish demographic information, a 47 item Likert survey indicating attitudes towards the guidelines, and two open-ended questions regarding enablers and barriers to implementation. After completing the survey, respondents submitted their answers to the Web site. The participants' responses were then analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program and the findings reported.

Significance of the Study

In this study, library media specialists employed in Georgia public high schools were asked to indicate what they believe are the most important roles in the performance of their jobs and what they actually practice on a daily basis. They identified these roles according to 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* guidelines, recognized and codified by the American Library Association and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology as the ideal job descriptors for library media specialists.

This study primarily addressed the questions of whether the national guidelines were adopted and actualized by library media specialists as well as whether practicing library media specialists believe they were in compliance with the guidelines. This is important in view of the challenging economic environment and the subsequent budgetary dilemmas facing our education system. As discussions regarding budgetary reductions continue at the policy making levels, library media specialists need information so they can increase awareness and appreciation for their efforts and the role they play in education. Awareness of priorities and concerns guide library media specialists when allocating resources, advocating for the media center, and defending the necessity of a strong media program. The development of focused library media programs benefits student achievement, an important issue regarding accountability and federal oversight (Spinks, 2009).

Assumptions of the Study

This study assumed library media specialists in Georgia public high schools have matriculated in a graduate school with an accredited library media program whose curriculum includes emphasis and education about *Information Power* and the guidelines for establishing a quality library media program. Even if they did not receive formalized training naming those guidelines, they may have been exposed to them through practice, workshops, collaboration, conferences, or evaluation instruments.

The study also assumed self-reported data on surveys were reliable and truthful. Cook and Campbell (1979) reported respondents tend to provide responses that exhibit the respondent in a positive manner and support their beliefs. Research by Cook and Campbell also demonstrated respondents tend to provide answers they believe the researchers anticipate.

Limitations of the Study

The design of the survey instrument used in the study limited the extent to which the results may apply to all public school media centers in general. The type of questions and the topics covered by the survey limited the extent to which conclusions could be drawn for other areas not covered by the study. Self-reported data gathered via the survey may not be accurate due to poor recall on the respondents' part or the unintended consequence of exaggeration of activities.

The pool of respondents consisted of only high school library media specialists; therefore, applying the results to grades or schools other than those

containing ninth through twelfth grades may not be possible. The lack of research solely involving secondary level library media specialists may also impact some of the conclusions drawn from the survey. If potential respondents decided not to participate individually, the number of respondents would be fewer and the data collected would not reflect a potentially larger pool.

Furthermore, potential respondents who were not comfortable using technology or may not have had adequate time to reply to the survey may have chosen not to participate. Respondents must have been familiar enough with the guidelines issued in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* to be able to determine the extent of implementation as well as the relative importance of the guidelines.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter 2 focuses on the literature related to the role of media specialists, the documented effect of media programs on student achievement, and perceptions library media specialists have concerning their roles and responsibilities in the past. Chapter 3 focuses on a discussion of the methods and actions used to collect data including a description of the design, survey respondents, and factors in data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 consists of a discussion of the findings, and in Chapter 5 the researcher expresses the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future studies.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Prior studies conducted with library media specialists focused on national guidelines, suggestions for operating library media programs, and how practitioners responded and utilized the recommended guidelines by the AASL and AECT. These previous studies provided a framework for this research and focused on areas that affect library media specialists and their profession.

Library Media Specialists and Their Profession

Library media specialists once concentrated on teaching students how to access information via the card catalog and volumes of reference books (Everhart, 2000). Now, according to Everhart, library media specialists have a complex resource network accessible by various technical means and composed of information spanning numerous media. Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue, calling on educators to help meet the budget shortfall, cut \$2.8 billion from state spending on public education, impacting schools and the services they provide (Sheinin, 2009). Library media specialists are highly skilled specialists, certified at the graduate level (505-2-.201 (a) GAPSC). The 2007 report on *Supply & Demand of Administrative and Student Services Personnel for Georgia* lists media specialists with the second highest rate of job attrition behind all other

student service personnel, highlighting a drop in the number of library media specialist professionals (GAPSC, 2006).

Gast (1984) wrote library media specialists have a common perception among the public that they fulfill the three needs of most library patrons: to locate information patrons want, to locate information in a timely manner, and to direct patrons to resources about which they were unaware. Yates (1997) noted if library media specialists do not become more proactive in defining their professional role, then the role may cease to exist as library media specialists find themselves supplanted by technologists or obsolescence. The opportunity to be meaningful has not been lost, yet this point has not been communicated to those who employ library media specialists or use their services (Yates).

History of Library Media Specialist Guidelines

Attempts to standardize and codify the role of library media specialists have been ongoing since the early 20th century (Gann, 1998). Craver (1986) pointed out there is a ten-year lag in the full implementation and practice of suggested guidelines for library media specialists. This finding by Craver was released two years before the first edition of *Information Power* was published. The history of recommended practices for library media specialists extends back even further.

The 1918 report *Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes*, prepared by the Committee on Library Organization and Equipment under the National Education Association's (NEA's) Department of Secondary Education, was the first appearance of library

guidelines for public secondary schools (Gann, 1998). The guidelines were approved by the NEA in 1918 and two years later, in 1920, they were adopted by the American Library Association (ALA) (Michie & Holton, 2005). According to Gann (1998), these guidelines set forth many of the empirical rules for librarians to follow such as collection size, books per pupil, and number of periodicals, while also describing the role of the library media specialists. Even in 1918, these guidelines set forth the vision the school librarian is both librarian and teacher (Gann).

The 1918 guidelines, known as Certain Standards for report author Charles Certain, were broken down into six areas: Standard I addressed housing and equipment, Standard II detailed professional qualifications, Standard III covered scientific selection and care of books and other materials, Standard IV outlined instruction in library skills and usage, Standard V allocated funding guidelines for salaries and material expenditures, and Standard VI addressed the need for a state inspector for libraries (Gann, 1998). Gann pointed out the areas prescribed in the Certain Standards would serve as the foundation of all future guidelines as well as establish the school library and librarian as the heart of curriculum.

Gann (1998) noted the NEA and ALA collaborated again in 1925 to prepare guidelines for elementary school libraries. Charles Certain was again tasked with the endeavor, and he believed the library was the teachers' best source of appropriate materials for instruction (Gann). These guidelines focused on the library media specialist supporting teachers' activities while making library

resources available to all students and teachers (Gann). Gann noted this set of guidelines goes into fine detail about the type and purpose of materials purchased for the media center. Specific color choices, brand names of office supplies, and furniture selection are listed. Another guideline protects the sovereignty of the media center, reserving it only for library purposes so as not to interfere with student use (Gann).

Trending towards a two-decade cycle of revision, the next major set of guidelines for elementary and secondary school libraries appeared in 1945 (ALA, 1945). Gann (1998) cited two key aspects of these guidelines, a definitive outline of the purpose and role of the library in a quality education and an attempt to link the quantitative components of the library with the quality the library offered. These recommendations included set criteria, both qualitative and quantitative, for the library media specialist to use as a measuring stick or advocacy device for increased funding. For example, Gann observed the rule of 2,000 volumes with 1,700 titles for 200 students and 15,000 volumes with 8,000 titles for 5,000 students. Emphasis was also evident which encouraged the library staff and other staff members to cooperate, according to Gann.

By the 1960s, the 1945 standards were in need of revision due to changing trends and technologies (Gann, 1998). Partly due to the heavy inclusion of quantifiable elements, the 1945 guides grew obsolete so the AASL formed a committee to update the standards, the School Library Standards Committee (Gann). Gann noted these new guidelines were promoted as an educational statement of rights for school children. Additionally, Gann indicated

the 1960 standards are divided into three sections: The School Library As an Educational Force, Planning and Implementing School Library Programs, and Resources for Teaching and Learning.

By the end of the decade in 1969, there were calls for another revision of standards due to the divergent path traditional and emerging technologies were taking (Gann, 1998). Caretakers of traditional print media were separate from professionals tasked with newer media, so an effort was made to bring everyone under the same set of guidelines for unified library media services (Gann). The 1969 *Standards for School Media Programs*, Gann noted, had to accomplish two main goals: to update standards to meet current goals and incorporate library and audiovisual programs.

By 1975, the joint committees of the AASL and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) reconvened to address continuing issues with advancing technologies and district-level programs (Gann, 1998). They produced *Media Programs: District and School* with detailed guidelines and recommendations for media programs (Gann). It was in this report, Gann noted, the new guidelines reaffirmed the central mission of the media program and espoused the view the library media specialist was not just a support resource but a collaborator in instruction.

In 1988, the AASL and the AECT again collaborated on new standards and the first edition of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* was written (Gann, 1998). Due to the qualitative nature of the new recommendations and the relegation of quantitative measures to the back of the

book, the word “standards” was replaced with “guidelines” (Mellon & Boyce, 1993). Gann observed the focus of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* is the building-level library media specialist and the proactive role the library media specialist should take in leadership and collaboration. Rooker (1990) stated the following:

The mission of school libraries as defined in *Information Power* is a broader mission than has ever been accepted in the past...Since the emphasis is on using information...the realization that must be addressed is what the actual abilities are that a student must possess in order to access and use information. (p. 27)

Information Power, according to Gann (1998), cemented the media program as an integral part of the curriculum while allowing individual library media specialists to tailor their programs to the needs of their patrons.

It is in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* the AASL and AECT establish three overlapping roles for library media specialists. These separate but equally important roles are information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant (AASL & AECT, 1988). Gann (1998) stated the move to elevate media programs within the educational setting and promote the library media specialist to a position of educational leader set precedent for redefining the role of library media specialists.

By 1998, the AASL and AECT saw the need to amend *Information Power*. The second edition, like the first, was written with an emphasis on guidelines, eschewing precise standards that should be followed blindly (AASL & AECT).

The three roles from the previous edition were expanded to four in *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL & AECT). The roles of teacher and information specialist were joined by program administrator while instructional consultant became instructional partner, reflecting the title of the second edition. A large part of *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* is dedicated to collaboration and incorporating the library media specialists into the fabric of instruction as the title of the book suggests (AASL & AECT). The AASL and AECT advocated a strong library media specialist who sought out opportunities for leadership in the school and district, collaboration with teachers, and discovery of present and emerging technologies.

History of Library Media Specialist Funding

During the post-World War II era and the onset of the Cold War, federal funds became available to assist public school libraries. Operated as study halls with little instructional emphasis up until mid-century, Craver (1986) noted a shift in the role of the library media specialist along with increased funding for materials. According to Craver, only 37 percent of high schools in the United States had access to a centralized library as late as 1954. With the Russian launch of Sputnik in 1957, the United States of America was jolted out of its complacency towards education and educational funding (Craver). Federal funds were first offered to support school libraries in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 although libraries were not particularly mentioned (Michie & Holton, 2005). Specifically, math, science, and foreign languages were targeted as areas wherein American students could improve in order to protect the nation

against the communist threat (Michie & Holton). Audiovisual equipment and materials, along with books that were not textbooks, were funded through the NDEA; thus, indirectly benefiting and swelling the collections of libraries (Michie & Holton). It was during this same year the role of the library media specialist was evolving into an instructional partner, moving beyond the passive resource and reading guide to one of active collaboration (Craver).

In 1969, the AASL and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (DAVI) published recommendations for libraries to introduce information skills into classwork (AASL & AECT). Michie and Holton (2005) noted Congress would recognize school libraries as a separate funding recipient in the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), providing \$100 million to fund school library acquisitions. An element of President Johnson's Great Society program, this money was earmarked for library resources and instructional materials (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967). According to Michie and Holton, education amendments in 1974 consolidated previous legislation to fund public school libraries under a new Title IV, Part B, Libraries and Learning Resources section. This consolidation pulled together the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Title II funding, the NDEA funding, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III monies (Hopkins and Butler, 1991). The following year, in 1975, the AASL and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) (formerly DAVI) presented guidelines for district level goals to support each individual school library media program (Michie & Holton).

The publication of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* in 1988 by the AASL and AECT signaled an attempt to set national guidelines to identify the core mission of the school library media program. Stated succinctly, it was to “ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information” (AASL & AECT, 1988, p. 1). Ten years later, the AASL and AECT published the second iteration of *Information Power*. Entitled *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*, the new edition focused on information literacy and emphasized students learning information literacy skills (AASL & AECT, 1998). The report also represented the AASL and AECTs’ efforts to stay current with changing technologies.

School libraries received extra support when former school librarian and First Lady Laura Bush was in the White House. The “Improving Literacy through School Libraries Program” was included in No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and her influence was evident in 2002 when she helped convene the White House Conference on School Libraries which placed national attention on the state of literacy and public school libraries (Hartzell, 2002a). Michie and Holton (2005) noted in the years 1999-2000, 92% of public schools operated a school library serving 97% of the students enrolled. They also noted the increase in public schools staffed by a certified library media specialist. Michie and Holton observed the number rising from only about 40% of public schools having certified library media specialists in the mid-1950s to 86% of public schools employing a certified library media specialist by the year 2000.

Library Media Specialists' Impact on Student Achievement

In a review of research examining increases in student achievement along with strong library media centers, Spinks (2009) located studies spanning 8,700 schools with 2.6 million students. He cited a consistent 10-20% increase in student test scores when students had access to a quality library program. Spinks defined a quality school library program as one that is well staffed, maintains an extensive collection, enjoys frequent patronage, and whose library media specialists collaborate with classroom teachers. Thus, library media programs cannot afford to be viewed as a babysitting service or an irrelevant element in today's assessment and achievement environment (Loertscher & Woolls, 2003). Jones and Zambone (2008) stated library media specialists are especially suited to assist at-risk students by mentoring, connecting, and nurturing students who are susceptible to failure. By collaborating with teachers in order to meet state guidelines, Loertscher and Woolls posited library media specialists can expand the classroom lesson by adding information literacy, providing technology, and increasing the volume of available reading material.

A study conducted by Smalley (2004) tracked students graduating from three school districts in California as they matriculated to community college. Three high schools in the study had library media specialists while the others did not. Students from each of the schools were enrolled in a basic information research skills class as part of the college curriculum, and their grades at the midpoint and end of the semester were compared. Smalley determined students coming into college from the district with library media specialists outscored the

other two districts by a significant margin. Sixty-six percent of the students with the benefit of a high school library media specialist made an A in the college course while an average of only 40% from schools without a library media specialist made an A. Smalley noted early experience with information literacy is a key component to success in post-secondary academics, and this requires quality library media specialists and their quality programs.

State Studies on the Influence of Library Media Specialists on Achievement

In 1999, Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, and Rodney published findings from their study of library media programs and their effects on achievement in the state of Alaska's public schools. The findings confirmed what "half a century of previous research on the topic" had already stated (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell & Rodney, p. 5). The results demonstrated "empirical support for the principles of *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*" (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, p. 5). Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, and Rodney looked at the direct and indirect effects library media specialists had on gains in academic achievement while also taking into account factors such as school, community, and instruction. The library media specialists in Alaska were what Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, and Rodney called "information empowered" (p. 1) because of the critical roles they played in the school setting: teacher, information specialist, and program administrator. Through these functions, the library media specialist was able to enrich students' and teachers' experiences to reach the goal of higher academic achievement guidelines (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney).

Some of the major factors cited by Lance et al. (1999) contributing to gains in academic achievement were staffing levels, access to the media center, and teacher-library media specialists' cooperation. Lance et al. noted Alaskan students who had the benefit of a full-time library media specialist over a part-time library media specialist scored higher on Version 5 of the California Achievement Tests (CAT5) in reading, language arts, and mathematics. Those with only a part-time library media specialist scored higher than students having no access to a library media program. Levels of staffing were also a key component of success as well. Longer hours of operation provided more access time for students and subsequently more activity by the library media specialist. Higher levels of staffing also allowed for library media specialists to engage in other behaviors were conducive to gains in academic achievement such as "delivering information literacy instruction, planning instructional units cooperatively with teachers, and providing in-service training to teachers" (Lance et al., 1999, p. 6). They concluded the more these activities were employed, the higher the rate of student achievement. Adjusting for community and other factors, "the librarian-pupil ratio outweighed both per pupil expenditures and teacher-pupil ratio at the elementary level and the teacher-pupil ratio at the secondary level" (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, 2000, p. 7). Spinks (2009) later reiterated these qualities as keys to a quality library media program.

Massachusetts public school libraries were the subject of a similar study in 2000 by Baughman. Baughman surveyed all 1,818 public schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and received 519 responses. His primary

conclusion was at each grade level, “schools with library programs have higher Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) scores” (p. 2). Baughman identified causes significantly related to this gain in achievement included factors such as high per-pupil book counts, increased rates of access for students, and more hours of operation. Baughman concluded students in high schools with a full-time librarian and automated collections scored higher on the MCAS than those who did not have a full-time librarian or automated collection.

Baughman (2000) appealed to the state legislature to increase funding for public school libraries since the additional expenditure would allow library media centers to offer the needed ingredients for increased academic achievement. He stated, “The school library, when one exists, is for many disadvantaged children a major source of exposure to books, magazines, and the newer media—learning materials that stimulate their thinking, creativity, learning, reading, and enjoyment” (p. 11). Students in Baughman’s study who were in the low socioeconomic bracket showed increased academic performance when a library media program was present in their schools. He demonstrated participants’ MCAS scores at the high school level were higher than average and directly proportional to increases in positive library media center program variables. Specifically, increases in hours of operation, books per pupil, library patronage, and a full-time staff that accessed the regional library system contributed to improved student academic performance. In his summary, Baughman noted the library is the center for all resource-based teaching and should be a crucial factor in targeting increased achievement.

Lance, Rodney & Hamilton-Pennell (2000b) published findings from a Pennsylvania statewide study of library media programs and their effect on academic gains. According to their findings, “Pennsylvania school library programs can make a difference supporting the efforts of schools to measure up to guidelines” (p. 6). Additional factors that consistently revealed themselves in each new study included staffing levels, influx of information technology, collection development, and access to resources to increases in student achievement (Lance et al., 2000b). The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) reading scores increased as librarian and support staff hours increased. The authors further suggested the ability of library media specialists to teach information literacy skills was a source of increased achievement. They reported as teachers and library media specialists spent more time on collaboration and in-service training, test scores correlated with a similar increase.

Lance, Rodney, and Hamilton-Pennell (2000b) addressed the concern other factors might also influence the increases in academic performance. They noted the media predictors were consistent even when other factors were considered. They observed neither “school differences, including school expenditures per pupil; teacher characteristics (education, experience, salaries); teacher/pupil ratio; and student characteristics (poverty, race/ethnicity), or community differences, such as: adult educational attainment; families in poverty; and racial/ethnic demographics” (p. 7) changed the outcome. At the elementary, middle and high school levels, school librarians who taught cooperatively with

teachers, re-delivered information literacy instruction to faculty, and were involved with curriculum planning and information technology showed a consistently positive and statistically significant relationship with improvements in test scores (Lance et al., 2000b). They stated “higher achieving schools often spend twice as much—or more—on their school library programs as lower achieving schools” (p. 52). In Pennsylvania high schools, high achieving schools outspent low achieving schools more than two to one on average (Lance et al.).

In Smith’s 2001 study of Texas library media programs and their impact on achievement, she determined the availability of a librarian increased scores on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). Drawing data from 600 random public school libraries, the results showed students in a school with a librarian and media program were twice as likely to meet minimum guidelines on the TAAS as students without a librarian. Library media specialists engaged in activities such as planning, teaching collaboratively, and redelivering technological lessons to teachers in order to integrate the resources into the curriculum. The presence of a library aide was also noted because it freed up time for the librarian to engage in collaboration rather than program maintenance (Smith, 2001).

Oregon’s state study was conducted by Lance, Rodney and Hamilton-Pennell (2001) in order to determine what influence, if any, the state’s public school libraries had on achievement. Oregon’s reading test scores were directly correlated to the amount of library staff available to help students, the number of books per student, periodicals available, and overall library expenditure per pupil

(2001). While the researchers could not control for these increases in student achievement based on school differences such as teacher/student ratios, professional experience or district funds per pupil, they concluded the library media program alone accounted for a three to five percent positive variation in test scores.

A year later, this same team of researchers published their findings for the state of Iowa. Reading scores for eleventh graders tended to increase with the availability of a media center (Rodney, Lance, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002). Their findings corroborated the findings from studies before; a trained library media specialist who keeps the media center open for longer hours, maintains a large current collection, and collaborates with teachers helps students post gains in academic achievement. This study also exhorted practicing library media specialists to seek out a leadership role in their schools and display initiative when advocating for their programs to be included in guidelines and curriculum discussions. Finally, Rodney et al. included the principal's role in tying these factors together, stating, "Principals can do much to make this possible, including adopting policies and practices and communicating expectations encourage library media specialists to act as professional educators and classroom teachers to accept them as colleagues" (p. 91). It is the principal as instructional leader, Rodney et al. surmised, who can promote this relationship that leads to so many positive gains.

Research in the state of Florida by Baumbach (2003) revealed high schools with higher levels of media staffing boasted higher pass rates on the

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Baumbach stated, “Strong high school library media programs—those with more certified, university-trained staff and staff hours, technology, and books— have more usage by high school students, and increased usage leads to higher academic achievement as measured by both the FCAT and the ACT” (p. 5). Baumbach concluded high schools where the media center and a certified library media specialist were available at least 60 hours a week outscored schools with fewer hours by a margin of 22.2% on reading tests.

In Michigan, eleventh graders showed increases on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) as the quality of their library media programs improved (Rodney, Lance & Hamilton-Pennell, 2003). In this study, scores on MEAP improved in relation to several factors including the number of hours worked by library staff, flexible scheduling of library time, library media specialists familiar with technology, larger print collections, greater access to computers, and more funds available for the library media program. The researchers succinctly stated, “The state’s high school librarians have a measurable, positive, and statistically significant impact on MEAP test scores that cannot be explained away by other conditions for which data are available” (p. 48). The team of three researchers once again revealed the same positive gains where they found the existence of a quality library media program and library media specialists.

Minnesota schools showed similar gains on measures of student achievement in a statewide study done by Baxter and Smalley (2003). They

reported schools with higher-than-average reading scores employed a library media specialist who worked longer hours and had a budget with higher per-pupil expenditure than lower performing schools. Schools in this study designated as a “Minnesota Five Star School” in reading and math had a library media specialist in 93% of the schools, with 70% having a full-time librarian and 15% having a part-time librarian. All other schools had a library media specialist visit at some point during the week.

A North Carolina study in 2003 concluded “School library programs in North Carolina elementary, middle schools, and high schools have a significant impact on student achievement – as measured by scores on standardized reading and English tests” (Burgin & Bracy, 2003, p. 4). These findings reinforced the conclusions done in studies in Alaska, Iowa, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Texas that demonstrated a link between academic achievement and strong library media centers.

Missouri contracted with researchers to determine the effect of a media program on student achievement, the specific factors of a media program that most benefited students, what other factors influence achievement, and how the state of Missouri compared with other states participating in similar studies (Miller, Want, & Whitacre, 2003). In Missouri, Miller et al. (2003) determined the presence of a school library media center increased the weighted average score on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) index by 12.6%. They noted other factors such as school or community demographics could not account for the variation in the index. Differences in schools such as the free and reduced lunch

rate, percentage of African-American students, or teacher qualifications did not negate the impact of library services on testing data (Miller, Want, & Whitacre).

Lance (2005) conducted the 14th study of its kind involving libraries and academic achievement in Illinois and essentially confirmed the results generated in previous studies. He surveyed 657 Illinois public schools from kindergarten to twelfth grade and found schools with better library staffing along with libraries connected via computer networks to catalogs and databases led to higher test scores. The data revealed students who patronized the media center scored higher on reading tests and those who used large collections achieved higher on reading, writing, and ACT tests. The researcher stressed the importance of students visiting the media center and associating it with the learning process as a classroom, study space, and resource for information. He recommended library media specialists should not be support personnel but an integral part of the instruction process. The author further recommended action on the part of administrators, suggesting they integrate library media specialists into the technology and curriculum committees, promote information literacy, value librarians as essential components in learning, and protect the budgets of media programs.

Smith's (2006) Wisconsin study broke from the quantitative research approach and used five case studies to measure the impact of school library media programs on achievement. Smith, the same researcher who conducted the Texas survey, interviewed stakeholders at five schools about their impressions of the library media program and role of the library media specialist.

All five cases revealed the library media specialist was a valued and significant member of the learning community. Smith observed principals in all five studies pointed out the symbolic nature of the library as the “heart of the school” (p. 6), “the foundation” (p. 24), “the core of the school” (p. 33), “indispensable” (p. 43) and “integral” (p. 52) to instruction.

An Indiana study continued to support other research and recognized a positive correlation between libraries and achievement (Lance, Rodney, & Russell, 2007). The Indiana study reported schools tended to score higher on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) when a well-run media program existed. Outside factors such as poverty or demographics were dismissed by Lance et al. The researchers pointed out those higher achieving schools had principals who placed emphasis on collaboration between library media specialists and teachers, met regularly with the media staff, and had the library media specialists involved in school decision-making committees. They reported principals overwhelmingly (99%) agreed the library media specialist should collaborate with teachers and concluded high schools reporting positive gains in test scores also reported teacher/library media specialist collaboration on a weekly or monthly interval.

A study in New York continued to demonstrate the positive correlation between public school media centers and gains in student academic achievement (Small, Snyder, & Parker, 2008). These findings remained consistent even when accounting for student socioeconomic status or the per-pupil expenditure of the school district. Small et al. looked at principal

perceptions of their support for the media program and revealed principals believed their level of support for the media program was much higher than what library media specialists determined the level of support to be.

Achterman conducted research on library media programs in the state of California. This study demonstrated at the high school level, where the state has the most qualified staffing levels, the correlation between media programs and student achievement was the strongest (Achterman, 2008). Achterman stated:

Certificated staffing levels, total staffing levels, total budgets, collection sizes, and total technology available in the library all correlated with test scores with r values between .32 and .60, $p < .001$ when controlling for school and community variables, and the library factor was a better predictor of test scores than other school variables. (2008, p. 194).

This study reported as the presence and quality of library media specialists increased from the lowest grades to the highest, so did test scores. In view of this strong correlation, Achterman (2008) argued, "Any school or district that decides not to invest in school library programs must account for that decision in terms of the public charge of equitable access to a quality education for all public school students" (p. 194). Having stated this, Achterman equates the presence of a strong library media program with the basic tenets of an educational bill of rights.

With an abundance of studies linking positive gains on standardized testing by students having access to a quality library media program, researchers

highlighted the benefits of a trained library media specialist. The studies conducted by Lance, Rodney, and Hamilton-Pennell offer an overwhelming amount of evidence, in addition to other state studies that bear similar results. The common traits noted in each study provided a blueprint for educational leaders seeking an answer to low test scores.

Technology in the Media Center

As per section 505-3-.46 Media Specialist Program for the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GAPSC), library media specialist training programs encourage library media specialists to integrate information literacy with content curriculum (GAPSC, 2005). This incorporation of technology is encouraged to extend the students' scope of resources beyond print materials. GAPSC further encourages library media specialists to teach students how to access, analyze, and deliver the information they discover. A fully credentialed library media specialist, according to Loertscher and Woolls (2003), acting as a professional partner can negotiate the vast field of information the Internet and other resources provide. Spinks (2009) observed one of the most essential roles of today's library media specialists is to impart information literacy to students. Helping students successfully locate, evaluate, and utilize information was part of the guidelines set forth in *Information Power* (1998). He posited the more frequently students experience information instruction and literacy training, the higher their scores are on standardized tests.

The state of Florida assessed the impact of information literacy in its 2007 Florida Association for Media in Education (FAME) Legislative Platform titled

“Student Achievement Begins in the School Library Media Center Making the Grade: The Status of School Library Media Centers in the Sunshine State and How They Contribute to Student Achievement.” The study noted students needed instructional technologies integrated into the education process in order to prepare them for higher education and the job world. The presence of a trained library media specialist and a reliable technology network brought safe, factual information to students at schools and in their homes (FAME, 2007).

In an attempt to demonstrate the common importance of information literacy across educational levels, Smalley (2004) noted both the American Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the American Association of School Libraries (AASL), partnered with the Association of Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), have proposed information literacy guidelines and competencies. Using the AASL/AECT guidelines as a foundation, the ACRL guidelines extended further while overlapping and supporting the ideals of the AASL/AECT document (Spinks, 2009).

Herring (2001) wrote the Internet should never be considered a replacement for a library and students can never be left to their own devices while accessing the Internet if information is to be found. Herring compared finding valid, reliable information on the Internet to seeking the proverbial needle in a haystack. Moreover, Herring pointed out the Internet lacks quality control over information and it is useless when the electricity fails. It is a tool at most and could never substitute for a full-time library media specialist. Regarding the

issues of contracting budgets and murmurs of library obsolescence, Herring stated, “If we make them obsolete, we’ve signed the death warrant to our collective national conscience, not to mention sentencing what’s left of our culture to the waste bin of history” (p. 78). Ellis and Lenk (2001) observed the library media specialist is the perfect vehicle for directing the resources of information technology toward the ultimate goal of producing students who are information literate.

Collaboration Among Library Media Specialists and Colleagues

As per section 505-3-.46 Media Specialist Program for the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GAPSC), library media specialist training programs should prepare library media specialist candidates to model and encourage collaborative planning with teachers. This collaborative effort should culminate in an integrated information skills curriculum (GAPSC, 2009). Jeffery (1998) noted it is no longer realistic for library media specialists to work in isolation. He observed the library media specialist must make it a top priority to focus on collaboration with teachers to merge highly specialized information into the curriculum. In regard to concerns involving budgetary shortfalls and threatened obsolescence, Jeffery stated, “If the library professional is to survive in this age of responsibilities being dictated by technology and diminished fiscal resources, we must find strategies for developing collaborative opportunities with faculty in order to meet educational goals” (p. 155).

Wethered (2003) conducted a Canadian study involving a district’s teacher-librarians, comparable to library media specialists, and their perceptions

of the relative importance of 16 roles outlined for their job performance.

Wethered reported the largest gap between the measures of actual and preferred ratings related to cooperative program planning and teaching. The teacher-librarians surveyed believed cooperative program planning and teaching was a high priority, but in reality they had great difficulty in incorporating it into their daily schedules. Studies conducted by Ervin (1989); Schon, Helmstadter, and Robinson (1991); Johnson (1993); and McCarthy (1997) all arrive at similar conclusions based on surveys of practicing library media specialists. Ervin et al. determined library media specialists perceived the instructional partner role was of significant importance, but they all noted library media specialists did not practice the role of instructional partner on a level deserving of its implied importance.

Lance (1994) underscored the value of skilled library media specialists and collaboration. Loertscher and Woolls (2003) indicated teachers were more receptive to library media specialists being full partners in teaching and learning rather than merely supporting them from the library. Loertscher and Woolls observed students were the biggest beneficiaries of teacher-library media specialist collaboration because it resulted in an improved learning experience. A trained library media specialist recognizes materials which contribute to instructional units and spends more time working with teachers to construct units (Lance, 1994). Despite proven success with achievement, Scott (1987) reported although library media specialists were equal to teachers in pay, organizational level, and union rank, teachers still perceived library media specialists served as

support personnel and not as equal colleagues. Pickard (1993) surveyed library media specialists in Dekalb County, Georgia, and reported library media specialists believed the instructional partner role was important, not as an equal partner, but rather in a support role. Pickard reported only a quarter of library media specialists surveyed believed they should be on equal footing to assess student work for a tandem unit (1993).

In a survey of elementary school library media specialists in Alaska, Putnam (1996) reported on average library media specialists supported the roles and guidelines from the 1988 edition of *Information Power*, including the roles of instructional design and consultant although they did not practice the two roles to a great extent. In Putnam's study, those library media specialists who were able to utilize a flexible scheduling pattern reported they were more often able to serve in the instructional role capacity. This study reinforced Pickard's (1993) conclusion library media specialists believed their instructional role was important but in an assistive function rather than as an equal.

McCracken (2000) surveyed a national sample of school library media specialists to determine their level of implementation of the 1988 and 1998 *Information Power* recommendations and the perceived level of importance library media specialists assigned them. McCracken reported the respondents believed the recommended guidelines were much more important in the ideal than in terms of actual implementation into their daily activities.

Anderson (2001) noted the challenge all library media specialists faced involved the progress of technology and the necessity library media specialists

must quickly adapt and utilize new methods and equipment with technical expertise. Anderson also revealed time was one of the most oft-quoted obstacles to collaboration. He reported some library media specialists did not have time to fulfill the responsibilities of collaboration and advocacy. Anderson observed older, traditional library media specialists may not be trained to collaborate. While some are not comfortable going into classrooms with teachers, others believed managing the media center requires too much effort according to Anderson. Anderson concluded this left little time for collaboration for some while others focused on different aspects of the profession. Time as an obstacle seemed to be an underlying assumption of most research in which the evidence suggested library media specialists favored a more prominent role for collaboration and instruction than they were able to practically institute (Drake, 2007).

Summary

After a century of progressive guidelines being issued by national organizations, library media specialists have continued to define their role in academia. Federal funding has given credibility to the inclusion of library media centers in the nation's public schools and allowed them to expand the resources and technologies offered within their walls. The link between the presence of a strong library media specialist and media program and their positive influence on student achievement has been documented rigorously by researchers such as Lance, Rodney, and Hamilton-Pennell (1999, 2000, 2001). The advancement of technology has found its home in the media center, compelling the library media specialist to become proficient in its use and keenly aware of its potential abuse

by the information illiterate. By partnering with teachers, library media specialists guarantee they will have a hand in shaping curriculum and resource allocation. It is a matter of concern, however, most library media specialists believe the role of instructional partner is important, yet they cannot practice it to the level they feel it should be put into action. Library media specialists must take action to remain relevant and continue to contribute to student success.

Chapter III

Methodology

Introduction

This study examined the extent to which secondary level library media specialists in Georgia's public school system have implemented the roles prescribed for them in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Media Programs* (AASL and AECT, 1988) and *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL and AECT, 1998). The study also sought to determine if library media specialists think it is a priority to implement these guidelines in their library media centers. Respondents helped determine the extent of the role instructional technology plays in performing the duties of a library media specialist. This chapter describes the research procedures, population, instrument, and the statistical methods used to gather and analyze data.

Research Questions

Research Question 1. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the following perceived practical and theoretical roles for media specialists as defined by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*: instructional consultant, teacher, information specialist, program administrator, and instructional partner?

Research Question 2. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the perceived practical and theoretical role of technology?

Research Question 3. What assistance do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as necessary to support the practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Research Question 4. What barriers do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as hindering their practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Research Design

This study utilized a survey to gather data on the perceptions of library media specialists and their efforts to implement the guidelines prescribed for them in *Information Power*. Surveys can produce information the researcher may find useful and may not be available from other sources (Folz, 1996; Fowler, 2008). Surveys also contain aspects that make them superior to other means of gathering information (Fowler, 2008).

These aspects include

1. The use of probability sampling eliminates bias for the researcher and allows the researcher to estimate how exact the data are going to be.
2. Since all respondents take the same survey, the data are comparable.
3. Constructing a comprehensive survey of all desired information allows the researcher to amass all the data needed for a study.

Population and Sample

Library media specialists working in public high schools in the state of Georgia were the population for this study. In all, 386 public high school library media specialists in Georgia were sent an invitation to participate in the survey. The Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) provided a list of high schools, and individual school Web sites provided names and email addresses. The Georgia DOE is the state agency for education in Georgia and oversees all public education facilities and the media programs contained in them. School Web sites were operated by the district or school and listed faculty directories or the media center and the library media specialists in them. Through rigorous investigation of all school Web sites, 386 email addresses were found, an additional 46 names were located with no email address, and 72 schools with no library media specialist name, email address, or Web site available were identified. All library media specialists who could be identified were sent invitations to respond to the survey.

Assuming a potential population size of at least 386 respondents, the sample generated from the number of respondents should adequately describe the entire population of high school library media specialists. Fowler (2008) stated population size has “virtually no impact on how well that sample is likely to describe the population. A sample of 150 will describe 15,000 or 15 mil with the same degree of accuracy” (p. 44). One hundred-seventy one library media specialists responded to the online survey.

Instrumentation

This study used a slightly revised version of an instrument developed by McCracken (2000) for her study titled “School Library Media Specialists' Perceptions of Practice and Importance of Roles Described in *Information Power*.” Permission to use the instrument was granted via electronic correspondence with the researcher (See Appendix A). The survey consisted of 47 statements about the roles of the library media specialist. Statements highlighted four categories: the role of the library media specialist according to the 1988 *Information Power* (instructional consultant); the roles unique to the 1998 *Information Power* (instructional partner and program administrator); the roles of the library media specialist found in each edition of *Information Power* (teacher and information specialist); and the extent of technology incorporated by the library media specialist.

Survey Development

McCracken (2000) based the survey on items selected after her extensive review of the literature on the role of library media specialists, both editions of *Information Power*, and similar research. The statements were designed to determine if library media specialists perceive the guidelines outlined in *Information Power* to be important and the extent to which they implemented them in their own media centers.

Based on McCracken's (2000) research, a total of 84 statements were formulated, categorized, and grouped into four sections. Any statement not related to these four areas was eliminated. Each statement was crafted for clarity

and meaning as it related to the roles of the library media specialists. The final survey instrument consisted of 47 items divided as follows: instructional consultant role unique to the 1988 edition of *Information Power*, roles unique to the 1998 edition of *Information Power*, program administrator and instructional partner; roles included in 1988 and 1998, teacher and information specialist; and use of technology.

This survey contained descriptive questions designed to gather demographic data (See Appendix B). The descriptive questions asked number of years experience as a classroom teacher, number of years experience as a school media specialist, grade levels where the library media specialist works, amount and types of technology available in the media center, if the circulation system was automated and the library catalog online, and the type of scheduling (fixed, flexible or hybrid) used in the media center. The descriptive information was used to generate descriptive statistics. The survey was constructed with the Office of Management and Budget guidelines for a respondent completing a survey in less than 30 minutes as reported by Fowler (2008).

McCracken's (2000) survey is divided into two scales. Respondents indicated an "ideal" and "reality" level for each statement. The Theoretical Role Scale asked respondents to gauge the level of importance a given role is for a library media specialist. The question asked by the survey is, "Is this important to you?" The second scale, The Practical Scale, asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they engage in a given role or activity. The question on the survey is, "Do you practice this?" A Likert-type scale of five levels was used for

responses to both scales. The responses are 1 = not at all, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to a moderate extent, 4 = to a great extent, 5 = to a very great extent. Direct comparisons of responses were possible because the same response set was used for both the theoretical and practical scales for each statement.

A Likert-type scale with closed responses provides the following benefits:

1. The respondent can more reliably perform the task of answering each question when the responses are given (Fowler, 2008, p. 101).
2. The researcher can more reliably perform the task of interpreting the answers when the alternative responses are supplied (Fowler, 2008, p. 101).

Two open-ended questions are present at the end of the survey in an attempt to determine barriers and obstacles library media specialists encounter as they navigate and expand their roles in schools and what strategies support or assist this expansion. The open-ended questions are (1) "What factors promote your ability to expand your role?" and (2) "What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?" The instructions for the open-ended questions asked respondents to respond with lists and phrases. Responses were examined to determine what common factors promote or encumber the library media specialist in the changing environment. Responses to the open-ended questions were categorized and totaled.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

McCracken (2000) conducted a pilot study to verify clarity of the survey and identify any problems with the instrument. During a conference of the

Virginia Educational Media Association's Leadership Conference, she surveyed a sample group of 80 library media specialists. Respondents were asked to flag any questions that were vague or ambiguous. Wording was revised for content and clarity in regard to these responses. Since the instrument is based on national guidelines and research literature, it evolved from broadly accepted guidelines. Only half of the pilot group returned completed surveys. Respondents indicated a lengthy completion time over 30 minutes while others noted the survey was too long. After subsequent revisions identified by the pilot phase, validity of the survey instrument was established (McCracken, 2000).

To test for internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was employed. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), this is the most appropriate method to test for internal consistency when the instrument does not score responses right or wrong. The results of the pilot study were used to determine internal consistency. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was administered to the four groups of statements used in the survey which reflect the four major areas of roles. The estimated reliability for the statements in each of the four major areas are as follows:

1. Instructional consultant role as described in *Information Power* (1988), practical scale, .87; theoretical scale, .77.
2. Program administrator (b1), practical scale, .75, theoretical scale .73 and instructional partner (b2), practical scale, .89, theoretical scale, .77, as described in *Information Power* (1998).

3. Teacher (c1), practical scale, .84, theoretical scale, .74, and information specialist (c2), practical scale, .78, theoretical scale, .72, as described in both editions of *Information Power*.
4. Use of technology, practical scale, .82 theoretical scale, .69.

Since McCracken's initial study was conducted in 2000, the survey instrument included some terms that a decade later were termed "dated." The continual advancement of technology has rendered some of the terms she used such as "videocassette player," "videodisc player," and "CD-ROM database" somewhat obsolete. These terms have been replaced by the researcher with "DVDs," "DVD player," "eBooks," "digital audio books (Playaways)," and "digital cameras" (See Appendix C).

Due to these slight modifications and the new medium in which the survey was presented to potential respondents, a small pilot test was conducted. The online survey link was sent using the email invitation to four elementary and middle school library media specialists who completed the survey according to directions. They were able to complete the survey as instructed, and the responses were recorded by the Web site as expected. No further modifications or changes were made to the instrument or the mode of delivery.

Data Collection

Permission to conduct research involving human subjects was requested from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at Valdosta State University (See Appendix D). Data collection involved the following steps:

1. An introductory email with the survey link was sent inviting potential participants to go online and answer the survey.
2. Following the first email on a Wednesday, the second email with the survey link was sent the following Tuesday to the list of potential participants. To insure total anonymity, no record was kept of who replied and who did not so every email address received all three invitations.
3. A third email was sent the following Monday thanking respondents and encouraging any potential respondent to reply before the survey was closed for participation. The survey remained open for eight days following the third and final email.

The emails explained the purpose of the study, assured the respondents' confidentiality, and asked for their prompt participation (See Appendix E). A period of six days was allowed for the first respondents to finish the survey. Ninety-three (93) responses were received during this four week period. A second invitation and follow up email was sent to remind non-responders about participation in the following week. Fifty-seven (57) surveys were received from the second request. The third invitation generated twenty-one (21) responses. A total of 171 responses were received.

Data Analysis

Survey responses were numerically coded for data analysis. Microsoft Excel (2010) software program was used to analyze the data. Standard deviation and mean were calculated for each item on the survey. Composite scores were used to test each group of items as well as each item. Subgroups were formed

based on descriptive demographics such as years of experience in the media center, years of experience as a teacher, amount of technology available, and type of scheduling.

The data analysis method for this study incorporates routine statistical methods. The mean and standard deviation for responses to the practical and theoretical scale for each survey item was calculated. Preferred over the median or mode, the mean is a measure of central tendency that incorporates all the information in a distribution (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The standard deviation is the most common and functional index of variability. Knowing these two numbers allows the researchers to make comparisons and other interpretations of the data (Fraenkel & Wallen). A paired t test was used in this study to determine any statistically significant difference between the means of theoretical and practical responses for each category.

The responses to the categories were compared to establish if library media specialists more frequently practiced the roles they perceived as being important. A paired t test was used to determine the significance of the means for the practical and theoretical responses (McCracken, 2000).

Descriptive variables served as the predictor variables in this study. Criterion variables are the perceptions and practices as noted by the library media specialists in their survey responses. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions.

Respondent Demographics

The target group of potential respondents for this study was the library media specialists working in Georgia public high schools. Over 500 secondary schools were identified through the Georgia Department of Education Web site. Out of those schools, 386 email addresses and names were found for library media specialists around the state. Table 3.1 shows the potential and actual numbers associated with data collection.

Table 3.1

Participants

Eligible Participants	<i>N</i>	Response Rate
504 Georgia secondary schools	386*	77%
386 mailed invitations	171	43.84%

*Note: Potential number of respondents by collected email addresses.

Of the 386 invitations sent to library media specialists in Georgia's secondary schools, 171 (43.84%) completed the survey. Those surveys were self-reported and anonymous, so the information should be valid as truthful. Three responses out of the 171 were invalid due to the respondents indicating being employed in a school other than a high school.

The respondents indicated a wide range of educational employment, beginning with the time they were employed as a classroom teacher prior to becoming a library media specialist. Table 3.2 breaks down the years worked and the number of respondents indicating their level of applicable experience.

Table 3.2

Years Experience as a Classroom Teacher

<i>N</i> (171)	Years
37	0
53	1-5
38	6 – 10
36	11 – 20
7	20 +

The 171 collected surveys included 55 library media specialists with five (5) or fewer years of experience in library media. Respondents with six to ten years of experience numbered 46. Forty-three (43) had between 11 and 20 years of library media experience, and 27 had over 20 years of experience in library media. Table 3.3 lists the length of time in categories each respondent indicated they had been employed as a library media specialist.

Table 3.3

Years Experience as a Library Media Specialist

<i>N</i> (171)	Years
55	0-5
46	6-10
43	11-20
27	21+

Of the 171 respondents to the survey, 165 respondents indicated flexible scheduling for student access to the media center with only one (1) respondent indicating a fixed schedule and five (5) indicating a hybrid combination of fixed and flexible scheduling. Table 3.4 lists the types of media center scheduling and the number and percentage of respondents indicating their individual type in a secondary setting.

Table 3.4

Type of Scheduling

Type of Schedule	N (171)	Percentage
Fixed	1	0.6%
Flexible	165	96.5%
Combination/Hybrid	5	2.9%

Table 3.5 provides an overview of the technology library media specialists indicated are available in their media centers. Access to the Internet was almost universally available in high school media centers. Ninety-nine point four (99.4%) percent of library media specialists noted their media center had Internet access. Five technologies, in addition to Internet access, were present in over 95% of all respondent surveys including Automated Circulation System, (97.7%); DVDs, (97.7%); DVD Player, (97.7%); Computer Workstation(s) with CD-ROM drive(s), (95.9%); and Student Computer Workstation with Word Processing, (97.7%).

Table 3.5

Technology Present in Library Media Centers

	<i>N</i> (171)	Percentage
Automated Circulation System	167	97.7%
Automated On-line Catalog	160	93.6%
TV Studio(Video camcorder/broadcast to school)	78	45.6%
Videocassette Player	155	90.6%
DVDs	167	97.7%
DVD Player	167	97.7%
Computer Workstation(s) with CD-ROM drive(s)	164	95.9%
Email Access	157	91.8%
Internet Access	170	99.4%
Student Computer with Word Processing	167	97.7%
Video Editing Equipment	62	36.3%
Digital Cameras	159	93.0%
Digital Audio Books (Playaways)	55	32.2%
eBooks	82	48.0%

Most of the technology included in the survey was present in library media centers among the respondents. Of the fourteen technologies surveyed, only four were below fifty percent while the other ten were 90% or higher. Only 45.6% of library media specialists reported having a TV Studio while only 36% reported having Video Editing Equipment. Digital Audio Books (Playaways) and eBooks

were only present in 32.2% and 48.0% respectively of respondents' media centers.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which library media specialists in Georgia's public secondary schools believed the guidelines put forth in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* are important and to what degree they were practiced daily. This study also looked at the impact of technology on the role and practice of library media specialists. The study used a survey developed as part of McCracken's (2000) research with library media specialists in Virginia, while being updated to reflect current technologies used a decade after the survey was developed. The mean and standard deviation were determined for each research question. A paired *t* test was used to determine the significance of difference between theoretical and actual practices.

Chapter IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there were differences between the theoretical implementation of the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* guidelines for library media programs and the practical implementation of guidelines for library media programs found in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. The researcher evaluated the statistical relationship between the perceived level of importance of the standards by library media specialists in comparison to the actual practice of meeting the criteria's expectations. This evaluation revealed the disparity between the aspiration and actual roles of the library media specialists. Library media specialists' input was gathered through an online survey. A series of paired *t* tests was used to determine the differences between practical and theoretical levels. This chapter begins with an analysis of the data to address the first two research questions followed by a qualitative analysis of the final research questions, which were open-ended.

Research Questions

Research Question 1. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the following perceived practical and theoretical roles for media specialists as defined by the 1988 and

1998 editions of *Information Power*: instructional consultant, teacher, information specialist, program administrator, and instructional partner?

Research Question 2. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the perceived practical and theoretical role of technology?

Research Question 3. What assistance do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as necessary to support the practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Research Question 4. What barriers do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as hindering their practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Data Analysis and Findings

A survey, replicated with some modifications and used with permission from McCracken (2000), was administered in November 2010 via the online survey Web site, SurveyMonkey™. The survey was distributed by email invitation to all available email addresses for secondary high school library media specialists in Georgia. The survey was administered over a 21 day period involving three emailed invitations. There were a total of 386 potential respondents of whom 171 returned surveys. One hundred and nine surveys were completed in their entirety. Sixty-two surveys were missing responses to one or more statements. Calculations were performed according to the number of responses for each individual statement present. Respondents were asked to

rate on a Likert scale their level of agreement with how often they actually performed a task. An answer of “1” on the survey indicated “not at all” moving up the scale to the answer of “5” which indicated “to a very great extent.”

Research Question 1: Perceived versus Theoretical Roles

The first group of survey items sought to determine library media specialists' perception of how often they engaged in activities related to instructional consulting, a role unique to the 1988 edition of *Information Power*. Table 4.1 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. A paired sample *t* test comparing practical and theoretical responses was performed and a *p*-value calculated along with Cohen's *d* effect size for each survey statement.

Table 4.1

Roles Unique to the 1988 Edition of Information Power: Instructional Consultant

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Assist teachers in assessment.	119	2.61	1.08	112	3.81	1.13	9.922	<.001	1.09
Assist in incorporating information skills in curriculum.	117	3.44	0.99	111	4.43	0.73	9.665	<.001	1.14
Assist in evaluating and modifying learning activities.	115	2.77	1.11	111	3.89	1.07	8.67	<.001	1.03
Serve as members of curriculum development.	118	3.03	1.36	111	4.31	0.97	9.697	<.001	1.08
Assist teachers in the development of unit objectives.	116	2.72	1.07	110	4.04	0.98	11.264	<.001	1.29
Assist teachers by analyzing learner characteristics.	113	2.69	1.10	111	3.97	1.12	9.767	<.001	1.15

Note: Full survey statements available in appendices.

A paired *t* test was used to determine the difference in the practical and theoretical responses. The paired *t* test revealed there is a significant statistical difference in the two responses for each statement. Statistical significance simply indicates the results found were in all likelihood not due to chance. All statements for the role of instructional consultant were found to be significant. Each *p*-value

was calculated at < 0.001 . The theoretical mean for all statements was higher than the practical mean. Responses showed a theoretical mean value of at least one point higher than the practical mean value for the same statement on all survey items for instructional consultant. Cohen's effect size value for all statements ($d = 1.09, 1.14, 1.03, 1.08, 1.29, 1.15$) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant.

Table 4.2 illustrates the second group of survey statements, asking library media specialists to rate their practical and theoretical agreement concerning the role of instructional partner. The role of instructional partner was added to the second edition to further specify the areas in which a library media specialist would expect to perform. Table 4.2 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. The table then shows the t value, p -value and effect size for each survey statement concerning the role of instructional partner.

Table 4.2

Roles Unique to the 1998 Edition of Information Power: Instructional Partner

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Work with teachers.	112	2.82	1.08	111	4.01	1.05	10.063	<.001	1.12
Work collaboratively with faculty.	115	2.94	1.17	111	4.20	0.88	9.677	<.001	1.21
Collaborate with teachers.	113	3.03	1.14	111	4.36	0.84	11.013	<.001	1.33
Promote information literacy skills to teachers.	113	3.74	0.84	111	4.51	0.72	8.83	<.001	0.98
Work to design learning activities.	113	3.16	1.07	110	4.37	0.80	10.688	<.001	1.28
Collaborate regularly with teachers.	111	3.16	1.07	111	4.25	0.89	9.252	<.001	1.11
Work closely with teachers in assessing work.	110	2.15	1.03	111	3.59	1.29	10.598	<.001	1.22

The results of the paired *t* tests used to determine the differences in the practical and theoretical responses for the role of instructional partner demonstrated consistency among library media specialists. There was a significant statistical difference in the two responses for each statement. All statements for the role of instructional partner were found to be significant. The *p*-values for all statements was calculated at < 0.001. Promotion of literacy skills

to teachers had the narrowest margin between practical and theoretical values. It was the only statement where the difference between the practical and theoretical mean was less than one, calculated at 0.77. Respondents indicated the widest range of belief about working with teachers to collaborate on assessing student work on the theoretical scale, calculated at 1.43. Cohen's effect size value for all statements ($d = 1.12, 1.21, 1.33, 0.98, 1.28, 1.11, 1.22$) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant.

Table 4.3 illustrates the third group of survey statements and the second role unique to the 1998 edition of *Information Power*, that of program administrator. The survey asked library media specialists to rate their practical and theoretical agreement concerning the role of program administrator. Table 4.3 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. The table then shows the t value, p -value and effect size for each survey statement concerning the role of program administrator.

Table 4.3

Roles Unique to the 1998 Edition of Information Power: Program Administrator

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Develop and implement a mission statement.	119	3.95	1.01	111	4.44	0.78	5.249	<.001	0.54
Communicate regularly with principals.	118	3.69	1.02	112	4.57	0.71	8.311	<.001	1.00
Manage space, equipment, resources, and supplies.	113	4.57	0.60	111	4.77	0.50	3.613	<.001	0.38
Integrate the Information Standards for Student Learning.	113	2.96	1.16	111	4.28	0.91	11.407	<.001	1.26
Inform teachers and others of program resources.	113	4.38	0.69	110	4.67	0.65	3.898	<.001	0.44
Promote the library in community.	111	2.82	1.15	111	4.05	1.16	10.899	<.001	1.06
Develop and maintain an effective advocacy program.	110	3.04	1.20	111	4.45	0.83	12.026	<.001	1.38

All statements for the role of program administrator were found to be significant. The *p*-values for all statements are all at < 0.001. Analysis of the means and standard deviations for the role of program administrator indicated

library media specialists perceived the practical implementation of this role to be important. The theoretical means were some of the highest on the survey. This suggested library media specialists believed the tasks associated with program administration were very important. A paired *t* test was used to determine the difference in the practical and theoretical responses for the role of program administrator. Library media specialists reported some of the highest levels of agreement on the theoretical scale for program administrator. The standard deviations for these theoretical statements were all less than 1 except for promoting the library in the community, which was calculated at 1.16. Cohen's effect size value for all statements ($d = 0.54, 1.00, 0.38, 1.26, 0.44, 1.06, 1.38$) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant.

The two roles mentioned in both editions of *Information Power* are teacher and information specialist. Library media specialists have performed these roles since libraries became a cornerstone of curriculum (Everhart, 2000). Table 4.4 illustrates the fourth group of survey statements and the first role outlined in both the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*, that of teacher. The survey asked library media specialists to rate their practical and theoretical agreement concerning the role of teacher. Table 4.4 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. The table then shows the *t* value, *p*-value and effect size for each survey statement concerning the role of teacher.

Table 4.4

Roles in Both the 1988 and the 1998 Editions of Information Power: Teacher

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Promote competency in information literacy.	116	3.66	0.96	108	4.51	0.74	8.19	<.001	0.98
Maintain current and in-depth knowledge about individual needs.	118	3.25	1.09	111	4.10	1.02	6.29	<.001	0.81
Teach students to understand each medium.	116	3.47	0.98	111	4.45	0.74	9.77	<.001	1.13
Develop and promote Information Standards for Student Learning.	113	2.93	1.06	111	4.21	0.96	10.57	<.001	1.26
Design and implement teaching and learning.	111	3.47	0.98	111	4.43	0.79	9.12	<.001	1.08
Identify and assess the staff's learning needs.	112	3.18	1.16	111	4.27	0.89	8.86	<.001	1.06
Provide instruction for parents.	112	2.12	1.11	109	3.61	1.28	11.76	<.001	1.25

Library media specialists indicated a high level of agreement with the roles outlined for teacher in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. The widest range of answers came from the survey statement about providing instruction to parents. Responses suggested that particular statement had the

lowest level of agreement both practical and theoretical. Library media specialists indicated they did not believe parental instruction was important, nor had they implemented parental instruction to a great degree. All statements for the role of teacher for both the practical and theoretical scales were found to be significant with a p -value calculated at < 0.001 . Cohen's effect size value for all statements ($d = 0.98, 0.81, 1.13, 1.26, 1.08, 1.06, 1.25$) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant.

The second role mentioned in both editions of *Information Power* is the information specialist. Table 4.5 illustrates the fifth group of survey statements and the second role outlined in both the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*, that of information specialist. The survey asked library media specialists to rate their practical and theoretical agreement concerning the role of information specialist. Table 4.5 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. The table then shows the t value, p -value and effect size for each survey statement concerning the role of information specialist.

Table 4.5

Roles in Both the 1988 and the 1998 Editions of Information Power: Information Specialist

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Build collections.	119	4.50	0.70	112	4.81	0.49	4.27	<.001	0.51
Assist students and staff in identifying appropriate information resources.	118	4.00	0.90	110	4.65	0.58	7.67	<.001	0.86
Guide and assist teachers in evaluating resources.	118	3.54	1.02	111	4.50	0.69	8.27	<.001	1.09
Encourage the widest possible use of program resources.	117	3.94	0.99	111	4.66	0.56	6.97	<.001	0.88
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning.	113	3.14	0.99	111	4.35	0.92	11.16	<.001	1.27
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning.	111	3.14	1.11	111	4.40	0.89	10.30	<.001	1.26
Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of the library profession.	112	4.38	0.72	111	4.72	0.61	5.12	<.001	0.52
Work with teachers to ensure students develop higher level	113	3.25	1.04	110	4.33	0.91	9.22	<.001	1.10

thinking skills.									
Facilitate access to resources outside the school.	111	3.31	1.17	111	4.20	0.96	8.10	<.001	0.83
Organize all library resources for effective and efficient use.	111	4.61	0.63	110	4.81	0.50	3.18	<.001	0.34

Note: One survey statement (5/6) is repeated per McCracken (2000).

All survey statements regarding the role of information specialist were indicated as significant by the paired *t* tests. The *p*-values continued the trend of the entire data set, falling at < .001. The practical and theoretical survey statements regarding information specialist were the closest in mean and standard deviation. This indicated the role of information specialist is one of the more highly regarded roles library media specialists perform and perceive as important. Cohen's effect size value for most statements (*d* = .086, 1.09, 0.88, 1.27, 1.26, 0.52, 1.10, 0.83) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant. Cohen's effect size values of 0.51 and 0.34 were moderately significant. Cohen (1988) described an effect size of .5 as moderate and an effect size of .2 as small.

Research question one is: Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the following perceived practical and theoretical roles for media specialists as defined by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*: instructional consultant, teacher, information specialist, program administrator, and instructional partner? Library media

specialists noted, as demonstrated by their responses on the survey, that there is a significant difference between the practical implementation of guidelines and the theoretical importance of implementation. Library media specialists indicated their closest agreement regarding the implementation of duties involving program administration and information specialist. Library media specialists reported the least agreement and widest disparity for the roles of instructional consultant and instructional partner.

Research Question 2: Technology in the Media Center

To address the impact technology has on library media specialists and its continuing influence on the profession, research question 2 asked library media specialists to rate their perceptions of technology and its incorporation in the library media center. Table 4.6 illustrates the sixth group of survey statements based on technology in the library media center. The survey asked library media specialists to rate their practical and theoretical agreement concerning the role of technology. Table 4.6 lists the survey statements with both the practical and theoretical responses including a total number of responses, the average level of agreement, and the standard deviation for that item. The table then shows the t value, p -value and effect size for each survey statement concerning the role of technology.

Table 4.6

Use of Technology in Library Media Centers

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Remain current on information technology.	117	3.84	0.82	111	4.68	0.59	9.90	<.001	1.18
Model and promote technology.	117	4.06	0.86	111	4.68	0.52	7.69	<.001	0.87
Guide and assist teachers in the use of media.	116	3.80	0.87	111	4.49	0.76	6.69	<.001	0.84
Evaluate and assess the impact of technology.	115	2.97	1.14	110	4.21	0.93	10.63	<.001	1.19
Serve technology planning team.	113	3.93	1.25	111	4.50	0.87	5.11	<.001	0.52
Provide instructions in use of on-line database.	113	4.12	0.88	111	4.61	0.72	5.71	<.001	0.62
Provide instruction in Internet searching.	112	3.97	1.00	111	4.60	0.69	6.74	<.001	0.73
Assist students in the creation of web pages.	111	2.06	1.18	111	3.35	1.39	9.42	<.001	1.00
Offer staff development program.	109	2.86	1.27	110	4.28	0.91	11.16	<.001	1.28
Serve as technology coordinator.	111	2.85	1.48	110	3.57	1.45	4.99	<.001	0.49

Differences between the practical and theoretical implementation of technology among library media specialists were significant. Library media specialist indicated the importance of staying current on technology and teaching others how to use it. The values for mean and standard deviation for both the practical scale and theoretical scale indicated the most agreement on modeling and teaching technology to others and the least amount of agreement on serving as a school technology coordinator. The p -values remained < 0.001 while the results of the paired t tests revealed significance for all statements. Cohen's effect size value for most statements ($d = 1.18, 0.87, 0.84, 1.19, 1.00, 1.28,$) suggested a very high practical significance. According to Cohen (1988), effect sizes are considered large at the .80 level and are practically significant. Cohen's effect size value for the remaining statements ($d = 0.52, 0.62, 0.73, 0.49$) were moderately significant. Cohen (1988) described values as moderately significant at the .5 up to .8 level.

Research question two is: Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the perceived practical and theoretical role of technology? The responses on the survey demonstrated there is a difference in the practical and theoretical roles as implemented by library media specialists. Respondents believe the role of technology is important and they noted they have implemented it to a degree on all levels of the survey.

Research Question 3: Enablers

Two open-ended questions were posed in an effort to determine which factors enable or prohibit library media specialists performing their jobs. The first question was “What factors enable you to expand your role?” Respondents were free to write as much or as little as they believed necessary to convey their perceptions. No prompts or suggestions were provided. Respondents’ written statements were read line by line and coded with the relative concept. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions. Key words mentioned frequently such as *principal*, *budget*, or *staff* were tallied and then ranked in order. The responses to the first open-ended question which asked library media specialists to detail enabling factors that allowed them to expand and fully realize the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*, are listed in ascending order of frequency.

Principal Support. Library media specialists most often cited principal support or support by school administration as beneficial in performing or expanding their professional tasks. Library media specialists spoke positively of the impact a supportive administration had on them and the library media program.

One respondent with eight years of library media experience stated, “We are valued and ‘in the loop’ regarding the direction we need to be towards for the 21st Century Learner” while others cited “Being a part of my school leadership team.” Another library media specialist of 31 years reported, “My principal is very

good about listening to me and will often let me 'do whatever I think' when it comes to new technology, sites, activities, etc. I am very fortunate in that area.” Other responses concerning supportive principals and administrators as a positive enabler for implementing guidelines included, “A principal who supports our program,” “Acceptance by the administrative team as a contributor towards school improvement,” and “Administrators providing the backing necessary.” Other respondents pointed out the essential knowledge necessary for a principal, stating, “An administration that respects what I do and understands my role in the teaching process.” Many respondents repeated similar points, citing “Complete cooperation with the teachers and administrators,” “Support from principal, adequate help and budget,” “Support of administration,” and the presence of a “Visionary principal” as being conducive to expanding roles outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*.

Principals or administration were mentioned in comments 46 times, highlighting their support as beneficial to library media specialists and the implementation of guidelines in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. Responses indicated library media specialists believed principals were most supportive when library media specialists were included in decision making, given program support, and were respected for the job they perform.

Teachers. Library media specialists indicated teacher cooperation second most often as enabling library media specialists to perform the duties outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. Collaboration with teachers allowed many media specialists to meet the performance objectives of

collaboration and student assessment. Teachers demonstrated this commitment to collaboration through willingness and a desire to provide the best opportunities for students.

One respondent indicated a “Good working relationship with most faculty” as a key enabler to expanding responsibilities. Another respondent echoed this need, saying, “Having teachers who are willing to allow me to participate in planning for their and their classes' needs.” An openness to collaborate on the teachers' part was mentioned frequently such as, “Teachers concerned with doing what is most effective for students,” “Teachers willing to try something new and collaborate,” and “The willingness of teachers to allow me to collaborate with them.”

Collaboration and shared student instruction is heavily emphasized in both editions of *Information Power*, and it is crucial teachers are willing and open to this form of partnership. Teacher cooperation was mentioned 28 times in comments made by survey respondents citing factors enabling the expansion of their roles. *Information Power* (1988) encourages teacher collaboration through the instructional consultant while 1998 *Information Power* establishes the role for library media specialists as an instructional partner. The comments made by library media specialists in this section indicated they are aware of teachers who are willing to work in partnership, or library media specialists realize that is what they need in order to fulfill this guideline.

Staffing, Technology, and Funding. Library media specialists' responses regarding the next three factors related to expansion of their professional role all

link to funding. Additional staffing, new technology, and adequate funding were indicated as crucial components of job improvement. Media staff such as clerks or paraprofessionals who performed the basic functions of the media center such as processing materials, re-shelving books, and serving patrons allowed library media specialists to have more time to collaborate with teachers, serve on committees, and attend conferences. As one respondent noted, "Having a media clerk and student assistants for day-to-day management of the media center. This allows me to interact with teachers and students in their classrooms."

Modern technology such as online card catalogs and automated circulation software allowed library media specialists to offer more information faster and with an emphasis on information literacy skills. One respondent said, "Internet, websites, and online cataloging have evolved many aspects of the traditional librarian. In the words of one library media specialist, "Utilizing these tools allows media centers to make their resources more readily available to even larger numbers of patrons."

The fifth ranked factor permitting library media specialists to implement the guidelines to the extent they believed necessary was having an adequate budget to purchase new supplies, books, resources, and equipment. Many respondents summed up the increase in budget or protection of current funding levels succinctly by stating, "[The] ability to order the materials needed for the library - funding wasn't cut!" Others echoed sentiments such as, "Additional money," "Adequate funding," and "Funding."

Library media specialists heavily favored media clerks, assistants, and paraprofessionals who allowed them extra time and freedom to meet the 1988 and 1998 *Information Power* guidelines. In the absence of assistants, library media specialists were obliged to perform very basic functions of the media center instead of more advanced collaborative undertakings. Newer technology such as automated card catalogs and automated inventory systems performed a similar function as the media assistants, enabling library media specialists to free up valuable time with more efficient processes. Funding for clerks, technology, books, and facilities was also an important factor that, if present, library media specialists believed greatly enhanced library media specialists' ability to expand and implement the roles outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*.

Additional Factors. Other factors contributed to the expansion of the library media specialists' ability to implement guidelines were participating in the leadership or curriculum planning committee, personal desire, and additional training. Concerning participation in management, one respondent stated, "Serving on the leadership team and department chair team, monthly meeting with the other county media specialists to discuss ways to improve our media centers what works, what doesn't" as an example of shared decision making.

Personal initiative to acquire more education, training, and attending conferences such as the one held by the Georgia Council of Media Organizations (COMO) were other ways library media specialists could expand their roles. Some respondents indicated an interest in "Attending conferences like COMO," "I

am acquiring another degree,” and “I am pursuing a specialist degree in Instructional Technology.” Further comments indicated some library media specialists relied on a sheer force of will to expand their roles, stating, “My own motivation and desire to do better,” and “My own work ethic.” These comments indicated self-awareness among library media specialists and a desire to continue learning, even in spite of or in concert with other enablers.

Interested and inquisitive students were also included as positive factors. As one library media specialist stated, “The kids are usually anxious to learn new information, and they've come to trust my taste in books.” Respondents mentioned the importance of others understanding the role library media specialists perform in the curriculum were mentioned. An example of this was when one library media specialist said s/he wanted “an administration that respects what I do and understands my role in the teaching process.” Scheduling, additional time, and other duties where library media specialists could promote the media program were also indicated as positive factors such as the idea from one respondent who suggested, “Word of mouth from teachers who use the resources of the media center and media specialist.”

The following is a list of factors library media specialists noted as playing a positive influence in expanding their professional role. They are listed in rank order with the frequency listed in parentheses. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions. Respondents' written statements were read line by line and coded with the relative concept. Key words

mentioned frequently such as time, principal, or teacher were tallied and then ranked in order.

1. Principal and administrative support (46)
2. Teacher cooperation (28)
3. Additional staff (18)
4. Technology (13)
5. Funding (11)
6. Leadership or curriculum committee (10)
7. Attending conferences (8)
8. Personal initiative (8)
9. Students (7)
10. Understanding the role of the library media specialist (6)
11. Additional time (2)
12. Schedule (2)
13. Other duties (1)

In all, respondents mentioned 160 items that could help them expand their professional role. Tabulated, they represent thirteen categories where library media specialists could nurture and concentrate their efforts towards cultivating these enabling factors and seeking out others who can assist them in this process.

Research Question 4: Barriers

Two open-ended questions were posed in an effort to determine which factors enable or prohibit library media specialists in performing their jobs. The

second question was “What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?” Respondents were free to write as much or as little as they believed necessary to convey their perceptions. No prompts or suggestions were provided. Respondents’ written statements were read line by line and coded with the relative concept. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions. Key words mentioned frequently such as principal, budget, or staff were tallied and then ranked in order.

Responses to the second open-ended question asked library media specialists to detail inhibiting factors which prevented them from expanding and fully realizing the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*.

Funding. Funding and budgetary concerns were most frequently cited as a barrier to library media specialists achieving ideal levels of implementation of *Information Power* guidelines. Budgetary concerns encompassed reduced funding, staff cuts, lack of new technology, and inadequate facilities. Library media specialists perceived the main cause of their inability to implement the guidelines stemmed directly from a lack of funds due to statewide austerity measures and administrations’ unwillingness to protect funds earmarked for library media programs. Library media specialists stated it often and bluntly, “Budget,” “Funding!,” “Funding,” “Money, money, money,” “NO MONEY!!!!!!,” “Working 3 jobs due to budget restrictions,” and finally, “Not enough funding.”

The lack of adequate funds to operate at the level library media specialists believe is necessary was noted in some form over fifty-five times in the

responses. Whether budgets were cut, assistance in operating the media center was nonexistent, or resources were denied or terminated, library media specialists perceived low operational funding as a significant negative factor when implementing professional roles and guidelines.

Time. Time was the second most cited barrier. Library media specialists attempted to allocate the necessary time for the many tasks and guidelines suggested in *Information Power*. With reduced budgets and funding unavailable for extra staff or new time-saving technology, they expressed reservations about being able to do it all. Respondents stated they were asked to cover classes and perform duties outside of the media program that hindered their ability to work on their own responsibilities. Comments from library media specialists indicated they were unable to accommodate the many additional tasks in which they were forced to allocate time.

One particularly burdened library media specialist stated:

The position of Media Specialist...has become a kind of 'catch all' for various duties, programs and schoolwide responsibilities that administration deals upon them...Many high schools even monitor Virtual High School and other Credit Recovery programs...these are full-time duties. Some schools also pawn off the inventory for the entire school onto the MS.

Another respondent repeated this, saying, "Being pulled in many different positions and duties. I run this media center by myself, and I have a lot of responsibilities that a normal media specialist with help would not." Several

respondents noted their solitary state in the media center, saying, “Budget cuts took away the media clerk - no extra help with routine clerical tasks, shelving books, processing new materials, etc.” and “Lack of a paraprofessional prevents me from being able to leave the media center when teachers need assistance in classrooms or labs. This has forced me to go back to a lot of the old librarian roles and not the modern roles of a media specialist.”

Without extra staff to provide some relief for library media specialists, they found few opportunities to work outside of the library media center due to “Lack of time and manpower. I only have a parapro part time this year, which makes leaving the library MUCH more challenging.” Other respondents reaffirmed the dearth of time, stating, “Time - too small a staff to complete all the tasks necessary for the job in a school as large as mine,” and “TIME is a huge factor!!!”

The inability of library media specialists to fit all of their expected tasks into a single day was echoed by several respondents. Finding the time to implement guidelines involved a reliance on additional help in the media center and with shrinking budgets leading to reductions in media staff, new technology, and additional duties around school, library media specialists indicated time was at a premium.

Administration. A lack of support by administration and a disenfranchisement from decision-making bodies was the third most frequently cited barrier to library media specialists’ performance. Library media specialists perceived a deficit in appreciation for their work, concerns, and opinions on behalf of principals and administrators who made decisions affecting library

media specialists without seeking media specialist input. Left out of decisions and leadership team meetings, they felt under-represented and taken advantage of by administrators who library media specialists believe consider them and their programs to be expendable. One respondent listed various ways administrators prevent library media specialists from expanding their roles stating, "Administration holding a narrow or one-dimensional view of the role of media specialist. Administration disregard of media flexible scheduling requirements and scheduling use of media center for testing and other events that close the library to all users. Administration giving media staff "other duties as assigned" such as lunch cafeteria duty, hall duty, classroom instruction, testing, proctoring, subbing, etc., even though it is clearly against state SACS standards."

Library media specialists also said of less-than-helpful administrators, "Administration ignores media center and media specialist, does not value the media program," "Administrators who do not know what to expect of competent librarians," and "Fear of new technology by administration." Some respondents indicated a significant feeling of disengagement, writing "I feel that my administrators do not think my media program is important. Consequently, I am not asked to be on school improvement committees or in any leadership role within the school," while another said the "Media Center does not have impact on student achievement is the feeling of administration. Role of Media Specialist is to check out and check in books. No place on leadership teams in school for media specialist."

As evidenced by these responses, library media specialists are keenly aware of the level of administrative support. Cited as the top enabling element to performing tasks, library media specialists also believed their performance was damaged by an uncaring or out of touch administration.

Teachers. The fourth most mentioned barrier is teachers. Library media specialists, challenged to engage and collaborate with teachers on information literacy skills, assignments, and assessments, were often met by teachers who had no interest in sharing the teaching load. Teachers were said to be disinterested in collaboration. Focused on high-stakes test preparation, teachers were not willing to turn over any aspect of their classroom to library media specialists. Other comments made by library media specialists were that some teachers were “resistant to change,” focused on their role as the expert,” and rather frankly, “old.” Library media specialists registered their frustration with less-than-engaging teachers, saying “Computer labs are built...all over the facility so that teachers and students avoid proper instruction in using the Internet, databases, information literacy.”

Other library media specialists complained about not “Having teachers who are willing to allow me to participate in planning for their and their classes' needs,” or “Teachers who are not receptive to the philosophy of collaborative planning.” Many respondents vocalized their perception they were not appreciated as a valued member of the school’s education team, saying “I almost feel as if I am perceived as a baby-sitter for kids in the MC rather than as a vital part of the educational team.”

One respondent, who had worked at other grade levels singled out teachers at the high school level as being the most difficult to partner, stated, "Working in a high school, teachers collaborate with their department members and operate in isolation. Hard to break into their planning structure." Others stated similar concerns such as, "There are 2 major teacher barriers. One teacher type wants me not to be involved in their classroom and the other teacher type who wants me to babysit or do anything (whether it is relevant or not) with the class." Related comments like "Teachers' attitudes. Many believe that making a research assignment means assigning a topic and turning the students loose." and "Teacher's lack of understanding of information literacy impact on learners" demonstrate the misconceptions held by teachers about the nature of the library media specialists' duties.

Public Perception. One barrier mentioned by library media specialists was the public perception about the role librarians and media specialists perform. Pre-conceived notions of what the library media specialist does and acts like dominate principal, teacher, and student attitudes and the expectations all of them have about library media specialists. The concern expressed among respondents is if library media specialists do not define their role themselves, they will have it defined for them or worse, as stated by one respondent, "If we cannot get people to understand our role, we will all be out of a job sooner rather than later." Others commiserated on the point, saying "The position and duties of Media Specialist need to be more defined...plain and simple," "Confusion about what an excellent media program consists of," and "Having teachers and

administrators understand that I can show them resources and tools that will help them create more engaging lessons and help increase student interactivity. Right now, I am viewed more as the technology and book person rather than an instructional partner. That perception needs to be changed.” One respondent termed the frustration, “Battling old librarian stereotypes.”

Continuing the theme of misunderstanding the role library media specialists perform, many respondents to the survey mentioned other duties such as filling in as school technologists and operating as a lab technician also prevented them from working in the media center. Duty assignments before and after school, during lunch, and at school events hindered the ability of library media specialists to meet their own job expectations.

A respondent indicated the hindrance of other duties, stating, “In charge of all the technology in the school, dealing with textbooks, and all other regular duties I am required to do.” Other library media specialists found themselves similarly inconvenienced with, “Too many other responsibilities in the school. I teach a leadership class, sponsor a school club, make student ID's every day for the students who forget theirs.” Some library media specialists believed they were asked to perform more duties as assigned than they could accommodate due to lack of manpower, saying “We are very small and everyone wears many hats. It is almost impossible for us to take on many more roles to do all of the things that I know I should be doing,” and “Having to deal with technology issues which should be handled by a technology specific person.”

Technology. Technology was cited as an enabling factor but also as a hindrance to library media specialists. The desire to learn new technology was also a barrier when library media specialists were not given adequate training or time to learn new technologies. Some respondents indicated a conflict with the instructional technologist at their school and the overlapping roles they sometimes perform. Technologists were also believed to dismiss the media program as secondary and many times unwilling to unblock needed Internet resources.

Library media specialists indicated technology based barriers as, “My school has no technology vision/leadership,” and, “Our current technology director does not see the media specialists in our district as anything more than book pushers. Where there should be collaboration and partnership, there is NO communication. Our district technology policies are outdated.”

A respondent expressed frustration with access, stating, “Our district does not let us use the technology that will enable me to expand my role. They block everything. I have so much I would like to do and show the students and teachers but can't because we do not have access to it.” Another respondent highlighted the contention that tends to occur when shared resources are dually managed, writing:

Technology director/program has usurped many of the roles and responsibilities of the media specialist through the employment of tech specialists to work with teachers, technology decisions are not

made based on school needs, but system priorities. Technology director does not value media specialist role.

Some library media specialists indicated an empathetic belief that teachers had entirely too many responsibilities placed on them and that was a factor in them not being able to engage teachers more. "Teachers are busy and overworked. Finding time to work with teachers, even if to assist them, is difficult. We have to work with the constraints of teacher time and focus to promote many of the items in the 'ideal' areas" one respondent stated. Another underscored the impact of standardized tests, stating "Emphasis on high stakes testing--teachers tell me they don't 'have time' to come to the media center. Same reason they are not interested in learning more standards or curriculum--is it on the tests is the big question."

Some library media specialists found their coworkers within the library media center to be a hindrance, stating "Other media specialists who are not completing duties as a 21st century media specialists (old school media specialists)" and "Older staff." Another stated "Now, I am by myself with a part-time clerk that is elderly and only allowed to work less than 19 hours a week. She is often out for health issues too. I desperately need a full-time clerk."

Students, scheduling, and nearing the age of retirement were also reasons given as why library media specialists could not expand their role. One respondent cited "Students lack of interest in EVERYTHING." Another noted "Now in the twilight of my career, I don't seem to be as proactive as I once was." School days were also mentioned, such as "School scheduling" as a barrier.

The following is a list of barriers library media specialists noted as inhibiting their professional role. They are listed in rank order with the frequency listed in parentheses. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions. Respondents' written statements were read line by line and coded with the relative concept. Key words mentioned frequently such as time, budgets, or teacher were tallied and then ranked in order.

1. Budget, cuts in funding, staff reduction, and inadequate facilities (55)
2. Insufficient time (30)
3. Lack of principal or administrator support (17)
4. Uncooperative teachers (17)
5. Public perception (16)
6. Other duties (15)
7. Technology (14)
8. Demands placed on teachers (7)
9. Other library media specialists or age (3)
10. Student apathy (2)
11. Scheduling (2)
12. District, federal, and state requirements (1)

Many of the factors library media specialists identified as barriers were also mentioned in the enabling factors section. The primary barriers noted by library media specialists were insufficient budget, insufficient time, and disengaged administrators. Some respondents indicated all three were present in their professional roles making their jobs much more difficult. These barriers,

when present, made it impossible to fully implement and expand the professional duties of library media specialists in Georgia high schools.

Summary

Chapter 4 contained the data analysis and findings of the study. The data was presented for the first two research questions and separated into clusters by the five roles outlined in *Information Power* plus technology. The two open-ended questions were discussed with respondents' statements ranked by frequency. The survey data were evaluated by statistical analysis. The mean, standard deviation, paired *t* test, *p*-value, and the effect size were used to evaluate the significance of practical and theoretical responses for each survey statement. The analysis and findings addressed the first two research questions of the study. The final two research questions were addressed by the open-ended responses for the study. A constant-comparative method was used to analyze data from the open-ended questions. Respondents' written statements were read line by line and coded with the relative concept.

After a comprehensive analysis of the findings of this study, library media specialists believed in the importance of the guidelines suggested in both the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* but encounter numerous factors that prevent them from fully implementing the guidelines to an ideal level. Library media specialists also seemed to value the role of technology but are unable to fully harness all technological potential. The respondents cited many factors that helped them perform their duties such as a supportive principal, cooperative teachers, and extra staffing. Barriers to full implementation were mainly lack of

funding, insufficient time, and lack of support from administration. Many of the factors overlapped, appearing on both the enabler and barrier lists. In the case of items such as budget or administrative support, the respondents seem to substantiate the importance of those two items. When support and funding was held in abundance, it was an enabling factor. In the absence of administrative support or adequate funding, library media specialists noted its debilitating effect on their programs.

Chapter 5 will discuss these findings as well as the consequences of these findings on the future of the library media specialist profession and practice. It will also provide recommendations for future research involving library media programs and library media specialists.

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Information Power, most recently revised in 1998 as *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*, established national guidelines for the operation of a library media program. Craver (1986) noted it takes a decade for new guidelines to be fully implemented in practice by library media specialists. Library media specialists have implemented many of the guidelines suggested but cite various impediments to full implementation of all recommendations. Factors such as cooperation from faculty, support by the administration, and lack of time by the library media specialist inhibited the total adoption of guidelines as suggested by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* (McCoy, 2001; McCracken, 2000). Researchers have linked higher student test scores with quality library media programs, yet it is often the case these programs are not fully supported by teachers and administrators facing accountability who would benefit most in pursuit of student success (Hartzell, 2002a & 2002b; Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, 1999; Lance & Loertscher, 2003; Lance, Rodney, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2000a).

McCracken (2000) demonstrated many library media specialists idealized the guidelines and agreed with the importance of various library media tasks and objectives, but when surveyed about their own level of implementation, library

media specialists rarely claimed full adoption. The present study investigated the extent Georgia public high school library media specialists implemented the roles outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* and the level of importance they assigned to each role. It further explored the impact technology has had on library media specialists and the significance they assign its role. The study was guided by four research questions.

Research Question 1. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the following perceived practical and theoretical roles for media specialists as defined by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*: instructional consultant, teacher, information specialist, program administrator, and instructional partner?

Research Question 2. Among Georgia high school library media specialists, is there a significant difference between the perceived practical and theoretical role of technology?

Research Question 3. What assistance do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as necessary to support the practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Research Question 4. What barriers do Georgia high school library media specialists perceive as hindering their practical implementation of the guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*?

Related Literature

Standardization of the library profession, its accompanying program, and facilities began in the early decades of the 20th century. In 1918, the “Certain Standards,” named for committee chair and standards author Charles Certain, a Detroit high school English teacher, were the first guidelines approved by the National Education Association’s (NEA) Department of Secondary Education (Gann, 1998). The guidelines grew out of the report *Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes* (Gann, 1998).

Information Power. In 1988, the AASL and the AECT published the first edition of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (Gann, 1998). Due to the qualitative nature of the new recommendations and the relegation of quantitative measures to the back of the book, the word “standards” was replaced with “guidelines” (Mellon & Boyce, 1993). Gann observed the focus of *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* was the building level library media specialist and the proactive role the library media specialist should take in leadership and collaboration.

It was in *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (1988) the AASL and AECT established the three overlapping roles of the library media specialists. These separate but equally important roles are information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant (AASL & AECT, 1988). Gann (1998) stated the move to elevate media programs within the educational setting and promote the library media specialist to a position of

educational leader set precedent for redefining the role of library media specialists.

By 1998, the AASL and AECT (1998) revisited *Information Power*. The second edition, like the first, was written with an emphasis on guidelines, eschewing precise standards that should be followed blindly (AASL & AECT). The three roles from the previous edition were expanded to four in *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL & AECT, 1998). The roles of teacher, information specialist, and instructional consultant were joined by program administrator and instructional partner, replacing consultant. A large part of *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* was dedicated to collaboration and incorporating the library media specialists into the fabric of instruction as the title of the book suggests (AASL & AECT).

Accountability & State Studies. A group of researchers, including Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, Rodney, and Russell (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2002, 2003), collaborated on seven statewide studies measuring student achievement among students who had access to a library media program operated by certified library media specialists. Research performed in Alaska, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana all determined a positive correlation between libraries and achievement (Lance, 2005; Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, 1999; Lance, Rodney, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2000b; Lance, Rodney, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2001; Lance, Rodney, & Russell, 2007; Rodney, Lance, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2002; Rodney, Lance, & Hamilton-Pennell, 2003). These researchers stated, “neither school differences, including school expenditures per pupil;

teacher characteristics (education, experience, salaries); teacher/pupil ratio; and student characteristics (poverty, race/ethnicity), or community differences, such as: adult educational attainment; families in poverty; and racial/ethnic demographics” (Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, 1999, p. 7) changed the outcome. The researchers documented positive results from administrators who placed emphasis on collaboration between library media specialists and teachers, met regularly with the media staff, and had the library media specialists involved in school decision-making committees (Lance, Rodney, & Russell, 2007).

Researchers in other states published results confirming the conclusions drawn by Lance et al (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2002, 2003). Researchers concurred with previous findings of a positive correlation between strong library media programs and increases in student achievement performed in California (Achterman, 2008), Florida (Baumbach, 2003), Massachusetts (Baughman, 2000), Minnesota (Baxter & Smalley, 2003), Missouri (Miller, Want, & Whitacre, 2003), New York (Small, Snyder, & Parker, 2008), North Carolina (Burgin & Bracy, 2003), Texas (Smith, 2001), and Wisconsin (Smith, 2006).

Collaboration. Jeffery (1998) noted it was no longer realistic for library media specialists to work in isolation. Wethered (2003) stated the largest disparity between the measures of actual and preferred ratings for cooperative program planning and teaching among teacher-librarians in Canada. Studies conducted by Ervin (1989); Johnson (1993); McCarthy (1997) and Schon, Helmstadter, and Robinson (1991) included similar conclusions based on

surveys of practicing library media specialists. Ervin, Johnson, McCarthy, and Schon, Helmstadter and Robinson noted library media specialists perceived the instructional partner role was of significant importance, but noted library media specialists did not practice the role of instructional partner on a level deserving of its implied importance. Lance (1994) pointed out the nature of a library media specialist is recognizing materials and resources which contribute to instructional units and spending time working with teachers to construct units. Loertscher and Woolls (2003) indicated teachers were more receptive to library media specialists being full partners in teaching and learning rather than supporting them from the library.

Even with this evidence, Scott (1987) reported while library media specialists were equal to teachers in pay, organizational level, and union rank, teachers still perceived library media specialists as support personnel and not as equal colleagues. Pickard (1993), surveyed library media specialists in Dekalb County, Georgia. The Dekalb library media specialists believed the instructional partner role was important, not as an equal partner, but rather in a support role (Pickard). In a survey of elementary school library media specialists in Alaska, Putnam (1996) determined library media specialists supported the roles and guidelines from *Information Power* (1988 & 1998), including the roles of instructional design and consultant although they did not practice the two roles to a great extent, reinforcing Pickard's conclusion.

Anderson (2001) noted one of the primary challenges library media specialists faced involved the progress of technology. It was necessary for library

media specialists to quickly adapt and utilize new methods and equipment with technical expertise before they could collaborate with teachers. A shortage of time was an underlying assumption of most research where evidence suggested library media specialists favored a more prominent role for collaboration and instruction than they were able to practically institute (Drake, 2007).

Methods

This sequential-exploratory study (Creswell, 2008) used an online survey developed by McCracken (2000) with slight modifications to reflect current advances in technology for timeliness. Potential respondents were emailed an invitation to participate and a link to access the survey hosted by SurveyMonkey™. The level of importance of the roles outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* was compared to the level of actual practice performed by Georgia public high school library media specialists.

Participants. The study included all Georgia public high school library media specialists who responded to the invitation to participate. Email addresses of library media specialists were gathered from all Georgia public high school Web sites where obtainable. A list of 386 addresses was compiled. Six emails were returned undeliverable while 171 responses to the survey were returned. One hundred and nine (109) surveys were completed in full while 62 were missing one or more responses. These two numbers indicated a response return rate of 45% and 29% respectively. All responses for individual statements were used to calculate statistics, regardless of survey completion.

The researcher used, with permission, a survey constructed by McCracken (2000) who completed a similar study. The survey was tested for validity and reliability by a pilot group. McCracken administered the instrument to a volunteer group at a library media specialist conference. McCracken then revised the instrument following their input, suggestions, and difficulties with the survey. This researcher updated the selections on the technology section since the survey was over a decade old and contained outdated technology choices. Newer technologies replaced outdated ones. The survey was also transferred from a paper and pencil survey to an online survey which caused some formatting and style changes. The survey consisted of a short demographic section, a technology inventory, a practical Likert scale, a theoretical Likert scale, and two open-ended questions about supports and barriers to job performance.

The survey was administered in November 2010 via the online survey Web site, SurveyMonkey™, and distributed by email invitation to all available secondary high school library media specialists in Georgia. The survey was administered over a 21 day period involving three emailed invitations. There were a total of 380 potential respondents with 171 surveys returned. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with how often they actually performed a task on a Likert scale. An answer of “1” indicated “not at all” while the answer of “5” indicated “to a very great extent.”

Survey respondents reported demographic data in the first part of the survey. In the second part of the survey, respondents indicated their level of

agreement with 47 statements concerning five roles and the role of technology on two scales, practical and theoretical.

Procedures and Data Analysis. After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board of Valdosta State University, a survey invitation was emailed to high school library media specialists throughout the state of Georgia. Once the survey data were collected, they were analyzed using Microsoft Excel 2010 to determine mean, standard deviation, paired *t* test results, *p*-values, and effect size for practical and theoretical responses. The following information was also recorded for each response: number of years as a teacher, number of years as a library media specialist, type of scheduling (fixed, flexible, or combination), types of technology present, open-ended responses to enabling factors, and open-ended responses to barriers.

Data were entered into a spreadsheet for the Likert-scale survey questions. Responses to both practical and theoretical statements were listed for each respondent, and then the mean and standard deviation was calculated for each statement using all responses for that statement. Statistical comparisons were made between practical responses and theoretical responses. Significance testing through paired *t* tests was conducted and effect size calculated between practical and theoretical groups. According to the American Psychological Association, “The general principle to be followed, however, is to provide the reader not only with information about statistical significance but also with enough information to assess the magnitude of the observed effect or relationship” (APA, 2001, p. 26). This is demonstrated through Cohen’s (1988)

effect sizes of $d = .20$, $.50$, and $.80$ as small, medium, and large effects respectively.

Limitations

The pool of respondents consisted of only high school library media specialists in the state of Georgia; therefore, applying the results to schools other than high schools or schools composed of grades other than ninth through twelfth grade may not be possible. The lack of research solely involving secondary level library media specialists may also impact some of the conclusions drawn from the survey. If potential respondents decided not to participate individually, the number of respondents would have been fewer, and the data collected would not reflect a potentially larger pool. Additionally, the research may be of limited application due to the exclusion of participants outside of the state of Georgia (Cohen, 1988; Gay, 1996; Huck, 2000).

The design of the survey instrument used in the study limited the extent to which the results could apply to all public school media centers in general. The type of questions and the topics covered by the survey limit the extent to which conclusions may be drawn for other areas not covered by the study. Self-reported data gathered via the survey may not be accurate due to poor recall on the respondents' part or the unintended consequence of exaggeration of activities.

Another limiting factor for potential respondents was a possible dislike of using technology or inadequate time to reply to the survey, so they may have chosen not to participate. Further, respondents had to be familiar enough with

the guidelines issued in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power* to be able to determine the extent of implementation as well as the relative importance of the guidelines.

Results

Respondents to the survey revealed a broad range of classroom and media center experience. Of the 171 respondents, 37 (22%) indicated no classroom teaching experience. Fifty-three respondents (31%) indicated five years or fewer of classroom teaching experience. Other respondents indicated 22% had six to ten years experience, 21% had 11 to 20 years classroom experience while only seven respondents (4%) indicated over 20 years classroom teaching experience.

Survey participants also indicated their years of experience as a library media specialist. Of the 171 respondents, 55 (32%) indicated that they had worked as a library media specialist for five years or fewer. Forty-six (27%) indicated they had six to ten years of experience. Forty-three respondents (25%) indicated between 11 and 20 years of library media experience while 27 respondents (16%) had over 21 years of experience. Altogether, respondents indicated over 1976 years of library media specialist experience.

When asked to describe the type of scheduling for class visits present in library media centers, an overwhelming number of respondents (95.3%) said they used flexible scheduling. Only one respondent indicated using fixed scheduling while seven indicated using a combination of fixed and flexible scheduling.

Research question one sought to determine the difference, if any, in perceived levels of practical and theoretical implementation of the five roles described in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. The role library media specialists placed the most importance on was information specialist as indicated by the level of agreement on the practical scale. This was followed by program administrator, teacher, instructional partner, and instructional consultant. All the respondents indicated a lower level of practical implementation compared to their ideal theoretical level of implementation.

Table 5.1 lists the overall mean for all statements for each of the five roles outlined in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. The roles are listed in descending order from highest (to a very great extent) to lowest (not at all). Respondents' statement means coincided in order for both practical and theoretical scales. Each role was calculated based on all individual statements which had significant Cohen's *d* values ranging from 0.34 to 1.37.

Table 5.1

Overall Means for Five Roles on both Practical and Theoretical Scales

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Information Specialist	114	3.78	0.93	111	4.54	0.71	7.42	<.001	0.87
Program Administrator	114	3.63	0.97	111	4.46	0.79	7.91	<.001	0.87
Teacher	114	3.15	1.05	110	4.23	0.92	9.22	<.001	1.08
Instructional Partner	112	3.00	1.06	111	4.18	0.92	10.02	<.001	1.18

Instructional Consultant	116	2.88	1.12	111	4.08	1.00	1.07	<.001	1.13
--------------------------	-----	------	------	-----	------	------	------	-------	------

All statements were found to be statistically significant according to tests for statistical significance. The likelihood of these results happening strictly by chance are minuscule, signified by the calculated *p*-values. The fact they were all significant indicated library media specialists have yet to implement these practices to recommended levels. None of the respondents indicated they were performing the tasks outlined in *Information Power* (1988 & 1998) to the degree they believed they should. Library media specialists indicated they did not yet meet the level of implementation still suggested by the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*.

Respondents also revealed a high degree of agreement with the implementation of technology in the library media center according to their stated agreement on the practical scale. Research question two sought to determine the practical and theoretical implementation of technology by library media specialists. The overall means for the practical and theoretical scales ranked technology third in both scales of importance and ideal implementation. Table 5.2 illustrates the responses for the practical and theoretical scales for technology. The statistics for technology were calculated based on all individual statements which had significant Cohen's *d* values ranging from 0.49 to 1.28.

Table 5.2

Overall Means for Technology on both Practical and Theoretical Scales

	PRACTICAL			THEORETICAL			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Technology	113	3.45	1.08	111	4.30	0.88	7.80	<.001	0.87

Technology was pervasive in library media centers as reported by the survey participants. Almost all respondents (97.7%) said they had an automated circulation system, and 93.6% indicated they had an automated on-line card catalog. The presence of these two items was a considerable source of time savings for library media specialists. Virtually all respondents (99.4%) indicated they had Internet access in their media centers. DVDs, DVD players, and computer workstations for students were present in 97.7% of respondents' programs.

Library media programs made other technology available to patrons in the form of digital cameras (93%), email access (92.4%), and the once ubiquitous VCR in 90.7% of library media centers. Other technologies surveyed in the study were less saturated. Electronic readers such as Playaways and eBooks were only indicated in 30.8% and 46.5% of library media centers respectively. TV studio equipment and video editing equipment were even less of a presence in library media programs with only 44.8% reporting TV studio equipment and 36% indicating video editing equipment.

An open-ended question asking library media specialists to detail factors which enabled them to expand their roles elicited a wide range of responses. Research question three sought to determine effective enablers which allowed library media specialists to achieve higher levels of implementation. The most common enablers were the support of the principal and the willingness of teachers to collaborate. Additional staff to help operate the library media program was noted as especially beneficial while technology and adequate funding were also noted as key elements to performing the library media specialist role at an elevated level.

The second open-ended question asked library media specialists to note any barriers to their ability to perform the roles outlined for them as a library media specialist. Research question four sought to determine impediments which prevented library media specialists to achieve higher levels of implementation. The lack of adequate funding was by far the most recorded theme including budget cuts, staff, resources, and equipment. Many respondents noted the lack of those elements lead to the second most debilitating factor, a shortage of time. Following those barriers were unsupportive administrators, uncooperative teachers, and poor public perception of the jobs that 21st century library media specialists are expected to perform.

Discussion

Implications of the findings of this study extend beyond the immediate area of library media programs and the extent library media specialists perform their professional responsibilities. McCracken (2000) reported library media

specialists believed the five roles outlined in the two editions of *Information Power* (1988 & 1998) were more important than they were able to perform adequately. Previous research conducted with library media specialists revealed similar levels of implementation and desire to accomplish more but faced many of the same constraints. In McCracken's (2000) study, as in this study, information specialist was listed as the role most implemented. Following this role was program administrator, teacher, instructional partner, and instructional consultant. None of the respondents suggested any of the five roles or technology was implemented to an ideal level. As library media specialists continue to compete for their justifiable share of a reduced budget, these findings impact a much more expansive list of issues such as teacher and principal training, budget allocation, technology, and curriculum.

Roles of the Library Media Specialist. Of the five roles outlined by the two editions of *Information Power* (1988, 1998), information specialist was the role most library media specialists indicated they came the closest to fully implementing. These results were consistent with McCracken's (2000) findings where respondents claimed the role of information specialist was the most important and the one they came nearest to fulfilling to an ideal extent. Information specialist responsibilities also follow the traditional perception of library media specialists and the role teachers and administrators expect them to execute (Lowe, 2000; McCoy, 2001; Shelton, 2002). The findings of both this study and McCracken's (2000) study suggested library media specialists remain firmly entrenched in stereotypical roles of library media specialists, retrieving

information and delivering it to patrons. It is to this function library media specialists have long returned as the role and responsibilities of the librarian have changed because of time and technology (Jeffery, 1998). Library media specialists have struggled to adapt to new roles that would keep them active in education while clinging to responsibilities others' expectations force them to carry out (Hartzell, 2002; Love, 2002).

The role of program administrator was the second highest role as rated by mean response rates of library media specialists on practical and theoretical levels. This role relies on the library media specialist operating the media center and, no doubt, this is a time-consuming task. Even with modern automation for circulation and cataloging, there is still an enormous amount of work to be done in order to operate an effective media program. Respondents noted they implemented many of the guidelines associated with overseeing a program but wished they had more time to operate programs more consistent with the suggested guidelines.

The role of teacher involved library media specialists reaching out to and instructing all patrons on information literacy. The responses to survey statements based on information literacy and instruction ranked the role of teacher near the middle with some tasks ranked above the median, others below. This role appeared to be a transition between the commonly held responsibilities of program administrator and informational specialist and two tasks of lower importance, instructional partner and instructional consultant. Love (2002) stated, "Much like the role of the classroom teacher, the role and responsibilities of the

education librarian are in continuous motion and therefore transition” (p. 150). McCoy (2001) and Shelton (2002) highlighted the need for information literacy and the role library media specialists perform by modeling and instruction.

The role of instructional partner is unique to the 1998 edition of *Information Power* and grew out of the role of 1988s instructional consultant. A key shift was the terminology, moving from a resource consultant to an emphasis on a full-fledged instructional partner involved in instruction and assessment. This role represented the biggest push by library media specialists to reinvigorate the library media center and its operators into the daily education of public school students (Church, 2007; Putnam, 1996). This study suggested the tasks outlined for instructional partner were implemented more than the tasks for instructional consultant but less than those associated with the roles of teacher. The lowest ranked theoretical response was assessing student work as an instructional partner. Respondents did not indicate if they were uncomfortable with this role or if teachers prevented them from engaging in assessing student work. Forty-nine respondents indicated one year or less of teaching in the classroom. Without experience, it would be reasonable to assume respondents might find it difficult to engage and collaborate with classroom teachers in the area of assessing student work.

The role of instructional consultant scored the lowest levels of agreement, both practically and theoretically, than the other statements on the survey. Only found in the 1988 edition of *Information Power*, the instructional consultant role received little recognition, importance, or implementation. Based on this work,

library media specialists have not embraced the roles of consultant and partner. Both of these roles have the potential to make library media specialists relevant well into the 21st century. Putnam's (1996) study revealed library media specialists underperformed the consultant role in relation to their own expectations. Principal support of library media specialist collaboration is often lacking as noted in previous studies by Oberg, Hay, and Henri (2000) and Pickard's (1993) study determined library media specialists did not practice this role to a great extent. According to some respondents, teachers can appear less than available for collaboration and administration does not always emphasize collaboration between library media specialists and teachers. Until the library media specialist, administrator, and teacher all agree on the need for collaboration, this could remain an issue of concern for library media specialists and this role.

Technology in the Media Center. Library media specialists underscored the importance of technology in their practice. Most library media specialists pointed out the library media program, as currently structured, is highly dependent on technology. The results of the technology survey established most technologies listed were available in almost 100% of library media centers. Automated catalogs and circulation, computers, and other digital equipment were in use. Nine of the fourteen items were represented in over 92% of respondents' facilities. One item, videocassette players, once a staple of the library media center, was declining in use and presence, dropping to just 90% of library media centers. Library media specialists in McCracken's (2000) survey indicated a high

reliance on technology. Yates (1997) explained technology was more common in schools, swept in by the Information Age and the technology revolution. Since 2000 the levels of technology have increased greatly. McCoy (2001) observed a high level of interest in technology integration and implementation among library media specialists. The trend towards greater connectivity through smaller devices and individualized information needs appears to be the future of information literacy (Lowe, 2000).

Even with the increase in available technology and increased funding for technology, library media specialists signaled a need for time to learn new technologies and make them relevant for the teachers and students. Survey participants indicated a need for workshops, conferences, and professional development in the use of the new technologies. Instructional technicians, technology directors, and academic coaches often perform roles library media specialists could (Yates, 1997). In responding to the open-ended questions, respondents shared anecdotes of turf wars and conflicts with other professionals when their responsibilities intersected. Comments such as “Having to deal with technology issues which should be handled by a technology specific person” and “Our current technology director does not see the media specialists in our district as anything more than book pushers” highlighted the disparity between expectations. If library media specialists do not engage with teachers and principals and attempt to sort out the responsibilities of these positions, the profession may be absorbed by others who are more technologically savvy.

Enablers to Expanding Roles. Library media specialists indicated at least thirteen factors that were conducive to their ability to implement the guidelines put forth in the two editions of *Information Power* (1988 & 1998). The support of the principal or administration of a school was the most common factor mentioned. Statements such as “Principal's flexibility and willingness to try new things” and “An administration that respects what I do and understands my role in the teaching process” are typical of comments made citing supervisory support. Supportive administrators either gave passive support, allowing library media specialists to perform as trained professionals, or provided active support by protecting budgets and paraprofessionals while including the library media specialist on the school leadership team. Library media specialists who were included in decision-making reported their presence and experience was valued and indicated a greater ability to operate at their full potential under the 1988 and 1998 *Information Power* guidelines.

The second most noted factor which enabled library media specialists to function as trained professionals at a higher level was the cooperation of teachers. The emphasis *Information Power* (1998) placed on collaboration between teacher and library media specialists makes teacher cooperation especially beneficial. Teachers can seek out collaborative projects or eschew any assistance beyond simply pulling books for research. Library media specialists indicated an eagerness for teachers willing to work with them, stating: “A few teachers are very enthusiastic and request my help/services and attend trainings/redeliveries of information I have learned” and “My faculty are great and

they know I will work with them on anything-- no matter how small.” According to respondents, a teacher willing to utilize the library media specialist allows the library media specialist to engage in instructional partnering and demonstrate his or her value to the learning experience.

Third on the list of enabling factors was the assistance of a media clerk, paraprofessional, or other media center staffing. Several respondents to the study noted assistance with the rote tasks of program administration liberated the library media specialists to engage in higher order tasks such as collaboration or technology redelivery. A library media specialist with competent assistance could offer many more opportunities and resources with the addition of time. The most impressive example of a library media specialist with the benefit of extra help in the media center can be illustrated through this comment, “We are fortunate to have 3 media staff who are committed to designing fun and exciting media activities throughout the year.” The respondent went on to list 16 different programs they were able to sponsor because they had the staff to do so. None of the other respondents indicated the advantage of additional assistance at that level.

Other factors listed as enabling an expansion of library media roles were technology, additional funding, attending conferences, personal initiative, and students. Several respondents indicated attentive or inquisitive students made their jobs much more enjoyable. The common link between all the enabling factors listed was they either allowed the library media specialist more time to work on more extensive projects or

provided a more efficient means of doing common tasks, resulting in more time for the library media specialist to better address the guidelines as outlined in *Information Power* (1988 & 1998).

Barriers to Expanding Roles. Library media specialists listed more than a dozen factors which they believed inhibited them from fully maximizing their ability to perform to the level of importance they felt needed as outlined in *Information Power* (1988 & 1998). The three most common factors mentioned were loss of resources due to budget restrictions, insufficient time to perform all tasks, and lack of administrative support. A majority of the respondents who listed these items also indicated they had little or no input into decisions which affected them in their library media specialist roles.

In the midst of a worldwide economic downturn, lack of sufficient funding was the primary target of library media specialists' disdain. They reported budget cuts were the reason media center paraprofessionals and other personnel were cut or reassigned, new technology went unpurchased, and resources either expired or were cut from budgets. Library media specialists could not order new materials and often had to perform menial tasks and cover duty assignments for others due to a lack of manpower. With deep budget cuts, no plans for expansion of facilities, no integration of new technology, and no registration fees available for conferences or workshops, library media specialists reported they were reduced to doing their best with what they had and searching for creative ways to do more with less. Aspirations to achieve idealistic levels of implementation have been deferred. Library media specialists must deliver basic services and cope

with reality without the additional benefit of staff, technology, or new materials. Sentiments such as these were expressed: “Lack of a paraprofessional prevents me from being able to leave the media center when teachers need assistance in classrooms or labs. This has forced me to go back to a lot of the old librarian roles and not the modern roles of a media specialist” were representative of comments concerning budgetary constraints.

With all the cuts in staff and technology, library media specialists indicated the lack of time to truly accomplish what they should be doing was nearly impossible. Citing a lack of time seemed to indicate willingness and desire to fulfill all the roles mentioned in *Information Power* (1988 & 1998), yet for most of the respondents, there was too much to do and not enough time available. These comments support this finding: “lack of planning time did not allow me to attend departmental meetings. Too much time is actually spent on daily routines in the media center and little time is allowed for development of instructional tools or instructional planning.” Many respondents simply said “time” in the comment section, knowing one word summed up all of their frustrations preventing them from delivering more services. Others suggested not only was time at a premium due to losses in funding and its accompanying effects, but they also had their time unfairly appropriated sponsoring clubs, covering duty stations, hosting non-library functions in the media center, troubleshooting technology, coaching teams, and substitute teaching.

These shortages in funding and time were blamed on the administrators, the third most cited factor hindering library media specialists from fulfilling their

ideal role. Responses to the survey believed the shortfalls were due to an eagerness on behalf of the school's administrators to undermine the library media program. After all, the respondents noted, administrators had the power to protect funding and library time if they elected. Administrators could choose to include library media specialists on lead teams and decision-making groups.

Principals had the authority of position to compel teacher collaboration or, at a minimum, set the expectation it should be occurring on a regular basis. Kaplan's (2006) study of principal's knowledge of the role performed by library media specialists and how principals could support the program was labeled "benign neglect" since they rarely supported or understood enough about the program to help it succeed. Respondents found fault with administrators who did not understand the role of the library media specialist or the media program. Some responses to support this were "I feel that my administrators do not think my media program is important, consequently, I am not asked to be on school improvement committees or in any leadership role within the school" and "My administrator lacks knowledge about the true function/role of a media specialist." Another responded "Administrators who do not know what to expect of competent librarians." Some respondents did, however, concede high school principals and teachers were under a tremendous amount of pressure to meet testing requirements, yet the library media specialists could not understand why the administrators and teachers would continue to ignore the potential of the library media program to assist in these matters.

Other factors inhibiting expansion of the role of library media specialists mentioned, but with less frequency, were technology issues, public perceptions, and other duties. Also reported were problems with technology ranging from a lack of modern library automation systems to unfriendly technology directors. Other library media specialists empathized with the workload placed on teachers and understood why they could not find time to collaborate. Older, traditional library media specialists were cited as hindering younger, energetic ones while student apathy, scheduling conflicts, and government regulation were also cited as barriers of role fulfillment.

Future Research

This study provided a model for more extensive research to assess the practical priorities of library media specialists and the impact they have on student achievement. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine the source of hesitancy to engage library media specialists on a collaborative basis in the classroom and as school leaders. Research focusing on teachers' and principals' attitudes toward a more proactive role for the library media specialist needs to be conducted. Studies that analyze teacher, principal, and library media specialist training for collaborative efforts also need to be conducted. Research could focus on the local expenditure for media programs as it relates to student achievement as measured by national testing assessments.

This research, conducted as part of a large national or even a state educational entity, would have access to a wider pool of respondents and more readily available source of data from a much longer period of time to analyze. A

large sequential exploratory study would include library media specialists in the elementary and middle school levels.

A larger sequential-exploratory study would include more in-depth qualitative study with a broad array of library media specialists, teachers, and principals. This would allow researchers to collect a vast amount of perception data to inform the quantitative study. Collection of teacher and administrative perception data would provide insight into their beliefs about the job expectations of library media specialists such as lingering stereotypes, knowledge about the extent of their expertise, and reservations about involving them in teaching and decision-making. With this data, researchers could attempt to determine optimal strategies for retaining the library media program and library media specialists as the nucleus of curriculum resources in public schools.

Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney (1999) determined a quality library media program benefitted student achievement even when all other factors were taken into consideration. Hartzell (2002a) believed library media specialists and their programs remain critical to increased student achievement in the present reality of high-stakes testing. Finding ways to communicate this value and make library media specialists integral to the education process is important for the future.

Future research should focus on educational leader training programs and how those programs present the utility of the library media program and its operators. Teacher training programs should emphasize collaboration not only with other teachers but all school resources. Library media specialists also need

further training and professional development opportunities to hone their collaborative skills and educate others on their professional role, especially for the library media specialists who never worked as a classroom teacher. Library media specialists must not limit their efforts to an audience of other library media specialists but expand efforts to increase awareness and their public image among all stakeholders.

With the increase in the ability to access large amounts of data through new technology and more information available to everyone almost instantly, studies need to be performed to determine the importance and impact information literacy skills have on student achievement. Students need practical skills to acquire factual, objective information for academics and for life. Library media specialists are in an ideal position to provide fundamental information literacy skills and support to the nation's school children.

Studies on state minimum guidelines for the construction of library media centers need to be conducted. Technology advances at a much more rapid pace than bureaucracy. Many of the current mandates could soon be considered obsolete. Bookshelves may soon be used for displays of fiction and antique reference material, giving way to computerized or electronic collections that are updated daily and span the entire world. A study involving eBooks and their effect on achievement would provide insight to the future of technology, literacy, and the design of new library media centers, perhaps necessitating a revision of state minimum guidelines for library media centers.

Technology may also perform a role in helping library media specialists collaborate with teachers on a regular basis. New technology requires training and redelivery. Email and other forms of social networking present the opportunity for library media specialists to quickly communicate with other educators on collaborative projects. Technology provides a medium for student work where teachers provide content and library media specialists teach and grade presentations on technical and information literacy standards.

Finally, the role of the library media specialist seems in conflict with the roles and budgets of instructional technologists and technology directors. A clear definition of job responsibilities and expectations of their collaboration needs to be undertaken. Researchers should investigate who manages hardware, student services software, curriculum based testing software, and audio-visual equipment. The findings of this research would inform policymakers and library media specialists about the direction their profession is advancing and account for their preferences and opinions. A qualitative study of how some work together and others do not would highlight ways these jobs create disagreements and how they can coexist for mutual gain. This study provides a reliable model for future research in pursuit of this end.

Conclusion

Results of this study indicated there was a significant difference between library media specialists' actual and ideal implementation of guidelines established in the 1988 and 1998 editions of *Information Power*. Library media specialists believed technology was important and needed to be expanded and

taught while making a distinction between the library media technology role and the role of the school instructional technologist. Library media specialists indicated they valued support from administrators, adequate budgets and teacher cooperation in order to expand their professional roles. A lack of administrative support, shrinking budgets, and a lack of time prohibited them from expanding their professional roles. As a school resource and curriculum hub, library media specialists often believed they performed in a supportive role rather than being a valued component in the education of students. This implies a valuable resource for education is often being marginalized at the expense of student achievement. If administrators and teachers support and collaborate more fully with library media specialists, students will benefit in terms of knowledge, strategies, and information literacy skills that may in turn better prepare them for academic and lifelong success.

REFERENCES

- Achterman, D. L. (2008). *Haves, halves, and have-nots: School libraries and student achievement in California*. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 2008. UNT Digital Library. digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc9800/.
- American Association of School Librarians and Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association. (1969). *Guidelines for school media programs*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- American Association of School Librarians, and Association for Educational Communications and Technology [AASL and AECT]. (1988). *Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs*. Chicago; Washington, D.C.: American Library Association; Association for Educational Communications and Technology
- American Association of School Librarians, and Association for Educational Communications and Technology [AASL and AECT]. (1998). *Information power: Building partnerships for learning*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- American Library Association. (1945). *School libraries for today and tomorrow*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- American Psychological Association. (2001). *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, M. A. (2001). *The media center: What are your challenges?* *Multimedia Schools*, 8(6), 26–27.

- Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1977). *The Definition of Educational Technology*. Washington, DC: AECT.
- Baughman, J. (2000). *School libraries and MCAS scores: A paper presented at a symposium sponsored by the graduate school of library and information science*. Simmons College: Boston, MA.
- Baumbach, D. (2003). *Making the grade: The status of school library media centers in the sunshine state and how they contribute to student achievement*. Spring: TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing..
- Baxter, S. J. & Smalley, A. W. (2003). *Check it out! The results of the school library media program census, Final Report*. St. Paul, MN: Metronet.
- Burgin, R. & Bracy, P. B. (2003). *An essential connection: How quality school library media programs improve student achievement in North Carolina*. Spring, TX: Hi Willow Publishing and Research.
- Church, A. P. (2007). *Elementary school principals' perceptions of the instructional role of the school library media specialist*. Virginia Commonwealth University: Richmond Virginia.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Craver, K. W. (1986). The changing instructional role of the high school library media specialist: 1950–1984. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 14, 183–91.

- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Drake, E. D. (2007). *The role of the school library media specialist in Michigan: Statewide survey of practices and perceptions*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education, Michigan State University.
- Ellis, K. V., & Lenk, M. A. (2001). Library media specialists: The keystone to integrating information technology and information literacy. *Independent School*, 60(4), 12-26.
- Ervin, D. S. (1989). *The effect of experience, educational level, and subject area on the philosophical acceptance, the perceived assumption, and the perceived barriers to implementations of the instructional and curricular role of the school library media specialist.*, Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Everhart, N. (2000). School library media specialists' use of time: A review of the research. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 6, 66-88.
- Florida Association for Media in Education. (2007). *Student achievement begins in the school library media center*. Orlando: FL. Retrieved from <http://www.sbac.edu/~media/LegPlatform.pdf>
- Folz, D. H. (1996). *Survey research for public administration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fowler, F. J., Jr. (2008). *Survey research methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Gann, L. (1998). School library media guidelines and guidelines: A review of their significance and impact. In K. H. Latrobe (ed.), *The emerging school library media center: Historical issues and perspectives* (153-194). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Gast, N. E. (1984). *The Role of the H.S. Library Media Specialist as Perceived by H.S. Library Media Specialists, Principals, and Teachers in the State of Oregon*. Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 no. 6: 1588-A.
- Gay, L. R. (1996). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Georgia Department of Education. (2008). *About GaDOE*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/aboutdoe.aspx>
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2005). *505-3-.46 Media specialist program*. Retrieved from <http://www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/EducatorPreparation/505-3-.46.pdf>
- Georgia Professional Guidelines Commission. (2006). *The Georgia educator workforce 2006: A report of the supply, demand, and utilization of teachers, administrative and student services personnel in Georgia public schools*. Atlanta, GA.

- Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2009). *505-2-.201 Media specialist*. Retrieved from <http://www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/Certification/505-2-.201.pdf>
- Hartzell, G. (2002). *Capitalizing on the school library's potential to positively affect student achievement*. White House Conference on School Libraries.
- Hartzell, G. (2002a). *White House conference on school libraries: What's it take?* www.ims.gov/pubs/whitehouse0602/garyhartzell.htm (retrieved Nov. 18, 2009).
- Hartzell, G. (2002b). *Why should principals support school libraries?* ERIC Digest. Syracuse, N.Y.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information and Technology. (ERIC Document No. ED470034)
- Herring, M. Y. (2001). Ten reasons why the internet is no substitute for a library. *American Libraries*, 32(4), 76-78.
- Hopkins, D. M. & Butler, R. P. (1991). *The federal roles in support of school library media centers*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Huck, S. W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Jeffery, R. B. (1998) Librarians as generalists: Redefining our role in a new paradigm. *Art Documentation*. 17(2), 25-29.
- Johnson, J. A. (1993). *The school library media specialist as instructional consultant*. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

- Jones, A. C. (1997). *An analysis of the theoretical and actual curriculum development involvement of Georgia school library media specialists*. Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.
- Jones, J. & Zambone, A. (2008). *The power of the media specialist to improve academic achievement and strengthen at-risk youth*. Worthington, OH: Linworth.
- Kaplan, A. G. (2006). *Benign neglect: Principals' knowledge of and attitudes towards school library media specialists*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware.
- Lance, K. C. & Loertscher, D. V. (2003) *Powering achievement: School library media programs make a difference: The evidence*. 2nd ed. Salt Lake City, UT: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.
- Lance, K. C. (1994). The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 22, 167-170.
- Lance, K. C. (2005). *Powerful libraries make powerful learners: The Illinois study*. Canton, IL: Illinois School Library Media Association.
- Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000a). *How school librarians help kids achieve guidelines: The second Colorado study*. San Jose, California. Hi Willow.
- Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Russell, B. (2007). *How students, teachers, and principals benefit from strong libraries*. Indianapolis: Association for Indiana Media Educators.

- Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000b). *Measuring up to guidelines: The impact of school library media programs and information literacy in Pennsylvania schools*. Greenburg, PA: Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries.
- Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2001). *Good schools have school librarians: Oregon school librarians collaborate to improve academic achievement*. Terrebonne, Ore.: Oregon Educational Media Association.
- Lance, K. C., Hamilton-Pennell, C., & Rodney, M. J. (1999). *Information empowered: The school librarian as an agent of academic achievement in Alaska schools*. Juneau, Alaska: Alaska State Library.
- Loertscher, D. & Woolls, B. (2003). You need the library to meet guidelines. *School Library Journal*, 49(6), S6-S7.
- Love, J. B. (2002). The enhanced and changing role of the specialist librarian: Survey of education librarians. *Reference Librarian*, 78, 149-165.
- Lowe, C. A. (2000). *The role of the school library media specialist in the 21st century*. Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information and Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446769)
- McCarthy, C. A. (1997). A reality check: The challenges of implementing Information Power in school library media programs: Survey of 48 libraries in New England. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 25, 205-214.

- McCoy, B. S. (2001). *A survey of practicing school library media specialists to determine the job competencies that they value most*. Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.
- McCracken, A. (2000). *Perceptions of school library media specialists regarding their roles and practices*. Doctoral dissertation, George Mason University.
- Mellon, C. A., & Boyce, E. S. (1993). School library standards: A force for change in library services for children and young adults. *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries*, 6(2), 130-133.
- Michie, J. S. & Holton, B. (2005). *Fifty years of supporting children's learning: A history of public school libraries and federal legislation from 1953 to 2000*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Miller, J., Want, J., & Whitacre, L. (2003). *Show me connection: How school library media center services impact student achievement*. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and Missouri State Library.
- Oberg, D., Hay, D., & Henri, J. (2000). The role of the principal in an information literate school community: Design and administration of an international research project. *School Library Media Research*, 3.
- Pickard, P. W. (1993). The instructional consultant role of the school library media specialist. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 12(3), 115-122.
- Putnam, E. (1996). The instructional consultant role of the elementary school library media specialist and the effects of program scheduling on its practice. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 25(1), 43-49.

- Rodney, M. J., Lance, K. C., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2002). *Make the connection: Quality school library media programs impact academic achievement in Iowa*. Bettendorf, Iowa: Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency.
- Rodney, M. J., Lance, K. C., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2003). *The impact of Michigan school librarians on academic achievement: Kids who have libraries succeed*. Lansing: Library of Michigan.
- Rooker, J. (1990). National School Library Standards/Guidelines Post-World War II to the Present. *Indiana Media Journal* 12(3) 24-27.
- Schon, I., Helmstadter, G. C., & Robinson, D. (1991). The role of school library media specialists. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 19, 228-233.
- Scott, J., & Brown, C. (2009). Aligned or askew: Faculty perceptions of principal preparation programs. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 4(3).
- Scott, W. (1987). *A comparison of role perceptions of the library school media specialist*. Doctoral dissertation, Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1987.
- Sheinin, A. (2009, July). Perdue calls on teachers to take furloughs to fill \$900 million hole. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.ajc.com/gold-dome-live/2009/07/21/schools-medicaid-cut-3-percent-as-state-fills-900-million-hole/>
- Shelton, P. B. W. (2002). *Perceptions of the changing role of the library media specialist*. Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans.

- Small, R. V., Snyder, J., & Parker, K. (2008). *The impact of New York's school libraries on student achievement and motivation: A multi-phase and multi-method study*. Proceedings of the American education researchers association (AERA) Annual Conference, March 26 to 27, New York, NY.
- Smalley, T. N. (2004). College success: High school librarians make the difference. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(3), 193-198.
- Smith, E. G. (2001). *Texas school libraries: Guidelines, resources, services, and students' performance*. Austin, Tex.: EGS Research and Consulting.
- Smith, E. G. (2006). *Student learning through Wisconsin school library media centers: Case study report*. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Spinks, A. (2009). *Library Media Programs and Student Achievement*. Retrieved from <http://www.cobbk12.org/librarymedia/proof/research.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare. (1967). *School library resources , textbooks, and other instructional materials: Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, first annual report, fiscal year 1966* (OE-20108). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Wethered, S. (2003). *The perceptions of the teacher-librarians and administrative officers of their roles and responsibilities in the management of school library programs*. University of Alberta: Edmonton, Alberta.
- Yates, B. (1997). *Our patch vs. their patch: Information technology and literacy in schools. Information rich but knowledge poor*. Research and professional paper presented at the annual conference of International Association of

School Librarians, Vancouver, BC, July 6–11. ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 412 957.

Appendix A

Permission Granted to Use Survey Instrument

March 2, 2010

Dr. Anne McCracken

Dear Dr. McCracken

My name is Jim Rehberg and I am a doctoral candidate at Valdosta State University pursuing my degree in Educational Leadership. I am also a high school media specialist and I am interested in your dissertation on media specialists' self perception of their roles.

I would like to perform, with your permission, a replication of your study using high school media specialists in the state of Georgia as my sample population. I hope to build on your research while identifying issues within the state among my colleagues.

I would like to discuss this possibility with you at your convenience. Please feel free to email or give me a call.

Thank you,
Jim Rehberg
Ed.D., candidate Department of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology
Dewar College of Education
Valdosta State University
229.225.5050 W
229.224.3357 C

fromMcCracken, (Julia) Anne <JAMcCracken@fcps.edu>
toJim Rehberg <jimr26@gmail.com>

dateTue, Mar 2, 2010 at 4:06 PM
subjectRE: Replication of your dissertation
mailed-byfcps.edu

Jim,
I am glad that you were able to find a copy of my dissertation. You may use survey and study. Please give me credit for designing the survey instrument in your dissertation. Good luck.
Anne

Appendix B

McCracken (2000) Survey

Please tell me a little about yourself...

1. How many years of experience do you have as a **classroom teacher**?
____years
2. How many years of experience do you have as a **school library media specialist**?
____years
3. What level of school is your current position?
____Elementary
____Middle/Junior High
____High/Secondary
4. What type of scheduling do you use for student access to the media center?
____Fixed
____Flexible
____Combination

(Please see below for the definitions for the different types of scheduling.)

Fixed schedule – A group is scheduled to come to the library media center for instruction or use of resources on a regular basis (often weekly), for a set length of time, frequently for the school year.

Flexible schedule – The library media specialist and the teacher plan together for instruction or use of the resources based on student learning needs in each curriculum unit and schedule on that basis. The schedule is arranged on an *ad hoc* basis and varies constantly.

Combination schedule – The library media specialist employs a schedule where specific classes in specific grades visit the library on a fixed schedule (i.e. kindergarten through second grade) and a flexible schedule for the classes at other grade levels in the school.

5. Does the library media center where you are currently employed have any of the following technologies? (Please place a check mark by all items that are in the media center.)

	Automated Circulation System		Computer Workstation(s) with CD-ROM drive(s)
	Automated On-line Catalog		Email Access
	TV Studio V(Video camcorder and capability to broadcast throughout school)		Internet Access
	Videocassette Player		Student Computer Workstation with Word Processing
	Videodiscs(DVD) and Videodisc(DVD) Player		Video Editing Equipment

For each statement answer the following questions:

- Do you practice this?(Practice)
- Do you think this is an important part of the school library media specialist's role?(Importance)

Please use the following scale to record your answers:

1 – not at all; 2 – to a small extent; 3 – to a moderate extent; 4 – to a great extent; 5 – to a very great extent (circle the appropriate response)

PRACTICE		IMPORTANCE
1 2 3 4 5	Build collections that contain resources that meet the goals and objectives of the curriculum and the interests of students.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Develop and implement a mission statement, goals and objectives, policies and procedures that reflect the goals and objectives of the school.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist teachers in determining type of assessment to be used in evaluating student work, especially when learning alternatives include various types of media.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Communicate regularly with principals and other administrators about program plans, activities, and accomplishments.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist students and staff in identifying appropriate information resources through comprehensive reference service and such vehicles as bibliographies and resource lists.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist teachers in incorporating information skills into the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promote competency in information literacy	1 2 3 4 5

	across the curriculum.	
1 2 3 4 5	Remain current on all issues related to the use of information and information technology.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist teachers in evaluating and modifying learning activities based on feedback gained from observation and interaction with students.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Guide and assist teachers in evaluating and selecting appropriate informational and instructional resources.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Maintain current and in-depth knowledge about the characteristics of students and teachers, and about ways of matching individual needs with appropriate behavior.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Serve as members of grade level building and district curriculum development teams and participate in curriculum design and assessment projects.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Model and promote the effective uses of technology for teaching and learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist teachers in the development of unit objectives that build viewing, listening, reading, and critical thinking skills.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Encourage the widest possible use of program resources and services by making them available throughout the school and through remote access.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Teach students to understand the characteristics of each particular medium in which information and ideas are presented.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Guide and assist teachers in the use of new media and technologies for teaching and learning.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist teachers by analyzing learner characteristics that will influence design and use of media in an instructional unit.	1 2 3 4 5

Please use the following scale to record your answers:

1 – not at all; 2 – to a small extent; 3 – to a moderate extent; 4 – to a great extent; 5 – to a very great extent (circle the appropriate response)

1 2 3 4 5	Evaluate and assess the impact of specific technologies on instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promote the Information Guidelines for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Work closely with teachers in designing authentic learning tasks.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Manage space equipment resources and supplies for the full range of library media programs and services.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Develop and promote specific plans for incorporating the Information Guidelines for Student Learning into day to day curricular and instructional activities.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Work collaboratively with other faculty to analyze students' learning needs; particularly as they relate to information literacy.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promote the Information Guidelines for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Integrate the Information Guidelines for Student Learning into all formal documents related to the library media program.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to develop curricular content that integrates information literacy skills.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Inform teachers and others of program resources activities and services.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Serve on the school's technology planning team.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of the library profession regarding intellectual freedom confidentiality, the rights of users, and other intellectual property concerns.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promote information literacy skills to teachers and other staff as integral to subject-matter learning in all areas.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Work with teachers to design and implement	1 2 3 4 5

	teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	
1 2 3 4 5	Provide instructions in use of on-line and CD-ROM database.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Work with teachers to ensure students develop higher level thinking skills for the organization, evaluation, and use of information, and ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to plan instructional activities.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Provide instruction in Internet searching and evaluation of Internet sites.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Identify and assess the staff's learning needs in areas related to information, and provide appropriate professional-development opportunities	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Work closely with teaching in assessing student work.	1 2 3 4 5

Please use the following scale to record your answers:

1 – not at all; 2 – to a small extent; 3 – to a moderate extent; 4 – to a great extent; 5 – to a very great extent (circle the appropriate response)

1 2 3 4 5	Facilitate access to resources outside the school by networking with other information agencies, borrowing or renting specialized materials, and using electronic networks that expand access to information	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Assist students in the creation of web pages.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Promote the library program throughout the local community.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Offer an ongoing staff development program in the use and integration of information technologies.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Develop and maintain an effective advocacy program that demonstrates the value of the library program to a broad audience.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Organize all library resources for effective and efficient use through such methods as cataloging, classifying, and arranging all elements of the collection.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	Serve as technology coordinator for the school.	1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5	Provide instruction for parents to assist them in sharing, reading, learning, listening, and viewing experiences with children.	1 2 3 4 5
-----------	---	-----------

Please answer the following questions. Do not feel it is necessary to use complete sentences in writing your answers.

What factors enable you to expand your role?

What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?

Appendix C

Modified McCracken Survey

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

1. Please tell me a little about yourself...

1. How many years of experience do you have as a classroom teacher?

2. How many years of experience do you have as a school library media specialist?

3. What level of school is your current position?

- Elementary
- Middle/Junior High
- High/Secondary

4. What type of scheduling do you use for student access to the media center?

- Fixed - A group is scheduled to come to the library media center for instruction or use of resources on a regular basis (often weekly), for a set length of time, frequently for the school year.
- Flexible – The library media specialist and the teacher plan together for instruction or use of the resources based on student learning needs in each curriculum unit and schedule on that basis. The schedule is arranged on an ad hoc basis and varies constantly.
- Combination – The library media specialist employs a schedule where specific classes in specific grades visit the library on a fixed schedule (i.e. kindergarten through second grade) and a flexible schedule for the classes at other grade levels in the school.

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

5. Does the library media center where you are currently employed have any of the following technologies? (Please place a check mark by all items that are in the media center.)

- Automated Circulation System
- Automated On-line Catalog
- TV Studio(Video camcorder and capability to broadcast throughout school)
- Videocassette Player
- DVDs
- DVD Player
- Computer Workstation(s) with CD-ROM drive(s)
- E-mail Access
- Internet Access
- Student Computer Workstation with Word Processing
- Video Editing Equipment
- Digital Cameras
- Digital Audio Books (Playaways)
- eBooks

2. Likert Scale Survey of Practical and Theoretical Implementation

Below you will find a set of statements listed twice.

The first set (PRACTICAL) asks you to rate the statements according to your actual implementation of the statement in your library media center.

The second set (THEORETICAL) asks you to rate the statements according to your ideal level of implementation of the statement in your library media center.

Please use the following scale to record your answers:

- 1 – not at all;
- 2 – to a small extent;
- 3 – to a moderate extent;
- 4 – to a great extent;
- 5 – to a very great extent

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

1. Please use the following scale to record your answers for PRACTICAL implementation.

	1	2	3	4	5
Build collections that contain resources that meet the goals and objectives of the curriculum and the interests of students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and implement a mission statement, goals and objectives, policies and procedures that reflect the goals and objectives of the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in determining type of assessment to be used in evaluating student work, especially when learning alternatives include various types of media.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate regularly with principals and other administrators about program plans, activities, and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist students and staff in identifying appropriate information resources through comprehensive reference service and such vehicles as bibliographies and resource lists.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in incorporating information skills into the curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote competency in information literacy across the curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Remain current on all issues related to the use of information and information technology.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in evaluating and modifying learning activities based on feedback gained from observation and interaction with students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guide and assist teachers in evaluating and selecting appropriate informational and instructional resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintain current and in-depth knowledge about the characteristics of students and teachers, and about ways of matching individual needs with appropriate behavior.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve as members of grade level building and district curriculum development teams and participate in curriculum design and assessment projects.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Model and promote the effective uses of technology for teaching and learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in the development of unit objectives that build viewing, listening, reading, and critical thinking skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage the widest possible use of program resources and services by making them available throughout the school and through remote access.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach students to understand the characteristics of each particular medium in which information and ideas are presented.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guide and assist teachers in the use of new media and technologies for teaching and learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers by analyzing learner characteristics that will influence design and use of media in an instructional unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluate and assess the impact of specific technologies on instruction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work closely with teachers in designing authentic learning tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Manage space, equipment, resources, and supplies for the full range of library media programs and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and promote specific plans for incorporating the Information Standards for Student Learning into day to day curricular and instructional activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work collaboratively with other faculty to analyze students' learning needs; particularly as they relate to information literacy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrate the Information Standards for Student Learning into all formal documents related to the library media program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to develop curricular content that integrates information literacy skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

Inform teachers and others of program resources activities and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve on the school's technology planning team.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of the library profession regarding intellectual freedom confidentiality, the rights of users, and other intellectual property concerns.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote information literacy skills to teachers and other staff as integral to subject-matter learning in all areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with teachers to design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instructions in use of on-line and CD-ROM database.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with teachers to ensure students develop higher level thinking skills for the organization, evaluation, and use of information, and ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to plan instructional activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instruction in Internet searching and evaluation of Internet sites.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identify and assess the staff's learning needs in areas related to information, and provide appropriate professional-development opportunities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work closely with teaching in assessing student work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitate access to resources outside the school by networking with other information agencies, borrowing or renting specialized materials, and using electronic networks that expand access to information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist students in the creation of web pages.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the library program throughout the local community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Offer an ongoing staff development program in the use and integration of information technologies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and maintain an effective advocacy program that demonstrates the value of the library program to a broad audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Organize all library resources for effective and efficient use through such methods as cataloging, classifying, and arranging all elements of the collection.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve as technology coordinator for the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instruction for parents to assist them in sharing, reading, learning, listening, and viewing experiences with children.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

2. Please use the following scale to record your answers for THEORETICAL implementation.

	1	2	3	4	5
Build collections that contain resources that meet the goals and objectives of the curriculum and the interests of students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and implement a mission statement, goals and objectives, policies and procedures that reflect the goals and objectives of the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in determining type of assessment to be used in evaluating student work, especially when learning alternatives include various types of media.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate regularly with principals and other administrators about program plans, activities, and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist students and staff in identifying appropriate information resources through comprehensive reference service and such vehicles as bibliographies and resource lists.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in incorporating information skills into the curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote competency in information literacy across the curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Remain current on all issues related to the use of information and information technology.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in evaluating and modifying learning activities based on feedback gained from observation and interaction with students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guide and assist teachers in evaluating and selecting appropriate informational and instructional resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintain current and in-depth knowledge about the characteristics of students and teachers, and about ways of matching individual needs with appropriate behavior.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve as members of grade level building and district curriculum development teams and participate in curriculum design and assessment projects.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Model and promote the effective uses of technology for teaching and learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers in the development of unit objectives that build viewing, listening, reading, and critical thinking skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage the widest possible use of program resources and services by making them available throughout the school and through remote access.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach students to understand the characteristics of each particular medium in which information and ideas are presented.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guide and assist teachers in the use of new media and technologies for teaching and learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist teachers by analyzing learner characteristics that will influence design and use of media in an instructional unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluate and assess the impact of specific technologies on instruction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work closely with teachers in designing authentic learning tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Manage space, equipment, resources, and supplies for the full range of library media programs and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and promote specific plans for incorporating the Information Standards for Student Learning into day to day curricular and instructional activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work collaboratively with other faculty to analyze students' learning needs; particularly as they relate to information literacy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the Information Standards for Student Learning as guidelines for student engagement with the full array of information resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrate the Information Standards for Student Learning into all formal documents related to the library media program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to develop curricular content that integrates information literacy skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implementation of IP Guidelines in Georgia Public High Schools

Inform teachers and others of program resources activities and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve on the school's technology planning team.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Demonstrate a commitment to the principles of the library profession regarding intellectual freedom confidentiality, the rights of users, and other intellectual property concerns.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote information literacy skills to teachers and other staff as integral to subject-matter learning in all areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with teachers to design and implement teaching and learning activities that reflect the best in current research and practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instructions in use of on-line and CD-ROM database.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with teachers to ensure students develop higher level thinking skills for the organization, evaluation, and use of information, and ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate regularly with teachers and other members of the learning community to plan instructional activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instruction in Internet searching and evaluation of Internet sites.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identify and assess the staff's learning needs in areas related to information, and provide appropriate professional-development opportunities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work closely with teaching in assessing student work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitate access to resources outside the school by networking with other information agencies, borrowing or renting specialized materials, and using electronic networks that expand access to information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assist students in the creation of web pages.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote the library program throughout the local community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Offer an ongoing staff development program in the use and integration of information technologies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop and maintain an effective advocacy program that demonstrates the value of the library program to a broad audience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Organize all library resources for effective and efficient use through such methods as cataloging, classifying, and arranging all elements of the collection.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serve as technology coordinator for the school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide instruction for parents to assist them in sharing, reading, learning, listening, and viewing experiences with children.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Short Answer

Please answer the following questions. Do not feel it is necessary to use complete sentences in writing your answers.

1. What factors enable you to expand your role?

2. What barriers do you face in changing and expanding your role?

Appendix D

Valdosta State University Institutional Review Board Protocol Exemption Report



**Institutional Review Board (IRB)
for the Protection of Human Research Participants**

PROTOCOL EXEMPTION REPORT

PROTOCOL NUMBER: IRB-02631- **INVESTIGATOR:** James Rehberg
2010

PROJECT TITLE: Library media specialists' perception of their roles and responsibilities in Georgia's public high schools

DETERMINATION:

- This research protocol is exempt from Institutional Review Board oversight under Exemption Category(ies) 2. You may begin your study immediately. If the nature of the research project changes such that exemption criteria may no longer apply, please consult with the IRB Administrator (irb@valdosta.edu) before continuing your research.
- Exemption of this research protocol from Institutional Review Board oversight is pending. You may **not** begin your research until you have addressed the following concerns/questions and the IRB has formally notified you of exemption. You may send your responses to irb@valdosta.edu.
-

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Although not a requirement for exemption, the following suggestions are offered by the IRB Administrator to enhance the protection of participants and/or strengthen the research proposal. If you make any of these suggested changes to your protocol, please submit revisions so that IRB has a complete protocol on file.

Barbara H. Gray _____ Date: ***Thank you for submitting an IRB application.***

Barbara H. Gray, IRB Administrator ***Please direct questions to irb@valdosta.edu or 229-259-5000*** _____ Leech (Dept. Head)

Dr. James Pate (Advisor) Form R _____ 009

Appendix E

Email Invitations 1, 2, & 3 to Participate in Research

Email 1, Week 1

From: Jim Rehberg

To:

Sent:

Subject: VSU dissertation research- request for library media specialists' feedback

Dear Library Media Specialist,

My name is Jim Rehberg and I am researching the practical and theoretical implementation of *Information Power* guidelines by high school library media specialists in Georgia for my doctoral dissertation at Valdosta State University.

As a library media specialist in one of Georgia's 336 high schools, your input is very important to insure that the results of this research accurately reflect the implementations of those roles and responsibilities.

I am asking you to participate in a survey designed to gauge your ideal and actual implementation of the guidelines established in 1998's *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*. The survey should take you less than 15 minutes to complete.

This survey is anonymous and has no impact on you or your employment. Participation is completely voluntary and at your own discretion. There is no penalty for not participating. Information and data collected will be confidential. You cannot be identified by your responses.

I am conducting this research under the supervision of Dr. J. L. Pate, in the Department of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology, at the Dewar College of Education at Valdosta State University. This study has been exempted from Institutional Review Board (IRB) review in accordance with Federal regulations. The IRB, a university committee established by Federal law, is responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of research participants. If you have concerns or questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the IRB Administrator at 229-259-5045 or irb@valdosta.edu.

Please take a few minutes to answer the survey about your experience as a high school library media specialist:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SLR59Z8>

Thank you for your participation. Your insights are extremely valuable. Without the cooperation of library media specialists like you, this research would not be possible.

If you would like a copy of my results and findings or have any questions, feel free to contact me by phone or email.

Thanks,

Jim Rehberg
7992 Metcalf Rd
Thomasville, Georgia, 31792
229.224.3357
jimr@rose.net

Email 2, Week 2

From: Jim Rehberg
To:
Sent:
Subject: VSU dissertation research- request for library media specialists' feedback

Dear Library Media Specialist,

Last week I sent you an invitation to participate in my dissertation research on the implementation of *Information Power* guidelines. If you have already responded, thank you.

If you haven't had a chance to take the survey yet, I hope you'll take a few minutes to answer the short survey and contribute your input towards what I hope will be some very useful data. The survey should take less than 15 minutes to complete.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SLR59Z8>

Please remember: Participation is anonymous and voluntary. There is no penalty for non-participation. All data collected will remain confidential.

I am always available to answer questions or concerns by phone or email.

I look forward to sharing the results of my research with you.

Thank you,

Jim Rehberg
7992 Metcalf Rd
Thomasville, Georgia, 31792
229.224.3357
jimr@rose.net

Email 3, Week 3

From: Jim Rehberg

To:

Sent:

Subject: VSU dissertation research- request for library media specialists' feedback

Dear Library Media Specialist,

Previous emails have invited you to participate in research involving high school media specialists in Georgia. As one of only 336 high schools in the state, your contribution to this research is very important.

Again, if you have taken the survey already, thank you for your time and input.

If you haven't had a chance to take the survey yet, I hope you'll take 15 minutes to answer the short survey and contribute your input towards what I hope will be some very useful data.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SLR59Z8>

Please remember: Participation is anonymous and voluntary. There is no penalty for non-participation. All data collected will remain confidential.

I am always available to answer questions or concerns by phone or email.

I look forward to sharing the results of my research with you.

Thank you,

Jim Rehberg
7992 Metcalf Rd
Thomasville, Georgia, 31792
229.224.3357
jimr@rose.net