A Study of Quantitative and Qualitative Factors in School Media Programs in 137 Selected School Districts in Illinois

Valerie Jean Downes

Loyola University Chicago
A STUDY OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FACTORS IN SCHOOL MEDIA PROGRAMS IN 137 SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS.

by

Valerie Jean Downes

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

June 1975
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is expressed for the assistance rendered by the committee, Dr. John M. Wozniak, Dr. Barney M. Berlin, and Dr. Robert Ennen. Sister Mary Constantine, SSJ, chairperson, is thanked in a special way for her prompt and meaningful contributions to this research project.

A grateful acknowledgment is expressed to Miss Kay Smith who has assisted the author on innumerable occasions.
VITA

The author, Valerie Jean Downes, is the daughter of George and Valerie (Lambert) Downes. She was born April 7, 1938, in Chicago, Illinois.

Her elementary and secondary education was obtained in the Catholic schools of Chicago, Illinois. She completed her secondary education at St. Scholastica Academy, where she was graduated in 1956.

In September 1956 she entered the University of Illinois at Urbana, Illinois, and in June 1960 received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in English Education.

In September 1960 she entered San Jose State College and received a Master of Arts in Library Science in 1966.

Miss Downes has worked in the development of school library media programs throughout the country. In her former capacity as Director of Media and Library Services (Title II ESEA) for the Illinois Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction she worked with many administrators in the development and utilization of school media programs.

Miss Downes is active in professional associations and has contributed many articles to professional journals. She is listed in the 1975-76 edition of Community Leaders and Noteworthy Americans.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENTS OF APPENDICES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................. 1

   Significance of the Study ...................................... 1
   Statement of the Problem ........................................ 5
   Hypotheses ....................................................... 6
   Limitations of the Study ......................................... 7
   Definition of Terms ................................................ 9

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ................................. 12

   Services of School Media Programs ............................. 12
   Review of the Development of National Standards .......... 22
   Review of State Standards on School Media Programs ...... 31
   The Relationship of State and National Standards to School Media Programs ............................................. 35
   Review of Standards Development in Illinois ............... 47

III. METHOD .......................................................... 56

   Subjects of the Study ............................................. 56
   Materials for the Study ............................................ 58
   Variable Definitions ............................................... 59
   "Media Program Evaluation Form" ................................ 59
   "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form" ............... 60
   Statistical Techniques for the Study ......................... 61
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. INTERPRETATION OF DATA FINDINGS</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Analysis of Hypotheses</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking of Quantitative Variables</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Services to Students</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Services to Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Survey of a Sample of State School Library Standards--Quantitative Components</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Survey of a Sample of State School Library Standards--Qualitative Components</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Size of Sample School Districts According to Type</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Size of Enrollment in Sample School Districts</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Per Capita Tuition Charge for Sample School Districts</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Rank Order of Quantitative Variables by Degree of Correlation Between Each Hypothesis</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>Media Program Evaluation Form</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Instructions</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Rating Reference</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. Services to Students</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Services to Teachers</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

School administrators, responsible for implementing educational programs in their community, are continually questioning the relationship between quantitative standards and qualitative standards for media programs. They are asking whether there is any relationship between the amount of money spent, the number of certified staff, the number of materials in the collection, the size of the facility, and the effectiveness of a school media program.

Evaluative Criteria: Library Services,\(^1\) published by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards in 1940, made an attempt to relate quantity and quality. Questions were asked concerning the size of staff, collection, budget, and the training of staff as well as the use of the library by students and teachers and the relationship of the library to the subject area disciplines. The implication has been that quantitative factors have a primary cause and effect relationship on the quality of a program of media services. National standards for school media programs have

always consisted of two parts: the qualitative and the quantitative. In fact, when one studies the history of school media programs since 1915, a trend may be perceived in the shifting of "emphasis of quantitative to qualitative standards, and then to a combination of the two with primary importance attached to the qualitative standards (with emphasis on programs and services for teachers and students)."²

Nonetheless, the standards for school media programs that have been developed by the states emphasize quantitative standards as essential factors in the development of quality media programs.

As of 1964, forty-seven states had standards for school media programs covering personnel, materials, expenditure, quarters and equipment, organization and program. Of these standards the following shows the number of states that did not include a specific component:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Number of states that omitted this component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarters and Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
This seems to indicate that most states do include a program component when discussing the quantity of personnel, materials, expenditure, and quarters, but the possibility of a specific relationship has never been established. This investigator was concerned with discovering the specific degree of correlation between the quantitative and the qualitative factors of a school media program.

Interpretation of the standards in terms of isolated parts rather than in their entirety has been a problem in their implementation. Frances Henne has said:

Most standards are very closely interrelated and interdependent, so that isolated parts can suffer from misinterpretation when removed from the total context. A quantitative standard has a direct and significant relationship to other quantitative standards, and all quantitative standards are tied to qualitative measures for their totally effective implementation.

School authorities tend to negate their importance when quantitative standards are circulated without the essential accompanying information concerning the role of these quantities in implementation of a program of media services.

In 1972 the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), in conjunction with the Illinois Audio-visual Association and the Illinois Association of School Librarians, published Standards for Educational Media

---

4Henne, "Media Programs," p. 244.
Programs in Illinois. This document is a quantitative statement regarding staff, budget, collection, and facilities that are necessary for the development and maintenance of a school media program.

The school district superintendents expressed concern because these standards were quantitative rather than qualitative at a time when the nationwide educational climate was moving toward performance competencies and away from the quantitative evaluations. Can it be proved that the quantity of materials, staff, budget, and facilities assures a quality media program?

Studies have been done in Oregon, Connecticut, Alabama, Ohio, and Louisiana comparing the status of school library programs to state or national standards. For the most part, these were quantitative in nature, with little attempt being made to relate the quantity of collection, budget, staff, and facility to the quality of a program of media services.

This study has attempted to correlate the relationship between the quantity of budget, staff, collection, facility, and the quality of a program of media services to students and teachers. No study of this type concerning schools in Illinois has been published.

---

5 Illinois, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois (Springfield, Ill.: OSPI, 1972).
Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to determine the relationship between a program of media services for students and teachers, and seven quantitative variables in selected elementary, secondary, and unit school districts in Illinois.

A program of media services was defined by:
1. Selection of the media collection
2. Utilization of media services
3. Administration of media services

The seven selected quantitative variables were:
1. The size of the certified media staff with 18 hours in audiovisual education or library science
3. The number of books in the collection
4. The number of filmstrips and sound filmstrips in the collection
5. The number of periodicals for students in the collection
6. The number of recordings in the collection
7. The size of the media center
Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the utilization of media services for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

Hypothesis 4: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services, defined as selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, and administration of media services, for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

Hypothesis 5: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the four criteria for a program of media services for the students in all sample school districts in Illinois.

Hypothesis 6: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for teachers in the sample school
districts in Illinois.

**Hypothesis 7**: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the utilization of media services for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

**Hypothesis 8**: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

**Hypothesis 9**: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services, defined as selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, and administration of media services, for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

**Hypothesis 10**: There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the four criteria for a program of media services for the teachers in all sample school districts in Illinois.

**Limitations of the Study**

This was a district survey rather than a survey of individual schools because the development of a media program is a district-wide commitment. The "Outstanding School Media Program Of The Year Award" selected by the American Association of School Librarians and Encyclopaedia Brit-
tanica, for example, is awarded to a school district on the basis of the quality of its total media program rather than to a single school.

The school districts studied were selected through the School Approval Section, Department of Recognition and Supervision of the Division of Supervision and Instruction of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The basic criteria for the selection of schools visited was the date of the last visitation. All schools were visited on a three-to-four-year cycle, with no special attention given to geographic distribution, size, or type of school. Insofar as the selection of schools was done on a random basis, the sample was random.

No non-public schools were used in this study.

The Chicago Public School District, Cook #299, was omitted from this study because not enough schools were visited by the OSPI to insure an adequate sampling.

The "Media Program Evaluation Form" was completed at the time of an on-site visit by an evaluator who was a third party to the school in question. These evaluators, selected because they were practicing certified media specialists, were given special training by OSPI. Nonetheless, the bias of the evaluator, degree of training, and quality of experience could have had some bearing on the quality of the evaluation.

This instrument dealt with the services of a media
program: selection, utilization, and administration. Therefore, no on-site data was gathered concerning quantitative factors such as the size of the media center. Media facilities were not one of the criterion variables used as a component of the media program.

**Definition of Terms**

**Certified media staff**: a certified teacher with 18 hours in library sciences or audiovisual education.

**Elementary school district**: a district composed of any number of schools with the student population in kindergarten through grade eight.

**Illinois Financial Accounting Manual Account Number 502.32**: expenditures for (1) regular or incidental purchases of school library books, including reference books, available for general use by students; (2) binding or other repairs to school library books and freight and cartage for school library books; (3) periodicals and newspapers for general use by the school library; (4) audiovisual materials used in the instructional program, such as films, filmstrips, recordings, exhibits, charts, maps, television and radio materials, and the rental and postage for such materials.

**Illinois Financial Accounting Manual Account Number 502.33**: expenditures for (1) regular or incidental purchases of school library books, including reference books, available for general use by the students; (2) binding or
other repairs to school library books and freight and cartage for school library books; (3) periodicals and newspapers for general use by the school library; (4) audiovisual materials used in the instructional program, such as films, filmstrips, recordings, exhibits, charts, maps, television and radio materials, and the rental and postage for such materials (not cataloged).

"Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form": This questionnaire is used by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to gather quantitative data concerning media programs in the local school districts of Illinois.

Local expenditure: amount of money spent by a school district for media services which is figured by using the budget figure in 502.32 and 502.33.

Media: all printed and audiovisual forms of communication and their accompanying technology.

Media centers: the area in which the media are organized and utilized.

"Media Program Evaluation Form": This instrument shows a profile of media services offered to students and teachers in a local school district. It is administered during an on-site visit by a third party media specialist under the auspices of the OSPI.

Per capita tuition charge: This figure shows the amount of money being spent for the education of each child in the district. It includes the local tax revenue and
local state aid. The only federal aid included in this figure is the Federal Impaction Aid.

**School media program:** the type of curricular interaction between the media specialist, teachers, students, and media in terms of utilization, administration, and selection of the media collection.

**Elementary school district:** a district composed of any number of schools with the student population in kindergarten through grade eight.

**Secondary school district:** a district composed of any number of schools with the student population in grades nine through twelve.

**Unit school district:** a district composed of any number of schools with the student population in kindergarten through grade twelve.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Services of School Media Programs

In developing the media program checklist, sources on school library services, as well as those on school media services, were studied. Evaluative Criteria: Library Services\(^1\) and Standards for School Media Programs\(^2\) were also used.

Evaluative Criteria: Library Services, published in 1940, was the earliest source used. This checklist was developed by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards for use in evaluating secondary school education programs. It clearly stated that suggestions by the pupils should be taken into consideration in the selection of "books, periodicals and other library materials."\(^3\) This checklist concerned itself with nonprint media as well as print media.

An important early study by Mary Gaver, Effective-


\(^3\) Cooperative Study, Evaluative Criteria, p. 58.
ness of Centralized Library Service in Elementary Schools, was published in 1963. This study dealt primarily with print materials, although an item on the checklist asks which audiovisual aids are used in the library program.

The Gaver checklist emphasizes instruction in the use of the library, guidance of reading and other activities, as well as organization of the library and public relations.

Ruth Ann Davies wrote a comprehensive volume on the integral position of the library and the librarian in the total educational process. The School Library: A Force for Educational Excellence, shows specifically how a library program can help each curricular area meet its objectives. The author objectively discusses methods of evaluating the school library program. Her concept of a library is a place where all types of instructional materials are organized for greatest accessibility and availability.

Another essential document for developing the checklist for this study was Standards for School Media Programs.
The previous sources cited emphasized print materials and print-related services. The major contribution of this document is that it emphasizes a media program which indicates a combined library and audiovisual program. This document also discusses the qualitative or service aspects of an exemplary media program.

The 1970 edition of the Lowrie study, *Elementary School Libraries*, was consulted. This edition gives emphasis to the library as a media center to a greater degree than did her first edition. For example, in the second edition she stated, "When reading or viewing for curriculum enrichment there should be a purpose." In the first edition, the statement read: "When reading for curriculum enrichment there should be a purpose." The addition of the words "or viewing" in the 1970 edition shows the move toward inclusion of nonprint materials and development of media centers. The second edition also expands the concept of notetaking when working with nonprint materials.

Gaver did another study, *Services of Secondary School Media Centers: Evaluation and Development*, in


9Ibid., p. 25.


11Mary V. Gaver, *Services of Secondary School Media*
which she designed and tested an objective evaluation of the variety and balance of media services in secondary schools. This study was an extension of the 1965 study conducted by Gaver and Jones to define and identify school library services. 12

The above materials were used as sources for the questions on the "Media Program Evaluation Form." Tables 1 and 2 indicate the questions and the sources used. The sources will be identified in the following manner:


### TABLE 1
SERVICES TO STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of Media Collection</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and social needs of the learner are served by a rich collection of recommended print materials. (&quot;Recommended&quot; implies use of standard selection tools.)</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and social needs of the learner are served by a rich collection of recommended nonprint materials.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are actively involved in the selection of materials for acquisition by the media center.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization of Media Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal instruction in the use of the media center and its resources is provided for individuals and groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional assistance is offered to students for the purpose of selecting, evaluating, and utilizing instructional resources appropriate to individual and academic needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are assisted in the development of competency in the listening, viewing, and reading skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are guided in the development of desirable reading, viewing, and listening attitudes and appreciations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A system for correlating student interests with available materials is successfully used to promote use of the media center.</td>
<td>Ga 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities are provided for students to design and produce audiovisual and printed materials needed for classroom assignments.</td>
<td>S 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration of Media Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print materials are systematically organized and accessible through a centralized card catalog.</td>
<td>Ga 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprint materials are systematically organized and accessible through a centralized card catalog. (A list does not constitute adequate bibliographic access.)</td>
<td>S 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An atmosphere (physical as well as mental) conducive to learning is evident in the media center.</td>
<td>C 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate learning facilities have been provided according to identified instructional goals and learner needs.</td>
<td>S 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All resources of the media center (materials and equipment) are circulated to any student to use in the media center.</td>
<td>G 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All resources (materials and equipment) are circulated for use by students in areas in the building other than the media center.</td>
<td>S 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All resources (materials and equipment) are circulated for students' use outside the school building.</td>
<td>G 128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The services and resources provided in the media program are available at times other than the normal school day. Student schedules, as well as media center philosophy, permit flexible use of the media center. (That is, schedules are not limited to study periods and/or scheduled class group use.) Systematic maintenance of facilities, materials, and equipment insures their constant accessibility to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>174-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
SERVICES TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of Media Collection</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A system is provided to acquaint faculty members with the resources in the media collection which are relevant to their instructional needs.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A plan is provided whereby faculty members regularly review, evaluate, and suggest possible new acquisitions.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers may request (for purchase) needed instructional materials and equipment at any time throughout the school year.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well selected professional volumes and journals are provided for faculty use.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty is informed of newly published professional materials and periodical articles which pertain to its subject field.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional reference tools (e.g., selection aids, catalogs, indexes, bibliographies) are provided which assist teachers designing curricula.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization of Media Services

| Classroom teachers receive consultative services aimed at implementing curricular objectives by the use of media and media services. | C      | 59    |
|                                                                                                 | L      | 24-56 |
|                                                                                                 | S      | 4     |
|                                                                                                 | G      | 126   |
|                                                                                                 | D      | 33    |
### TABLE 2--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media center staff develops resource units or packages from the media collection, for classroom or media center use, either on a short- or long-term basis.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media center staff develops resource units or packages from the media collection, for classroom or media center use, either on a short- or long-term basis.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers are provided local production facilities.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media professionals assist classroom teachers in the design of instructional media.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media center staff provides inservice education in the effective utilization of all types of media.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers are given training and/or assistance in the use of instructional equipment.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers are assisted in the effective use of professional reference tools.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Media Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media center staff identifies and designs services according to curricular needs.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>24-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media center staff identifies and designs services to meet varied teaching styles.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>144-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media center provides opportunities for procurement of pertinent resources from sources other than the school's media collection.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media center staff systematically observes, records, and distributes information regarding student progress.</td>
<td>Ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional equipment needed in classroom instruction is readily available and well maintained.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the media center and its services is predicated according to the needs of students and teachers rather than inflexible time schedules.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of the Development of National Standards

When reviewing the history of standards for school library programs, it is evident that when standards first appeared the emphasis was on quantity: the size of the staff, book collection, the facility, and budget. Nonetheless, the first national standards, *Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes*, do indicate a criteria for "scientific selection and care of books and other material . . . and instruction in the use of books and libraries . . . as partial requisites of library organization."\(^{13}\) These early standards also state that "the library must be an integral part of the high school housed in the school building . . ."\(^{14}\)

Published in 1925, *Elementary School Library Standards* was prepared by C. C. Certain under the supervision of a joint committee of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association and the School Librarians Section of the American Library Association.\(^{15}\) This document, while emphasizing the quantitative


\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 11.

\(^{15}\) National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, and American Library Association, School Librarians Section, *Elementary School Library Stan-
aspects of a library program, touched upon utilization of
the library in the sections on the aims, scope, and use of
the library. 16

Beust, in her review School Library Standards,
1954, states that these quantitative standards filled the
need of that era. There were only a few well planned func-
tioning high school libraries in the county at that time.
Elementary school libraries were practically nonexistent.
Therefore, administrators wanted something "definite and
official" which these standards supplied. She continues:

These almost completely quantitative standards were used
for approximately fifteen years before educators real-
ized that qualitative statements needed to be added.
This change was largely brought about by the fact that
schools were developing library programs in relation to
the program of the school. This and other changes in
the curriculum could not be measured by quantitative
standards only. 17

In 1934 the Executive Committee of the Cooperative
Study of Secondary School Standards developed a statement of
desirable principles for secondary schools which included
library services. 18

_____________________
16 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
17 Nora E. Beust, School Library Standards, 1954
18 Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards,
Evaluation of Secondary Schools: General Report (Washing-
ton, D.C.: Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards,
1939), pp. 45-46.
In 1940 *Evaluative Criteria* was published by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards based on the principle that a school should be evaluated in terms of its philosophy and objectives. These criteria, which were revised in 1950 and 1960, are being used by regional accrediting associations today.  

In the section *Evaluative Criteria: Library Services*, quantitative data was sought in terms of size and training of staff, adequacy of materials, collection, and financial provisions. This data was sought through questions concerning the use of the library by pupils and teachers; the librarian's responsibility with respect to other staff members and pupils; and the methods of selection and utilization of materials. The development of this instrument represented a successful attempt to probe the total library program and its place in the school. 

The American Library Association in 1945 made a strong stand for the integral nature of a school library program by its publication of *School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow: Functions and Standards*. In the title itself, 

---

20 Cooperative Study, *Evaluative Criteria*.
the word "functions," implying service, precedes the word "standards" which implies quantity.

The philosophy of this document is predicated upon the statements of educational objectives by the Educational Policies Commission in its report, *Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, published in 1938.

It demands the fusion of all school activities into a complete pattern of social and learning experiences, wherein the library as one integral part shares these objectives and assumes responsibility for their achievement on an equal basis with the rest of the school. It continues to perform its important task of curriculum enrichment and library service, but, in addition, the school library today assumes a significant role in fulfilling other educational objectives. \(^{22}\)

The principles and purposes of a school library are repeated throughout the document. For example, when discussing the quantity of the book collection, the following statement is made:

Quantitative measures of the book stock, taken alone, are not satisfactory in evaluating its usefulness. Therefore, emphasis is given to the adequacy of the collection in terms of the varying interests and needs of the pupils and teachers; abilities of the pupils; requirements of the curriculum; methods of teaching; availability of books outside of the school collection; provision for growth in literary appreciation; and opportunity for widening informational interests. \(^{23}\)

Quantitative standards on size of budget, facility, and staff are also stated in terms of purpose and utilization.

---

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 6.  
\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 20.
A statement concerning the responsibility of the librarian in the selection and utilization of audiovisual aids is also included. (No terminology change had taken place: a library was still a library and not a media center.)

This document develops a total rationale, philosophical and practical, for a quality school library program.

In 1960 Standards for School Library Programs was prepared by the American Association of School Librarians in cooperation with nineteen other educational associations. Richard Darling stated that these standards:

... stress the relationship of the quality of school library service to the improvement of education. The quantitative standards are based on research in schools that have very good school library programs and that represent quantitative levels essential for the achievement of such programs.

The basic premise of these standards can be succinctly stated through the following quotation:

The most important part of the library program is the work with students and teachers, these activities and services that make the library an educational force in the school. The objectives of very good schools require that the library program be in full operation, which can be done only when the school meets standards

---

for the personnel, materials, funds, and quarters of the school library.  

Quality of the services is continually stressed when discussing quantities of materials, staff, budget, and facilities. Since a summary of the quantitative standards is included, they often are read and discussed without the accompanying explanation of the specific need for these items in order to develop a quality program of library service integral to the school program.

There is no terminology change in these 1960 standards. In the chapter on the selection and scope of the materials collection, attention is given to the selection and budget for audiovisual materials, but the facility is still called "the library" and the program is called "the school library program."

The qualitative and quantitative standards set in this document evolved from many sources. Eleanor Ahlers described the process:

The qualitative standards for school library programs have evolved from many sources--from the advice, suggestions, and criticism obtained from consultants in special areas, from a two-day work session held at Kansas City ALA Conference in 1957, from another work session held at the ALA San Francisco Conference in 1958 (in which some six hundred school librarians participated), and from information secured from scores of librarians in response to questionnaires, letters and conferences.

The quantitative standards were compiled by means of

---

various procedures--by information obtained from questionnaires sent to schools identified by state and city school library supervisors as having very good library facilities and resources, by the judgement of a panel of experts, including the members of the Standards Committee and advisory consultants, and by the appraisal of the standards by specialists in various fields.  

In 1966 the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association (NEA) published the first national audiovisual standards: Quantitative Standards for Audiovisual Personnel, Equipment and Materials. As the title indicates, these standards were quantitative in nature, although one statement is made concerning the purpose of the personnel, equipment, and materials:

It is anticipated that some schools, especially those experimenting with new approaches, may well exceed the "advanced" state in some categories and perhaps fall behind in others. While such flexibility is desirable, seminar participants and members of the organization who have accepted these standards emphasized the need for a balanced program where materials, equipment, and personnel each make their unique and integrated contribution to the instructional program.

The Department of Audiovisual Instruction and the American Association of School Librarians published joint standards in 1969 entitled Standards for School Media Pro-


The Department of Audiovisual Instruction was one of the nineteen educational associations that cooperated with the American Association of School Librarians in the development of the 1960 standards. Their joint publication of standards, nine years later, is very important to the essence of these standards. A very significant aspect of this relationship is evidenced in the title which changes the name of the program from "school library program" to "school media program."

In this publication the term media refers to printed and audiovisual forms of communication and their accompanying technology. Other basic terms include media program, media specialist, and media center.

Again, in this document, the numerical standards are carefully shown to be essential for the development of quality educational programs. As in the 1960 standards, this document reiterates the essential nature of a media program to the variety of curricular and instructional modes being used to educate today's children.

Kenneth Norberg has written about the kinds of support, educational and financial, that implementation of these standards implies:

Implicit throughout the standards is the principle of adequate support: support for the educational program as a whole; support for the instructional resources and instrumentation without which both the modern teacher

---

30 American Library Association and National Education Association, Standards for School Media Programs.

31 Ibid., p. xi.
and the modern learner are thwarted and deprived. The bill for a contemporary education program suited to the needs of all students is high, but not nearly so high as the mounting costs of alienation, social turbulence and destruction that now loom so threateningly within the very halls where formal education is supposed to take place.

Throughout the review of national standards for school library programs, it has been evident that each document has reflected the educational practices and philosophies of its era.

The early standards published by the National Education Association for secondary schools in 1920 and for elementary schools in 1925 reflected the self-contained classroom approach to education whereby students were all expected to be on the same page of the text at the same time. The libraries were expected, for the most part, to be a silent place where instruction in research skills and use of books would be taught in a formalized manner.

The development of the Evaluative Criteria: Library Services was an important step forward because it asked questions concerning the role of the library in the philosophy and objectives of the school.

The publication School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow clearly stated the integral place a school library should occupy in the implementation of all educational

---

objectives.

The 1960 and 1969 standards published by the American Library Association reflected the concern that the library/media program is not only integral to the instructional and curricular process but that its services should be versatile enough to meet the individual styles of teachers and students.

The evolution has been from the development of quantitative standards to build a library program to quantitative standards essential for the development of a quality media program to meet the educational objectives of the school and the individuals within it.

Review of State Standards on School Media Programs

National standards played a significant role in the development of state standards. Persons who helped to formulate national standards returned to their own states and began working with state associations and state offices of education in the development of school library standards. School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, published by the American Library Association in 1945, had a great impact on the development of state library standards.

Standards for secondary school library programs were

far more prevalent than those for elementary schools because regional accrediting agencies for high schools developed library standards as a part of the evaluation of the quality of education within a secondary school.

In 1954 four of the six regional educational associations accredited the high schools within their membership; the New England Association and the Western Association, however, did not accredit their secondary schools at that time.\(^{34}\)

All states except two had developed or planned standards for high school libraries by 1954.\(^{35}\) Generally, these standards were quantitative in nature, listing the size of staff, facility, collection, and budget necessary for a library program.

Twenty-nine of the states made an attempt to describe the library program in terms of services which included instruction in library use, promotion of the reading habit, contribution to guidance services, and accessibility. Minnesota listed the major function of a library as that of furthering the objectives of the school. California talked of the role of the librarian in curriculum development.\(^{36}\)

By 1954 thirty states had elementary school library

\(^{34}\) Beust, *School Library Standards, 1954*, p. 3.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p. 4.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., pp. 18-35.
standards, and three states were in the process of developing them. Fourteen included qualitative statements along with the normal quantitative standards. Again, Minnesota and California were the only two states that stressed the place of the library in the educational objectives of school and curriculum development. The other states stressed "program" in the areas of instruction, development of reading habit, and accessibility of the facility. 37

Standards for School Library Programs, published in 1960 by the American Association of School Librarians, further influenced the revision or development of state school library standards. Nine states who have completed their standards since 1960 either refer to these national standards as goals or quote from them. 38

By 1964 only three states—Alaska, Massachusetts, and Utah—did not have state school library standards; neither did the Virgin Islands. However, the standards for Alabama, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and West Virginia were for secondary schools only. 39

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 also had a great impact on the development and revision of state standards. Under section 117.13 (a)(2) of

37 Ibid., pp. 36-43.
39 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
the Title II Regulations, one of the functions to be fulfilled by the State Plan administration must be:

The development, revision, dissemination, and evaluation of standards relating to the selection, acquisition, and use of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials.

The guidelines for Title II ESEA further state:

A main purpose of standards in this program is to establish qualitative and quantitative measures which will set new or revised levels in the requirements for the materials to be obtained. These standards serve the general purposes of all educational standards, that is, to set minimum levels below which no instructional program can be effective, and to stimulate efforts not just to meet standards, but to go beyond them toward excellence in educational opportunity. Therefore it is essential that those responsible for formulating or revising standards for Title II materials should consider the educational objectives involved and the extent to which they are attainable.

Since 1965 the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have either developed or revised standards for school library resources in elementary and secondary schools for use in the Title II program or have adopted the official standards of a professional organization.

---


41 Ibid.

State standards from twenty states were studied to determine if qualitative statements were included with the quantitative components (see Tables 3 and 4). Wherever possible, the latest standards available were studied to determine references to national standards.

In the area of quantitative statements, all of the twenty standards studied in the sample discussed personnel and collection, and all but one discussed facilities. Twelve standards did not discuss expenditures.

In terms of qualitative standards, twelve discussed principles of administration; fifteen discussed utilization; and five discussed selection.

Twelve state standards referred to the national standards and ten of them set their budget figure according to the national 1969 standards.

The Relationship of State and National Standards to School Media Programs

Studies have been done in Ohio, California, Connecticut, Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, Idaho, Missouri, and Oregon comparing the status of school library programs to state or national standards. For the most part, these studies were quantitative in nature with no attempt being made to relate the quantity of collection, budget, staff, and facility to the quality of a program of media services. The Oregon study is an exception with an attempt being made to assess the program of services to students and teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date Published</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Reference to National Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in all of the public schools in the state. Questionnaires were sent to the schools to ascertain their library development in the areas of staff, facility, expenditure, and collection. These data were then compiled and compared with the basic requirements for a functional school library program as set forth by the American Library Association, Standards for School Library Programs.

The findings of the studies done in Ohio, Connecticut, Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, and Oregon will be summarized here.

Moyer studied one hundred elementary school districts in Ohio to ascertain their conformance to standards. Through this study he also determined factors which inhibit and foster conformance to standards.

The data showed that 20 percent of the schools met the national recommendations in terms of expenditure. Fewer than 17 percent of the schools met the recommendations for minimum number of books in the collection. Twenty percent of the schools surveyed had a librarian who was responsible


for the administration of the library. But in 75 percent of the schools administrative responsibility for the library belonged to the principal or superintendent. In 60 percent of the schools, the library facility was used as a classroom, and in 20 percent of the schools it was used as a study hall.

The superintendents listed the following factors as those which inhibit conformance with standards:

1. Lack of space
2. Lack of money
3. Lack of school board cooperation
4. Failure of staff to make requests for library materials or to use the materials already available
5. De-emphasis of the library by the superintendent

The librarians and principals listed these factors which inhibit conformance with standards:

1. Lack of money
2. Lack of space
3. Delay caused by administrative procedure
4. Scheduling of library space
5. Lack of trained help
6. Lack of cooperation among teachers
7. Slowness of school board in providing funds
8. Outside control by pressure groups and individuals
The superintendents listed the following factors which foster conformance with standards:

1. Community support
2. Central staff support
3. Teacher support
4. Book exhibits
5. Ohio Reading Circle

The librarians and principals listed the following factors which foster conformance with standards:

1. Cooperative staff
2. PTA assistance
3. Open minded administration
4. Education minded community
5. Permissive regulations
6. Good relationship with public library
7. Funds allocated by school administrators

Prostano studied 504 elementary and secondary schools in Connecticut in order to secure information about school library resources and to interpret the data in terms of national standards. He discovered that 79 percent of the schools in the study had centralized libraries. Fewer than 20 percent of these schools had the seating capacities recommended by national standards. Considering the total

---

student population of the schools surveyed, the personnel ratio was one librarian to 988 students. The personnel were not fully qualified in terms of educational background and certification for positions held. In every aspect of the collection (books, magazines, newspapers, and professional books and magazines), the schools failed to approach the standard applied.

In terms of financial support, none of the schools enrolling 200-249 students received the $1,000-1,500 for books as specified by national standards, while 4.6 percent of the schools enrolling 250 or more students met or exceeded the minimal per pupil recommendation of $4.00 for books. None of the schools receiving funds for audiovisual materials met the minimal standards of $2.00-6.00 per pupil.

Prostano also attempted to ascertain the direction of anticipated growth and development of school library programs in terms of national standards. He found that 56.7 percent of the schools had established goals for school library development. Only 19.4 percent of the schools indicated that they had participated in the establishment of goals for district-wide school library development. Two hundred and eight schools specified the means employed for implementation of standards.

Ward surveyed 483 elementary schools in Louisiana to determine the extent to which the school library program met
the 1960 national standards. In terms of facilities, 35.3 percent of the schools met the national standards; 233 schools did not have a centralized library; and 10.3 percent of the schools met the national standards in terms of personnel which calls for one librarian for each 300 students.

The percentage of schools meeting the standards in terms of collection based on student enrollment of 200-999 was as follows: 25.9 percent met the standards in terms of books; 10.7 percent met the standards in terms of magazines; 5.8 percent met the standards in terms of newspapers.

The minimum expenditure level set by the standards was met by 18.8 percent in schools having an enrollment of up to 249 students. Eleven percent of the schools with student enrollment of 250 or more met the standard of expenditures.

Guise examined 175 elementary and 344 secondary school library programs in Arkansas and analyzed the data in relationship to the 1960 and the 1969 national standards. He discovered that not one of the school library programs met the 1969 national standards in any of the components:


personnel, facilities, collection, or expenditure.

In terms of the 1960 standards, minimal recommendations were met in some components. In the area of personnel, 28 percent of the elementary schools and 9 percent of the secondary schools met standards. In the area of collection, 15 percent of the elementary schools and 7.6 percent of the secondary schools met the minimal standards. Thirty-eight percent of the elementary schools and 58 percent of the secondary schools met the recommendations for annual expenditure. In the area of facilities, he found that no elementary schools met the 1960 standards which recommended seating for 10 percent of the enrollment. All high school libraries in enrollment groups 250-499 and 1,000-1,249 met the 1960 seating standards. Part of the libraries in the 500-749 enrollment category met them.

Martin also used the 1960 and 1969 national standards when charting the development of media resources in 522 of Alabama's elementary schools which participated in Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Program. The data were collected from 1967 to 1972.

Martin found that both the receipts and expenditures remained below 10 percent of the amount recommended in the 1960 standards. By 1972 83 percent of the schools studied

---

had a centralized facility. Only 17 percent of the schools had facilities adequate to meet the 1960 standards.

In terms of personnel, 38 percent of the elementary schools included in the study offered service to students and teachers. Unfortunately, fewer than one-half of these people were professionally trained.

By 1972 Alabama had met almost one-half of the 1960 standards for print materials, but it met only 15 percent of the requirements of the 1969 standards which dealt with non-print materials as well.

Martin also found that approximately one-half of the systems received more than one-third of their support for media programs from Title II. Two systems depended solely upon Title II for support of their programs.

Although the above studies dealt with quantitative aspects of school library media programs and their relationship to the standards, several of the dissertations contributed additional information. Moyer's study brought into focus specific factors which inhibit and foster conformance with standards. Prostano attempted to determine the degree of planning for school library programs that was taking place in Connecticut. Martin assessed the impact of Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. None of the works cited thus far attempted to relate the quantitative data with the quality of a media program in specific school systems.
Lane's questionnaire, sent to all the public schools on record in the Oregon State Office of Education, asked similar quantitative questions, as well as questions concerning the program of services to students and teachers. As in the other studies, Lane discovered that in most instances the quantitative data did not meet either state or national standards. For instance, schools in every enrollment category were below standards for recommended seating capacity and number of books per pupil. Of the schools reporting, 87.3 percent did not meet the national standards for professional staff. Over 33 percent of the schools indicated that additional school responsibilities were a part of the librarian's assignment.

In the area of services, Lane discovered that school libraries were not getting maximum utilization. Fewer than three-fourths of the libraries were open before and after school, during lunch hour, and throughout the school day. Only 76 percent of the schools reporting stated that the library could be scheduled for entire classes.

When assessing services in terms of instruction, Lane found that 59.4 percent of the librarians presented library orientation to all students at the beginning of each year while 56.6 percent presented a planned program of library instruction throughout the year. Approximately 50
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30 percent had a library manual. The program of library instruction was jointly planned by teachers and librarians in 46.4 percent of the schools.

In over 60 percent of the reporting schools the librarians assisted the students in developing desirable attitudes, skills, and tastes in reading, selecting materials, and executing research projects. However, the librarian was credited with assisting students in developing viewing and listening habits in only about 25 percent of the schools.

Services to teachers in 26.5 percent of the schools consisted of curriculum development in special programs such as guidance and counseling and exceptional children. The librarian provided information about new materials, assisted in the selection of materials, and supplied classroom collections in over 50 percent of the reporting schools. However, in fewer than 50 percent of the schools, the librarians introduced new materials to classes, provided professional materials, prepared bibliographies, and helped in planning units of study.

This study is important because in it Lane has tried to get to the essence of the school library program. She states:

Paradoxically, the most important aspect of a school library is its program of services; however, this is the aspect most difficult to evaluate. The reason for the
Review of Standards Development in Illinois

A review of standards development for school library programs in Illinois must begin with the statements concerning library programs that have been made by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Recognition and Accrediting of Illinois Secondary Schools, published in 1935, indicates that the school library should contain enough books, reference materials, and magazines to be adequate for the number of pupils enrolled and to meet the needs of instruction in all courses of study. It states that the library should be well organized, supervised, and easily accessible to all students. It also states a minimum staff ratio of one certified librarian for each 500 pupils and indicates that an adequate number of library assistants are needed.

In the revised edition of The Recognition and Accrediting of Illinois Secondary Schools, published in 1940,
the section on school libraries was expanded. Qualitative components such as the librarian being recognized as a member of the teaching staff and the extent and ways in which the pupils and teachers use the library were added.

In 1958 the Recognition Bulletin was expanded from kindergarten through junior college in the publication Guide to Supervision, Evaluation and Recognition of Illinois Schools: Kindergarten through Junior College. This document made a statement concerning audiovisual education of staff in terms of recognition. The section on school libraries also dealt with course work for recognition for librarians at all levels of education.

A library program directed by a trained school librarian should be provided for all children. Each school librarian shall meet general certification requirements for teachers and shall have, after September 1, 1958, a minimum of sixteen (16) semester hours in preparation in library science in areas of (1) materials; (2) functions of the school library; and (3) reading guidance.

This document specifically states the requirements for elementary, secondary, unit (combination of elementary and secondary), and junior college librarians.

---
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The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision and Recognition of Schools, published in 1964, recommends different courses for recognition in six categories of instructional materials services. The positions are described by function:

Coordinator of Instructional Materials
School Librarian
Audiovisual Coordinator
Instructional Materials Specialist
School Library Specialist
Audiovisual Specialist

The bulletin also states:

Each school should progress steadily and as rapidly as possible to attain or exceed the standards of the American Association of School Librarians, Division of Audiovisual Instruction, Illinois Audiovisual Association, and the Illinois Association of School Librarians.

The 1970 and 1971 editions of The Illinois

---
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Program are similar in their recognition requirements. The titles of the six positions have changed:

- Instructional Media Specialist
- School Librarian
- Audiovisual Coordinator
- Media Specialist
- School Library Specialist
- Audiovisual Specialist

Both of these editions again state that a "quality program should progress steadily and as rapidly as possible" to meet and exceed state and national standards. They further state:

"Each school shall have an instructional media program (library, audiovisual and instructional materials) organized to provide an equal opportunity for each student to prepare to his utmost potential. To be fully recognized, each school should have the services of a media specialist (library, audiovisual, and instructional materials) with the minimum qualifications."  

Both editions list quantitative minimums for materials, a budget of $6.00 per pupil, and discuss physical facilities and organization.

---
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The 1973 revision of The Illinois Program continues with recognition requirements using the same six positions but adding a seventh, Media Supervisor or Director.

This document has a section called "Standards for media programs," which states the following:

6-5.1 Each attendance center shall provide a program of media services to meet the curricular and instructional needs of the school.

a. The student depends on the media program for many purposes related to instructional requirements, as well as recreational interest. The focus of the media program must be on facilitating and improving the learning process.

b. The basis of a quality program of media services is not the number of materials, amount of budget, number of professional and clerical staff, and size of quarters alone, but an adequate media program cannot be developed without them. Equally as important is the manner in which these resources are used. A program of media services should be rated on a scale that measures to what extent it meets the curricular and instructional needs of the school. The Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois (1972) is suggested as a guide for program improvement.

---
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Paralleling the development of statements concerning school library/media programs in the state recognition bulletins was the increased awareness by state officials and professional associations of the importance of disseminating information concerning national standards and developing state library standards for Illinois.

A statement by the Council of Chief State School Officers in 1961 served as an incentive for state education agencies and state library associations to begin thinking in terms of developing state standards. This document unequivocally states that "the state department of education should develop standards for elementary and secondary school library programs." 74

In 1961 the Illinois Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) released a document that dealt with all facets of the development and implementation of programs of media services. This document lists quantitative standards and gives the following rationale for so doing:

"The preceding chapters of this handbook have described various types of learning and instructional

---
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materials, their uses, selection, and administration. In effect they have given qualitative standards which form the basis for the program of providing learning materials. These materials would be easily accessible, available on a wide range of subjects, covering a wide range of learning abilities, and useful to both students and teachers by trained professional personnel.

In order to obtain effective use of learning materials and to meet the qualitative standards as outlined, an administrator must meet certain quantitative standards. Adequate personnel, funds, materials, equipment, and quarters are all needed if effective use of learning and instructional materials is to be made by teachers and students. All five are closely related. The quantitative standards will help a teacher or administrator determine what is needed to develop a good instructional materials program.

All schools should set as ultimate objectives the attainment of standards as developed by the following Departments of the National Education Association: The American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction. Although all the standards appearing in this Appendix are not recommended by the American Association of School Librarians, where such recommendations are explicit in the Association's Standards proper credits are cited.

That this was the prelude to developing standards for Illinois is indicated by the fact that the quantities indicated were not necessarily recommended by the American Library Association.

In 1962 Illinois still did not have its own standards. The Illinois Association of School Librarians Committee for the Implementation of School Library Standards held a series of implementation workshops based on the 1960 national standards.

---
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In 1963 an early draft of the Illinois Standards appeared in Illinois Journal of Education. The rationale for the development of these standards was:

The Illinois Department of Public Instruction endorses the national standards as does the Illinois Association of School Librarians. However, a number of Illinois schools have not yet put into effect the standards of 1945; therefore, it seems advisable to provide a means of reaching national goals in successive upward steps over a designated period of time.

The following is a progress report of the work of the Illinois Standards Committee. The committee recommends that a period of two years be allowed for attaining each of the three steps or "phases" designated so that within six years all schools might reach the national standards.

Standards for School Library Programs in Illinois, prepared by the Illinois Association of School Librarians, was published by the OSPI in 1964. These standards are quantitative in nature with a philosophical introduction to each section. These standards cover materials, budget, centralized library service, personnel, quarters, facilities, and equipment. The three-phase development of a centralized library program is also discussed.

When Title II ESEA became a law in 1965, Phase I of the Standards for School Library Programs in Illinois was

---
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CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects of the Study

The subjects used in this study came from the School Approval Section, Department of Recognition and Supervision of the Division of Supervision and Instruction of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Each year the staff of this Section visits approximately one-third of the schools in the state to evaluate the educational program for the purpose of granting state aid. During this visit, every subject area in the school district is surveyed by the third party evaluators using a questionnaire prepared by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI).

From a total of 1,084 operating school districts in Illinois, 275 were visited for the purposes of school approval in 1972-1973. Of the total number of school districts visited, 190 were evaluated by media specialists. The subjects of this study were chosen from the 190 school districts that were visited by media specialists as a part of the School Approval Program of the Department of Recognition and Supervision of the Division of Supervision and Instruction of the OSPI. Of the 190 school districts visited, 138 were evaluated through the use of the instrument "Media Program Evaluation Form." The Chicago Public School
used as a minimum toward which each school should develop its library program.  

In 1968 the Illinois Audiovisual Association published quantitative standards for personnel, equipment, and materials for audiovisual programs.

Subsequently, a committee of members of the Illinois Association of School Librarians and the Illinois Audiovisual Association was organized to develop joint standards for library and audiovisual programs. The document, Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois, was published in 1972. Again, these standards were developed in three phases with Phase III equivalent to Phase I of the national standards.

---


District, Cook #299, was omitted from this study because not enough schools were evaluated to insure an adequate sample. Thus 137 school districts whose media programs were evaluated through the use of the "Media Program Evaluation Form" during 1972-1973 were the subjects of this study.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 describe the sample characteristics which were thought to influence the relationships to be investigated.

**TABLE 5**

SIZE OF SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>No. in State</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-8)</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (9-12)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit (K-12)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6**

SIZE OF ENROLLMENT IN SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Adequate Size</th>
<th>No. in Sample Above Adequate Size</th>
<th>No. in Sample Below Adequate Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-8)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (9-12)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit (K-12)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
PER CAPITA TUITION CHARGE FOR SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>No. in Sample Above State Average</th>
<th>No. in Sample Below State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-8)</td>
<td>$903.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (9-12)</td>
<td>$1,359.76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit (K-12)</td>
<td>$1,013.96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Districts</td>
<td>$1,026.52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials for the Study

The following instruments which were used in this study have been distributed by the Media and Library Services Section, Department of Instruction, Division of Supervision and Instruction of the OSPI to gather information concerning media programs in Illinois:

1. The "Media Program Evaluation Form" is the media services questionnaire which was administered by professional media specialists during on-site visitations to schools in conjunction with the School Approval Section. This instrument shows a profile of media services offered to students and teachers by the school district.

2. The "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form" is the form by which quantitative data was gathered by the OSPI. This instrument, which was completed by the media specialist or the administrator in the local school district, shows a quantitative profile of media services.
These two instruments were developed by the professional staff of the Media and Library Services Section, OSPI. They were reviewed by the Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act Advisory Committee which consisted of professional school media specialists, professors of library science and audiovisual education, State agency librarians and school administrators, as well as personnel from the OSPI. As a result of such activities, these instruments were adopted by the OSPI for defining media service programs in Illinois school districts.

**Variable Definitions**

The data were gathered and compiled from the on-site "Media Program Evaluation Form" and the "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form" for each school district.

"Media Program Evaluation Form"

Using the "Media Program Evaluation Form," a separate score for media services to students and a separate score for media services to teachers was determined by summing the scores for all items within each of the following components:

**Media services to students**

1. Selection of media collection (sv)
2. Utilization of media services (u)
3. Administration of media services (ad)
Media services to teachers

1. Selection of media collection (sv)
2. Utilization of media services (u)
3. Administration of media services (ad)

These three component scores were based on a rating scale ranging from 1-5. A fourth criterion variable was determined by the average of the scores of the three above components:

\[
\frac{sv + u + ad}{3} \text{ for students} \quad \frac{sv + u + ad}{3} \text{ for teachers}
\]

Thus the four criterion variables to be utilized, separately for students and separately for teachers, in this study were:

1. Selection of media collection (sv)
2. Utilization of media services (u)
3. Administration of media services (ad)
4. \( sv + u + ad \)

"Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form"

Using the "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form," the total for each of the seven selected quantitative variables was determined by the summing across schools in a school district for each of the seven quantitative variables. The seven quantitative variables were:

1. The number of certified media staff with 18 or more hours in audiovisual education or library science
2. The amount of local expenditures for instructional materials out of Account Code Numbers 502.32 and 502.33

3. The number of books in the collection

4. The number of filmstrips and sound filmstrips in the collection

5. The number of student periodicals in the collection

6. The number of recordings in the collection

7. The size of the media center in square feet

**Statistical Techniques for the Study**

Canonical correlation was used to determine the degree of relationship between seven selected quantitative variables and the four program criteria for a media services program for both the students and teachers in all sample school districts. The acceptable level of significance was chosen to be .01.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to determine the relative contribution of each variable in predicting each of the four program criteria for both the students and teachers in all sample school districts. The stepwise multiple regression also yielded the best predictors of each of the four program criteria for both groups. (For further information, see Appendix C, p. 100.)
CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF DATA FINDINGS

The results of this study show that there is little relationship between the quantitative variables assumed to be essential in the development of a quality media program and the qualitative aspects of a media program. In all cases the null hypotheses were accepted.

The canonical correlation indicates that there is virtually no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables taken as a group and the four program criteria taken as a group, for a media services program for students and for teachers. The null hypotheses are accepted in both cases. In each case, the Alpha level was .20 which was above the acceptable level of .01. The quantitative variables were only significant to the four program criteria at the .20 Alpha level, showing no significant relationships between the two groups of variables.

The accountable variance was minimal: .23190 (23.1 percent) for the students and .22328 (22.3 percent) for the teachers which shows that the variables within each group were not controlling variables when one considers quality of media programs.

A stepwise multiple regression was run to determine the relative contribution of each of the seven quantitative
variables in predicting each of the four program criteria for the students and teachers in the sample school districts.

In all cases, the null hypothesis was accepted because of the minimal amount of the variance accounted for by these variables. This variance ranged from 0.09475 or 9.4 percent (for the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for teachers) to 0.15636 or 15.6 percent (for the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for students). Since 1.00000 means all variance was accounted for, this shows that the majority of the variance is not taken into account. Therefore, something other than the stated variables best predicts the four qualitative variables.

Summary Analysis of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only 0.15398 (15.3 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than 0.28258.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>0.02682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>0.28258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the utilization of media services for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only .09753 (9.7 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .21253.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.13986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.20268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>.05927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.06704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>.02400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.12051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.21253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only .15636 (15.6 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .27504.
Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.10026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.27504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>.01278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.09070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>-.00541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>.16729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.24132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services, defined as selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, and administration of media services, for students in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only .15564 (15.5 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .27705.

Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.09793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.27705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>.02397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.09155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>-.01404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.16733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.23695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 6. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant rela-
tionship between the two groups of variables: only .09475 (9.4 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .25068.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.06050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.25068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>-.00777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.02998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>.01299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.15786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.12394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 7. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the utilization of media services for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only .11757 (11.7 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .19217.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.08753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.19217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>-.08785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.00606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>-.09250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.09189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.15158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 8. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant rela-
tionship between the two groups of variables: only .14673 (14.6 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .24282.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.10991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.24282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>-.08082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.01304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>-.06919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.11466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.17024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 9. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services, defined as selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, and the administration of media services for teachers in the sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because the multiple regression shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables: only .12487 (12.4 percent) of the variance is accounted for and there is no correlation coefficient greater than .24007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>.09021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>.24007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>-.06207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>.01714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>-.05259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records per pupil</td>
<td>.12769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of square feet per pupil</td>
<td>.15628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the four criteria for a program of media services for the students in all sample school districts.
in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because canonical correlation results in the following relationship:

The first group is significantly related to the second group only at the .20 level.

These variables account for .23190 (23.1 percent) of the relationship (variance).

Hypothesis 10. There is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the four criteria for a program of media services for the teachers in all sample school districts in Illinois.

The result is the acceptance of the null hypothesis because canonical correlation results in the following relationship:

The first group is significantly related to the second group only at the .20 level.

These variables account for .22328 (22.3 percent) of the relationship (variance).

Keeping in mind that the null hypotheses were accepted in all instances due to the small amount of variance accounted for, the hypotheses should be studied by pairs in terms of the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and (1) the selection of the media collection for students and teachers; (2) the utilization of media services for students and teachers; (3) the administration of media services for students and teachers; (4) the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services; (5) the four criteria for a program of media services.
Hypotheses #1 and #6 deal with the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for students and teachers. In #1 the null hypothesis was accepted with \( .15398 \) or 15.3 percent of the variance accounted for, and in #6 it was accepted with \( .09475 \) or 9.4 percent of the variance accounted for. In both cases the variable accounting for the highest correlation coefficient is the amount of expenditure per pupil at \( .28258 \) for hypothesis #1 and \( .25068 \) for hypothesis #6.

In both hypotheses a slight negative relationship is shown between the number of books per pupil (hypothesis #1: \( -.00687 \); hypothesis #6: \( -.00777 \)) and the selection of the media collection. Not only did the number of books per pupil not positively affect the selection of the media collection for students and teachers, but in many cases where there was a high number of books per pupil, the selection of the collection was ranked low.

In hypothesis #1, the number of periodicals per pupil also resulted in an inverse relationship at \( -.05830 \). Some school districts that had a large number of periodicals per pupil had poor media programs in terms of selection of the collection for students.

Hypotheses #2 and #7 deal with the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the utilization of media services for students and teachers. In
#2 the null hypothesis was accepted with only .09753 or 9.7 percent of the variance accounted for, and in #7 the null hypothesis was accepted with .11757 or 11.7 percent of the variance accounted for by the included variables.

In #2 the variable accounting for the highest correlation coefficient is the number of square feet per pupil (.21253) with the amount of expenditure per pupil having the second highest degree of correlation (.20268). In #7 the amount of expenditure per pupil has the highest degree of correlation which is .19217, and the number of square feet per pupil has the second highest degree of correlation which is .15158.

In hypothesis #7, two quantitative variables resulted in a negative relationship: the number of books per pupil at -.08785 and the number of periodicals per pupil at -.09250. In some programs, not only did the number of books and periodicals not positively affect the utilization of media services for teachers, but in some instances where there was a high number of books and periodicals per pupil, the utilization of media services for teachers was ranked low.

Hypotheses #3 and #8 deal with the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for students and teachers. In #3 the null hypothesis was accepted with .15636 or 15.6 percent of the variance accounted for, and in #8 it was
accepted with .14673 or 14.6 percent of the variance accounted for. In both cases, the highest coefficient is the expenditure per pupil at .27504 for hypothesis #3 and .24282 for hypothesis #8.

In both hypotheses a slight negative relationship is shown between the number of periodicals per pupil (hypothesis #3: -.00541; hypothesis #8: -.06919) and the administration of media services for students and teachers. Not only did the number of periodicals per pupil not positively affect the administration of media services for students and teachers, but in many cases where there was a high number of periodicals per pupil the administration of media services for students and teachers was ranked low.

In hypothesis #8, the number of books per pupil had an inverse relationship at -.08082. Some school districts that had a large number of books per pupil had poor media programs in terms of administration of media services for teachers.

Hypotheses #4 and #9 deal with the relationship between seven selected quantitative variables and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services for students and teachers. In #4 the null hypothesis was accepted with .15564 or 15.5 percent of the variance accounted for, and in #9 the null hypothesis was accepted with .12487 or 12.4 percent of the variance accounted for. In both cases the highest coefficient is the amount of expenditure per
pupil, with .27705 for hypothesis #4 and .24007 for hypothesis #9.

In both hypotheses, a slight negative relationship is shown between the number of periodicals per pupil (-.01404 for hypothesis #4; -.05259 for hypothesis #9) and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services. Not only did the number of periodicals per pupil not positively affect the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services, but in many cases where there was a large number of periodicals per pupil the mean of the program criteria was low.

In hypothesis #9, the mean of the three program criteria for teachers and the number of books per pupil also resulted in an inverse relationship at -.06207. Some school districts that had a large number of books per pupil had a poor program of media services as determined by the mean of the three program criteria for teachers. The data show that there is very little predictability in the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative variables. Within this framework, the data suggest that the quantitative variable with the greatest correlation to a program of media services as defined by selection, utilization, administration, and the mean of the three is the amount of expenditure per pupil. This information must be looked at in light of the fact that this study showed little correlation between the seven quantitative variables and the qualitative aspects
of a media program.

An inverse relationship was obtained between the number of books per pupil and selection of the media collection for students and teachers, the administration of media services for teachers, and the mean of the three program criteria for teachers.

An inverse relationship was obtained between the number of periodicals per pupil and the selection of the media collection for students, the administration of media services for students and teachers, mean of the three program criteria for students and teachers, and the utilization of media services for students.

Therefore, in some instances, not only did the number of books and periodicals not have a positive effect on various qualitative aspects of the media program, but in some cases where a great number of books and periodicals did exist, the qualitative aspects of the program ranked low.

Hypotheses #5 and #10 show that there is no relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables taken as a group and the four criteria for a program of media services taken as a group (for students and teachers). In each case the null hypothesis was accepted with an Alpha level of .20 which shows no significant relationship between the two groups of variables.

In each case the accountable variance was minimal: .23190 (23.1 percent) for the students and .22328 (22.3
percent) for the teachers, which shows that the variables within each group are nonpredictive of the four criteria variables.

**Ranking of Quantitative Variables**

Within the framework of the fact that the null hypothesis has been accepted in all cases due to the minimal nature of the variance accounted for, the ranking of the seven quantitative variables should be studied for the eight hypotheses in which the relationship between the seven quantitative variables and the four program components was tested (see Table 8).

**TABLE 8**

**RANK ORDER OF QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES BY DEGREE OF CORRELATION BETWEEN EACH HYPOTHESIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per pupil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square feet per pupil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records per pupil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified staff per pupil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips per pupil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books per pupil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals per pupil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The quantitative variable regarding the amount of expenditure per pupil had the greatest degree of correlation to seven of the eight hypotheses. The second highest degree of correlation existed between the utilization of media services for students.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of square feet per pupil had the second greatest degree of correlation to six of the eight hypotheses. The number of square feet per pupil had the greatest degree of correlation to the utilization of media services for students and had the third highest correlation to the selection of media collection for teachers.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of records per pupil had the third greatest degree of correlation to six of the eight hypotheses. This variable had the fourth greatest degree of correlation to the utilization of media services for students and the second greatest degree of correlation to the selection of media collection for teachers.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of qualified staff per pupil had the fourth greatest degree of correlation to five of the eight hypotheses. The number of qualified staff per pupil had the third greatest degree of correlation to the utilization of media services for students. This variable had the fifth highest correlation to the selection of the media collection for students and the
sixth highest correlation to the administration of media services for students.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of filmstrips per pupil had the fifth greatest degree of correlation to six of the eight hypotheses. This variable had the fourth highest correlation to the selection of media collection for students and the administration of media services for students.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of books per pupil had the sixth greatest degree of correlation to four of the eight hypotheses. This variable had the seventh highest correlation to the selection of the media collection for teachers, the administration of media services for teachers, and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services for students. This variable had the fifth highest degree of correlation to the administration of media services for students.

The quantitative variable regarding the number of periodicals per pupil was ranked last in correlation to four of the eight hypotheses. This variable had the sixth highest correlation to the selection of the media collection for teachers, administration of media services for teachers, and the mean of the three criteria for a program of media services for teachers.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was undertaken in an attempt to determine the degree of correlation between quantitative and qualitative factors in school media programs. The impetus for this study was the 1972 document, Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois, published by the Illinois Association of School Librarians, the Illinois Audiovisual Association, and the Illinois Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). This document was a quantitative statement regarding staff, budget, collection, and facilities that are necessary for the development and maintenance of school media programs. The school district superintendents expressed concern that these standards were quantitative rather than qualitative at a time when educational competencies rather than quantitative data were being regarded as educationally sound.

A review of the literature showed that when school library standards first appeared, the emphasis was on quantity: the size of the staff, collection, budget, and facility. Gradually, as school libraries became established, qualitative standards were added to encourage utilization of the libraries; then nonprint materials were added to form
media centers, and additional quantitative and qualitative standards were developed.

The questionnaires used in this study were developed by the professional staff of the Media and Library Services Section, Illinois OSPI, and reviewed by the Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act Advisory Committee.

The "Media Program Evaluation Form" administered on-site by third party evaluators showed a profile of media services offered to students and teachers. These questions were grouped within the following areas: selection of media collection, utilization of media services, and administration of media services. These areas of service were the qualitative variables used in this study.

The "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form" was the form by which quantitative data were gathered by the OSPI. It was filled out by the media specialist or administrator in the local district. The quantitative variables from this form used in this study were: (1) the size of the qualified staff; (2) the amount of the local expenditure per pupil; (3) the number of books per pupil; (4) the number of filmstrips per pupil; (5) the number of periodicals per pupil; (6) the number of records per pupil; and (7) the number of square feet per pupil.

The subjects of this study were 137 school districts in Illinois: 46 elementary districts, 25 secondary districts, and 66 unit districts. These were selected from the
275 districts in Illinois that were visited for the purposes of school approval in 1972-1973 by the OSPI. The 137 school districts surveyed in the study were selected on the basis of the fact that all information pertinent to the study was available for them.

In this study, all of the null hypotheses were accepted due to the minimal nature of the accountable variance. The variance accounted for ranged from .09475 or 9.4 percent (for the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the selection of the media collection for teachers) to .15636 or 15.6 percent (for the relationship between the seven selected quantitative variables and the administration of media services for students). Since 1.00000 means all variance is accounted for, the range .09475 to .15636 shows the majority of the variance is not accounted for by these variables. Therefore, something other than the stated variables would best predict the four qualitative variables: selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, administration of media service, and the mean of the preceding criteria.

Some of the variables not analyzed in this study that might be important are the human variables such as the characteristics of effective teachers, effective media specialists, and effective learners. A study might be done in which the learning styles of students are analyzed in
terms of the characteristics of effective teachers and effective media specialists.

Characteristics of an effective media program might be investigated. Utilization of media in terms of its place in the curriculum should be determined. Is the media organized and housed in the media center? Is it viewed as a supplement to the curriculum, or is it an integral part of the teaching/learning process? Does a school employ a systems approach or instructional design approach to the utilization of media in the curriculum?

If no more than 15.6 percent of the variance is accounted for, there must exist some variable or variables that will account for the rest of the predictability. Investigation into other possible choices should be considered, such as: intelligence or intelligence-related variables; quality of the school; parents' level of education; affective variables such as attitude of teachers, parents, and students toward learning and education; students' relationship to instructors; and parents' use of information services in the community.

Student interviews might be conducted to determine what conditions cause them to use the media center: for class work, for personal interests, for technical interests. A student questionnaire could determine how many students know how to use the media center and what materials are available in the media center.
Taking the sample used in this study, five or six school districts with identified quality programs could be studied to determine common characteristics of quality programs. The same number of school districts that demonstrate poor programs through this study should be studied to identify common characteristics of quality programs that are lacking in these districts.

The socioeconomic factors of the parents and the community in the selected school districts should be studied to determine their effect on the school media program and the curriculum.

The limitations of the study always have had a bearing upon the results. As a district-wide study, individual programs that might be excellent are averaged in with mediocre and poor programs on both the quantitative instrument, "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form," and the qualitative instrument, "Media Program Evaluation Form." Therefore, both the quantitative and qualitative variables represent a single district-wide score showing the district commitment to a media program.

The quantitative instrument, "Instructional Media Program Evaluation Form," asks for figures only: the amount of expenditure, and the number of square feet, books, filmstrips, records, periodicals, and staff. There is no statement as to the availability and accessibility of the facility and materials. There is no statement as to the quality,
relevancy, and utilization of the materials.

The subjective bias, as well as the overt experiences and qualifications of the third party evaluators, might have had an effect on their observations which would be reflected on the scores in the qualitative instrument, "Media Program Evaluation Form."

These limitations suggest a further study in which the universe is limited to a single school district. The investigation might center around the factors within each school that have an effect on that program of media services. The on-site visitation could be done by a single individual to eliminate variances with the bias of the evaluator. A profile of the quantitative and qualitative programs by individual schools could offer a different picture of the program of media services for the total district.

Since the evolution in the development of standards for school library/media programs has been from emphasis on quantitative standards to building a library program to quantitative standards essential for the development of a quality media program to meet the educational objectives of the school and the individuals within it, it is important to do further studies into this area. A study might be undertaken in which the behavioral objectives that have been developed by grade levels or curricular areas are surveyed to determine the extent of utilization of media services in
meeting these objectives.

All school library/media standards call for quantities of staff, collection, budget, and facilities to build programs of media service. This study has shown that in 137 school districts in Illinois, none of the seven quantitative variables can significantly predict a quality program for teachers and students in the areas of selection of the media collection, utilization of media services, and administration of media services.
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APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Media and Library Services Section
Valerie J. Downes, Director
316 South Second, Springfield, Illinois 62706

MEDIA PROGRAM EVALUATION

Instructions: The attached program evaluation form should be used by the evaluator to assess media services offered in the school district. Many quantitative aspects of a media program contribute to the qualitative aspects outlined on the checklist; quantitative standards, such as those described in the new Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois should be consulted as the program is evaluated.

Each aspect of the program of media services should be given a rating from 0 to 3; the rating corresponds to the phase development technique used in the State standards.

0 = Nonexistent (the service is not offered)
1 = Below Phase I (in need of achievable improvement)
2 = Phase II (meets need to reasonable degree)
3 = Phase III (exemplary and unique)

Spaces are provided after each service statement for short, definitive comments. The column on the right side of the page should be completed using the lettered statement(s) attached which describe the method(s) used to rate the service. For example, Section A, No. (1) might appear on the form thus:

0 B 1 2 3 (1) Academic and social needs of the learner are served by a rich collection of recommended print materials.

a, b, c, d, e, j, l, o, m

The final section of the form contains a graph on which you are to "plot" the profile of the district media program and make recommendations on the needs of the district.
RATING REFERENCE

a. Application of State Standards for Educational Media Programs in Illinois
b. Examination of media center collection
c. Examination of curriculum guides
d. Examination of classroom collections
e. Examination of records (statistics, shelflist, and the like)
f. Observation while in media center(s)
g. Observation while in a classroom session
h. Observation while in several classroom sessions
i. Interview: one teacher
j. Interview: two or more teachers
k. Interview: one student
l. Interview: two or more students
m. Interview: district superintendent
n. Interview: building principal
o. Interview: district business manager
p. Interview: media professional staff
q. Interview: media support staff
r. INTUITIVE RECOGNITION
s. Other (name)
t. Other (name)
u. Other (name)
### THE MEDIA PROGRAM

#### A. Services to Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (1)</td>
<td>Academic and social needs of the learner are served by a rich collection of recommended print materials. (&quot;Recommended&quot; implies use of standard selection tools.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (2)</td>
<td>Print materials are systematically organized and accessible through a centralized card catalog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (3)</td>
<td>Academic and social needs of the learner are served by a rich collection of recommended nonprint materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (4)</td>
<td>Nonprint materials are systematically organized and accessible through a centralized card catalog. (A list does not constitute adequate bibliographic access.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (5)</td>
<td>Students are actively involved in the selection of materials for acquisition by the media center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (6)</td>
<td>An atmosphere (physical as well as mental) conducive to learning is evident in the media center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (7)</td>
<td>Adequate learning facilities have been provided according to identified instructional goals and learner needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B 1 2 3 (8)</td>
<td>Formal and informal instruction in the use of the media center and its resources is provided for individuals and groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional assistance is offered to students for the purpose of selecting, evaluating, and utilizing instructional resources appropriate to individual and academic needs.

Students are assisted in the development of competency in the listening, viewing, and reading skills.

Students are guided in the development of desirable reading, viewing, and listening attitudes and appreciations.

A system for correlating student interests with available materials is successfully used to promote use of the media center.

All resources of the media center (materials and equipment) are circulated to any student to use in the media center.

All resources (materials and equipment) are circulated for use by students in areas in the building other than the media center.

All resources (materials and equipment) are circulated for students' use outside the school building.

The services and resources provided in the media program are available at times other than the normal school day.

Student schedules, as well as media center philosophy, permit flexible use of the media center. (That is, schedules are not limited to study periods and/or scheduled class group use.)
Opportunities are provided for students to design and produce audiovisual and printed materials needed for classroom assignments.

Systematic maintenance of facilities, materials, and equipment insures their constant accessibility to students.

B. Services to Teachers

The media center staff identifies and designs services according to curricular needs.

The media center staff identifies and designs services to meet varied teaching styles.

Classroom teachers receive consultative services aimed at implementing curricular objectives by the use of media and media services.

A system is provided to acquaint faculty members with the resources in the media collection which are relevant to their instructional needs.

Media center staff develops resource units or packages from the media collection, for classroom or media center use, either on a short- or long-term basis.

A plan is provided whereby faculty members regularly review, evaluate, and suggest possible new acquisitions.

Classroom teachers may request (for purchase) needed instructional materials and equipment at any time throughout the school year.
The media center provides opportunities for procurement of pertinent resources from sources other than the school's media collection.

Media center staff systematically observes, records, and distributes information regarding student progress.

Classroom teachers are provided local production facilities.

Media professionals assist classroom teachers in the design of instructional media.

Media center staff provides in-service education in the effective utilization of all types of media.

Instructional equipment needed in classroom instruction is readily available and well maintained.

Classroom teachers are given training and/or assistance in the use of instructional equipment.

Well selected professional volumes and journals are provided for faculty use.

Faculty is informed of newly published professional materials and periodical articles which pertain to its subject field.

Professional reference tools (e.g., selection aids, catalogs, indexes, bibliographies) are provided which assist teachers in designing curricula.

Classroom teachers are assisted in the effective use of professional reference tools.
Use of the media center and its services is predicated according to the needs of students and teachers rather than inflexible time schedules.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIA CENTER STAFF</th>
<th>8 mm Film</th>
<th>Kits (3 or more mediums)</th>
<th>Sound Film Strips</th>
<th>Film Strips</th>
<th>Student Periodical Subscriptions (and duplicates)</th>
<th>Books (volumes)</th>
<th>LOCAL EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS 1972-73</th>
<th>Is the Media Center also a Study Hall?</th>
<th>Media Center Seating Capacity</th>
<th>Media Center Size in Square Feet</th>
<th>Enrollment on Oct. 1, 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Certified Supportive (FTE)</td>
<td>Certificated and Qualified in Media (FTE) 18 hrs. in Library or AV and Organized Collection (Case)</td>
<td>502.32</td>
<td>502.33 (Exclude Federal Grant Funds)</td>
<td>86 mm Film</td>
<td>Print &amp; Nonprint Materials</td>
<td>Books (volumes)</td>
<td>Enrollments (Nonpublic) Paid (Public and Nonpublic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Be certain that all buildings in the district (public and nonpublic) are listed.

NAME OF ALL BUILDINGS (Public and Nonpublic by Place Name)

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central District Media Center Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of 16mm Films in District</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**APPENDIX B—Continued**
APPENDIX C

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES FOR THE STUDY

The two programs used in the study were canonical correlation and stepwise multiple regression. The particular package used for the canonical correlation was the fourth edition of SOUPAC, Statistically Oriented Users Programming and Consulting, published by the University of Illinois at Urbana in February 1972.

For the stepwise multiple regression, the package used was the SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, authored by Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and C. Hull and published by McGraw-Hill in 1970.

The programs were run on the IBM System 360, Model 65, under OS/MFT at Loyola University of Chicago.
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