Designed to synthesize information of interest about current doctoral-level library and information education in North America, this study examines the doctoral programs in library and information studies at 17 universities in the United States and Canada. Each program is investigated from the following perspectives: (1) a survey of faculty publications over the 5-year period 1978-1982; (2) a brief summary of the program curriculum drawn from catalogs and related materials disseminated by the program to prospective students; (3) a survey of dissertations completed during the 5-year period; and (4) an opinion questionnaire that drew responses from students at 13 of the 17 programs. An orientational survey, this study is intended only to be considered within a wider context in determining relevant problem areas related to library and information doctoral education, and the programs are not evaluated. Results of the faculty publication survey for each institution and summary results for all institutions surveyed are presented in tabular form, and the faculty publication survey subject classification scheme and a copy of the student questionnaire are provided. (KM)
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PURPOSE

The following is a compilation of information reflecting current doctoral-level library and information education in North America. It is not intended as an interpretive report but rather as an early product of my curiosity about this subject. It draws together and synthesizes certain information of interest not found, as such, elsewhere in order to assist in orienting myself with regard to the later selection of relevant areas that might contain problems worthy of research. Although the approach taken here is journalistic, it is hoped that this document may be of use to prospective doctoral students and of interest to others with concerns in this area.

It was decided that 17 programs would be examined from four accessible perspectives. The 17 were selected as those reported in Jonathan S. Tryon's October 1982 Library Quarterly article, "Theses and Dissertations Accepted by Graduate Library Schools: September 1978 Through August 1981," as having produced two or more dissertations during the period of interest. A list of these schools may be found in table 1. The four perspectives of interest were provided by: (1) a survey of faculty publications over the five-year-period 1978-1982, (2) brief summaries of the programs' curricula drawn from catalogs and related materials disseminated by the programs to prospective students, (3) a survey of dissertations completed during the five-year-period, and (4) an opinion questionnaire that drew responses from students at 13 of the 17 programs.

Faculty Publication Survey

Each program's current full-time assistants, associates, and full professors and deans were identified using their program's catalogs and related materials and the 1982 and 1983 directory issues of the Journal of Education for Librarianship (JEL). It is recognized that not all of these faculty members may be directly involved with their schools' doctoral programs, but it is assumed that, in either case, they are available as resources who may be drawn upon by doctoral students.

For the 215 faculty identified, a search was undertaken in the open library and information literature as represented by the 1978 through 1981 annual volumes and February 1982 through June 1983 bimonthly issues of Library Literature, in the January/February 1978 through June 1983 issues of Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA), and in the February 1978 through December 1982 bimonthly numbers of the less timely Information Science Abstracts (ISA), for contributions dated 1978 through 1982.
Library Literature is produced by H.W. Wilson Company, a private firm in the United States, and is more library oriented. LISA is produced by the (British) Library Association, is library and information oriented, and perhaps benefits, in selecting works for inclusion, from a distant perspective. ISA is sponsored by ASIS, American Chemical Society's Division of Chemical Information, Special Libraries Association, American Society of Indexers, and ALA's Library Research Round Table, and is more information oriented. These indexes do not account for the entire published output of either the library and information field or of the selected faculties, but when taken together seem less likely to have distorted the faculties' comparative outputs than to have presented them in scale.

The intention in selecting contributions was to identify instances of faculty responsibility for published works. If a faculty member was identified as having authored a portion of a larger work which he or she also edited or compiled, only the overall editorship or compilation was considered. As well, other authors identified as contributing to the larger work were considered responsible for their contributions. A work jointly authored, edited, or compiled by two selected faculty members was considered twice. The same work identified as having been published twice was also considered twice. It was not always possible to identify multiple publications of the same work, and to have defined the contribution to the open literature as the work itself and to have deleted known duplicates would have additionally distorted this survey.

Perhaps inconsistently, errata and letters to editors, when identified as such, were deleted as being typically of a clearly lesser order of consequence than works considered. They seemed easier to distinguish and, in any event, very few.

Also, in an attempt to avoid permitting regular journal columns a disproportionate influence upon the survey, authors or editors of columns or "department" features were credited with only one contribution for each journal volume in which their features appeared, regardless of the number of component issues in which these were included.

Table 1 divides the 1317 selected contributions among the 17 programs. In the table each program's overall faculty contribution average is determined, for the five-year-period, by dividing the program's total number of selected contributions by its total number of identified faculty members. For example, Illinois' 159 contributions are divided by its 14 faculty to determine its average of 11.4. Note that in addition to the total number of each program's identified faculty, the table also reports the number found to have contributed to the literature.
# TABLE 1

**Faculty Publication Survey**

(Summary Table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Contribution Average</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Contributing Faculty</th>
<th>Total Contributions</th>
<th>Journal Contributions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Contributions</th>
<th>Conference Contributions</th>
<th>Book Contributions</th>
<th>Report Contributions</th>
<th>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(60.4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(52.9)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(65.5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(59.2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(25.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(51.2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(61.6)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(69.1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(70.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(36.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(67.9)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(68.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(32.7)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(44.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(71.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(34.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(81.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The faculty contribution averages, representing overall levels of productivity within the open literature during the five-year-period 1980-1982, are determined by dividing each program's total number of contributions to the literature by its total number of identified faculty members.*
For each program, the summary table divides the number of journal contributions from all others, and reports the journal contributions as a percentage of the total. The remaining contributions are further divided among conference presentations and editorships and, less clearly, among other "books" emanating from publishing houses and the major associations, etc., that might tend to be available commercially, and various other "reports," including a few faculty dissertations, that might ordinarily tend to require more scholarly means of access. Note that the total number of conference contributions identified is slightly underestimated, here, as a few were published in journals.

The summary table also reports numbers and percentages of contributions to works jointly authored, edited, and compiled. Note that these do not report a systematic inflation of a faculty's total number of actual publications since responsibility for a published work might be shared with another member of the same faculty, a member of another selected faculty, or someone else.

For each program, in the body of the document to follow, an expanded table supplements the overall information presented in the summary table with corresponding information for the program's assistants, associates, and professors and deans. Also in the body of the document is a breakdown of the journals in which each faculty published.

The remaining portions of the faculty publication survey are summaries of subjects written about by each faculty grade within each program. The classification scheme used in arranging the summaries is based on the faculty "Classification Guide" in the 1983 JEL Directory Issue which was modified and expanded to reflect the dominant subjects recognized in the content of the selected contributions. The scheme includes general categories relating to school libraries and children, and to other library and information service, materials, and use, a number of categories representing more specific forms of service and related considerations, categories relating to personnel and education, a category for publishing and related industries, and additional general categories for automation and technology, for communications and information science topics, for research-related matters and techniques, and for history. The subject classification of the faculty publication survey details these categories and, separately, additional descriptive factors commonly included in the summaries. Within each summary, the number of applicable contributions precedes each subject description.
Program Curriculum Summary

These summaries were drawn from published catalogs and related materials descriptive of the 17 programs, typically disseminated by them to prospective students.

For programs currently offering two degrees, a distinction is drawn between the two. Requirements, and any nontypical prerequisites, are set out to the extent specified in the programs' materials. Note that, in all cases, course credits given are minimums and assume the possession of a master's degree.

Opportunities for study in areas outside the program are described to the extent specified. Occasionally, illustrative programs of study or, comprehensive, or preliminary, or qualifying examination topics are also provided.

Note that although the materials from which the curriculum surveys are drawn may in certain cases be somewhat dated due to recent changes in faculty or programs of study, even relative to the time period under consideration, and often the most interesting facets of programs cannot properly be committed to print, these materials seem, from the corporate nature of their construction and their rough uniformity of purpose if not format, a worthwhile point of departure in considering the programs' curricular components.

Dissertation Survey

For 16 of the 17 programs a search was undertaken in the "Information Science" and "Library Science" sections of the January 1978 through September 1983 numbers of Dissertation Abstracts International, Part A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, for dissertations dated 1978 through 1982. These sections of Dissertation Abstracts were considered to most regularly represent dissertation research in the open library and information literature, but for the remaining program, Chicago's, which was found not to have listed its dissertations in them, a number were located in the corresponding sections of the 1977-78 through 1979-80 volumes of American Doctoral Dissertations, as well as in the 1982 Library Quarterly article mentioned earlier. These were augmented by a few additional proposals for dissertation research approved at Chicago during the five-year-period, located in the "Current Research" section of the Summer 1978 through Fall 1982 issues of Journal of Education for Librarianship.
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In all, 319 dissertations and six additional Chicago proposals were located. Subject summaries of these are presented for each program, largely following the classification scheme used for the faculty publication subject summaries, although here the latter general categories of the faculty scheme, with the exception of that for history, are compressed into one "other topics" category. Within each summary, the number of applicable dissertations precedes each subject description.

For those programs offering two degrees, separate summaries are presented for each, except in the case of Pittsburgh, where both degrees offered are Ph.D.s and Dissertation Abstracts "Information Science" and "Library Science" categories are not sufficient to distinguish between information science and library science degrees.

Student Questionnaire

Mailings of questionnaires were sent to the 17 schools. Sixteen confirmed receipt either with the return of completed questionnaires and often other requested materials, or, in three cases, with a letter declining participation and, in one, the return of my mailing. Each mailing contained my request for the cooperation of the school's dean and doctoral program's administrator, and ten questionnaires with explanatory cover letters and stamped return envelopes, or, for Toronto, envelopes containing international postal coupons redeemable for return postage. An additional form, again with a stamped return envelope or envelope with coupon, requested of the program administrators names and addresses of questionnaire recipients in order to permit any necessary follow-up mailings being made directly to them.

Five of the questionnaires, with their cover letters and return envelopes, were sealed in additional stamped envelopes, or in sealed envelopes accompanied by coupons, and were intended for forwarding to "random candidates," who it was assumed might not have regular contact with their program's office. The remaining five questionnaires, stapled to their cover letters and return envelopes, were intended for distribution to "random students" taking coursework. Note that random sampling, though welcome, was not assumed, and I do not know the methods used by administrators to distribute questionnaires.

Follow-up mailings were sent as needed to programs and to student recipients. As only seven of the 13 participating programs returned lists of recipient names and addresses, the total number of questionnaires distributed is not known, but, in all, 80 of between 96 and 121 student recipients...
responded to this “straw poll” with questionnaires completed in various degrees.

Presented in the text to follow, for each cooperating program, are the number of its student respondents, of the total number of questionnaire recipients, if known. These are accompanied by numbers of checked and filled-in reasons for their attending the program, the number who attended the same school for a library or information master’s degree, and by the respondents’ checked overall satisfaction level with their doctoral program.

Summaries of student respondent perceptions of areas of strength, weakness, and limited applicability in their program’s curriculum and research components and relative to other or more general concerns are also presented. Curriculum summaries include checked appraisals of opportunities for supervised independent study in various subject areas. These are presented as a consensus together with any exceptions. Research summaries include respondents’ research interests and their checked appraisals of experienced or anticipated program support for them. Often more than one interest was specified, but here only the first is considered.

Student questionnaire items summarized are reproduced later in this paper. Note that the three questions requesting information on faculty strengths and weaknesses relative to curriculum, research, and other concerns were largely interpreted by respondents as being related to these program areas in general, and that responses to these questions are summarized as such. As well, responses to the two questions requesting information on any important topics ignored by programs were summarized as program weaknesses.

Students’ and candidates’ responses to questionnaire items were considered too similar to warrant presenting separately, and, for the three programs currently offering two degrees, it was not always possible to distinguish between students in each program in order to determine with certainty if presenting their responses separately might be desirable.

For Further Consideration

This brief, orientational survey is intended only to be considered within a wider context in determining relevant problem areas related to library and information doctoral education and I have not attempted to offer any evaluation of the programs examined, as this would distract attention from the working papers to follow while merely adding yet another premature interpretive contribution to the related literature.
I would like to end these introductory pages only by suggesting that one, perhaps not generally recognized problem area fundamental to a thorough evaluation of programs or educational process underlies an acute need for determined, systematic investigations of the nature of the constraints placed upon both programs and process by organizations essentially external to education and primarily social service (or social activist) oriented rather than scholarly (such as control the accreditation of related programs and schools), within or under the influence of which much of the programs' direction is intended to be decided, and of alternative organizational frameworks that might capably facilitate decisive scholarly discussion necessary to address a lack of clear direction.
Faculty Publication Survey Subject Classification

General service categories:
- School library service, materials and use, and children
- Other library and information service, materials, use and users

Specific forms of service:
- Reference and information service
- Collection development
- Bibliographic instruction
- Independent adult learning
- Information retrieval
- Circulation
- Technical services
- Materials preservation

Service related categories:
- Advertising, marketing, public relations
- Cooperation, systems, networking, etc.
- Standards and codes
- Intellectual freedom and censorship
- Information policy and planning
- Legislation and government funding
- Copyright

Personnel related categories:
- Librarians and information professionals
- Education and training for librarianship
- Professional organizations
- International and comparative librarianship

A publishing and information industry category
An automation and technology category

Other, broader or conceptual categories:
- Communications
- Information science
- Research, methods and techniques
- History

Additional descriptive factors commonly included in the summaries:
- Library type
- Collection subject
- Materials type
- User group
- Geographic or demographic factors
- Specific organization or institution
- Future conditions
- Societal context
- Administrative aspects
  - Governance
  - Planning
  - Economics or fees
  - Budgeting
  - Systems
  - Operations research
  - Measurement and evaluation
  - Management by objectives
  - Facilities planning
  - Work analysis
  - Personnel management

* The classification scheme used in arranging the summaries is based on the faculty Classification Guide in the 1983 JFL Directory issue, which was modified and expanded to reflect the dominant subject recognized in the content of the selected contributions to the open literature.
The Student Questionnaire

Items Summarized:

This survey instrument deals with the adequacy of doctoral programs in library and information studies. I would appreciate the benefit of your perspective on these aspects of your program concerning which you have familiarity or insight.

How did you select your program? 
proximity to home  
other geographical preference  
program's reputation  
program's scholarly emphasis or interests  
wish to study with particular faculty member(s)  
no library work experience requirement  
no language requirement  
time required to complete degree  
offer of scholarship/financial aid/job/etc.  
already employed at university/college offering program  
others:

Did you attend the university/college offering your program for your master's degree?  
yes  
no  
If yes, is your master's degree in library studies?  
yes  
no  
What is the total number of program credit hours you both have completed and are currently taking?  

Overall, are you happy with your choice of program?  
very happy  
reasonably happy  
unhappy  
If unhappy, do you intend to withdraw transfer continue towards degree  

Does your program offer courses that seem to have limited applicability to the field?  
yes  
no  
If yes, on what topics?  

Does your program not offer courses on topics that seem to have significant applicability to the field?  
yes  
no  
If yes, on what topics?  

How would you characterize your program's opportunities for independent study on topics significant to the field but not covered by courses of directed study?  
reader's services technical services administration information studies  
very helpful adequate inadequate  

What would you consider as noteworthy strengths and weaknesses of your program's faculty relative to the program's curriculum? (and as these have affected or as you anticipate they will affect you)  
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The Student Questionnaire (cont.)

Do your program's predominant research interests currently seem to relate to:
--- (check one) reader's services technical services administration information studies (if interests seem largely historical or methodological, add 'H' or 'M' after check)

How would you rate your program's capacity to pursue these interests?
--- reader's services technical services administration information studies

What particular research topics are of interest to you personally?

How does your program rate (or do you anticipate it will rate) in supporting your interests?
--- rating anticipated

Are patterns of research projects undertaken within your program that seem to have limited applicability to the field?
--- yes no

If yes, on what topics?

Does research within your program tend to ignore topics that seem to have significant applicability to the field?
--- yes no

If yes, what topics?

What would you consider as noteworthy strengths and weaknesses of your program's faculty relative to research? (and as these have affected or as you anticipate they will affect you)

What would you consider as noteworthy strengths and weaknesses of your program's faculty relative to matters important to the program other than curriculum and research? (and as these have affected or as you anticipate they will affect you)

The remaining space is for any questions or comments you may have. Thank you for your participation and assistance.
Berkeley—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(80.8)</td>
<td>(60.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td>(20.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 19 journals with more than one contribution in each of 6 journals:

2 in Computing Machinery 5 in JASIS
4 in Drexel Library Quarterly 2 in Library Research
2 in Information Processing and Management

Assistants (24 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (5) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: retrieval, some on fees, some interest in public libraries—surveys of available databases in California and Missouri. (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: Library of Congress subject cataloging—evaluations of COM catalogs—indexing. (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service demand, fees, and planning, some interest in public libraries—service implications of the growth of knowledge in the social and behavioral sciences. (4) COOPERATION: reference referral in California—Evaluations of NASA's NALNET book system. (3) RESEARCH: research record use—citation analysis of computer field
literature. (1) supply of/demand for LIBRARIANS. (1) the AUTOMATED office. (1) a HISTORICAL STUDY on Italian music incunabula.

Associates (3 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (2) SERVICE fees and economics. (1) demand for LIBRARIANS.

Professors (26 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (6) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library service and book and information use, some on evaluation—legal document delivery. (6) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, some on evaluating system effectiveness, and on probability ranked search output. (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: indexing. (5) EDUCATION: library and information education, some on preparing for service policy analysis, and on continuing education—some reference to programs in the United States and Canada. (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT. (1) AUTOMATION TOPICS. (1) quantitative RESEARCH. (1) a HISTORY of federal government information.

Berkeley—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offerings: Ph.D., DLIS (Doctor of Library and Information Studies)
The Ph.D. is an academic degree “centered entirely on a subject matter.” The Ph.D. dissertation reports “pure or ‘applied’ research, and involves the discovery of knowledge.” The DLIS is a professional degree “centered on preparation for professional practice.” The DLIS dissertation “focuses on making use of available knowledge in the attempt to invent or create new ways of doing things.”

Neither degree program has specific course or unit requirements. Programs of study may include work outside the program, in such areas as business administration, statistics, education, etc. A student may do “considerable amounts of work in other departments to acquire the necessary competencies: for instance, the study of mathematics, statistics, logic, linguistics, in preparation for theoretical work in information studies.” Foreign language(s) may be required per student needs.

Ph.D. examination topics (2 are required):
—Information systems analysis and library automation
—Library organization and management
—Formal techniques for intellectual access to recorded information
—Economics of information
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—Social studies of information
—Contemporary bibliographical organization
—Theory of bibliographical organization
—Comparative librarianship
—History of printing and bookmaking
—History of publishing

DLIS examination topics (all are required):
—Basic librarianship
—Environmental variables as they affect library services
—Library technology
—Analysis and design tools
—Evaluation
—Demonstration of successful experience in service design
(and choice of 1):
—Organization and management of libraries and information services
—Library automation
—Information systems analysis
—Subject access to documents and information

Berkeley—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (10 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: client reaction to educational information service—student user time allocation—the public library’s organizational adaptation to its environment—time allocation and public finance approaches to public library user fees. (2) HISTORICAL STUDIES on Italian music incunabula, and a San Francisco printer. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: corporate authorship. (1) resource allocation and simulation model of REFERENCE/information service management. (1) LIBRARIANS: library manpower. (1) OTHER TOPICS: pragmatic aspects of inquiry.

DLIS/DLS (3 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: restructuring research library functions. (1) LIBRARIANS: designing Zambian library human resource development. (1) LEGISLATION, ETC.: allocation of state funds to California public library systems.

Berkeley—Student Questionnaire

Berkeley declined to distribute questionnaires to students.
Case—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>(64.7)</td>
<td>(45.8)</td>
<td>(32.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 22 journals with more than one contribution in each of 7 journals:

2 in ASIS Bulletin
4 in Collection Management
3 in Information Processing and Management
3 in Library Research
4 in Library Research
8 in Special Libraries
3 in UNESCO Journal of Information Science
3 in JASIS

Assistants (5 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (3) RESEARCH: historical/bibliographic research—scientific communication. (2) systematic book PRESERVATION.

Associates (17 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (10) RESEARCH: bibliometrics and citation analysis, some on studies of nonscientific literatures—scientific communication. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: serials use—evaluating book availability. (2)
INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, some on presearch aspects. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: automatic indexing. (1) COOPERATION: serials sharing. (1) public access to library AUTOMATION.

Professors (48 Contributions).
Subject Summary: (13) library and information SERVICE and needs, some on health and scientific/technical information, some interest in the third world. (11) library and information EDUCATION, some interest in Latin America. (5) COOPERATION: subject cataloging and searching in OCLC. (4) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: the future of the catalog—an indexing system for automated catalogs (PRECIS). (3) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: some on presearch aspects, and on systems in science/technology. (3) INFORMATION SCIENCE and COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS. (3) RESEARCH on information systems and on classification. (2) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: collections in science/biomedicine—demand on journal collections. (2) AUTOMATION TOPICS. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION in the third world. (1) a HISTORY of information education.

Case—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 24-36 semester hours including:
—Doctoral seminar (one or more semesters)
Students without competence in statistics are required to take either:
—Basic statistics, or
—Quantitative methods
and those not familiar with computer programming and applications must take:
—Information processing
in addition to basic course requirements.

All courses necessary to satisfy the requirements are given by the program, but opportunities for study in outside areas are available.

Case—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (27 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (7) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: file organization and retrieval efficiency analysis—constructing systematic author-name
files—an indexing system as a switching language for integrating automated information networks—quantitative approaches to thesaurus dynamics—social science terminology in discipline based information systems—subject related documents' citation and index term similarities—identifying relevant document sets from a known document. (6) OTHER TOPICS: a critique of theses and dissertation style manuals—bibliometric study of scientific community dynamics—bibliometric analysis of relationships between the patent and scientific journal literatures—measuring periodical scattering and obsolescence—journal evaluation entropy measure—scientific management literature analysis. (4) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: principles and purpose of Roget's thesaurus—Ranganathan's influence on faceted classification—bibliographic relationships between subject defined document populations—analytical approach for studying corporate authorship in cataloging. (4) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: information theory applications for materials selection and collection evaluation—quantitative model for selecting biomedical journals—problem-oriented approach to small community college journal selection—school library book fund allocation according to curriculum. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: model of recorded information flow in ambulatory care—Nigerian M.D.'s' information needs and use of information systems. (2) COOPERATION: design for cooperation among Iranian academic libraries—history and plan for development of Iran's public library system. (1) systematic library book PRESERVATION. (1) a HISTORY of federal assistance to public libraries.

Case—Student Questionnaire
(2 of an Unspecified Number of Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (2) proximity to home, (1) personal achievement, (1) opportunity to receive information science training without having a technical background, (1) employer pays tuition. Both respondents attended Case for a library/information master's degree. Both are reasonably happy at Case.

Curriculum-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (2 respondents): (1) bibliometrics, (1) faculty are attempting to modernize curriculum and add more practical knowledge.
AREAS OF WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) archives and medical libraries, (1) relevance, (1) index structure, (1) information science, (1) faculty are too removed from library and information work and "practical issues."
AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) industrial library management.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (2 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate.
Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (2 respondents): (1) academic, medical, and public libraries, (1) children's services, (1) theoretical issues, (1) faculty's research background and good ideas, (1) faculty's helpfulness. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (1 respondent): (1) library practice, (1) library administrative planning. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) bibliometrics. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (2 respondents): (1) relevance in indexing and abstracting/very helpful, (1) bibliometrics/very helpful.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (1 respondent): (1) school has a friendly, pleasant atmosphere.
### Chicago—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>30% (40.0%)</td>
<td>75% (75.0%)</td>
<td>65.5% (65.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>3.3% (13.3%)</td>
<td>10% (10.0%)</td>
<td>10.9% (10.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Journal Contributions

The faculty have published in 18 journals with more than one contribution in each of 7 journals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JASIS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Education for Librarianship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Library &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Quarterly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Library History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Library Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Library Bulletin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Associates (15 Contributions)

**Subject Summary:** (15) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: services and materials for children and youth—children's literature awards.

#### Professors (40 Contributions)

**Subject Summary:** (18) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service economics—implications of the growth of knowledge for service—research library future conditions—public library societal context and service access—models of document retrieval—a library operations research primer. (7) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, some on evaluating system effectiveness.
Chicago—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.
Course Requirements: 18 courses, at least 9 of which are to be taken before candidacy. Required courses include:
—Empirical research methods
Typically, additional courses in statistics and research methods are also “appropriate.” Two foreign languages are required.
The following illustrative course concentration reflect “some of the enormously varied professional and research opportunities in the field:”
—Information systems, services, and management
—Scientific and technical information
—Libraries, manuscripts, books, and information as social and historical phenomena
—Literature and libraries for children and youth
—Management of libraries and information centers
Illustrative concentrations typically include coursework in such areas as business, philosophy, history, sociology, and education.

Chicago—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (18 Dissertations and *Proposals)
book publishing, and a Chicago printer and his press. (2) OTHER TOPICS: database structures and transformations—discourse cohesion in printed text. (1) COOPERATION: academic library resource sharing systems.

Chicago—Student Questionnaire

Chicago declined to distribute questionnaires to students.
Columbia—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(63.9)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(48.3)</td>
<td>(59.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(30.6)</td>
<td>(30.3)</td>
<td>(19.8)</td>
<td>(25.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 23 journals with more than one contribution in each of 11 journals:

- 5 in *AB Bookman's Weekly*
- 2 in *American Libraries*
- 2 in *College & Research Libraries*
- 3 in *JASIS*
- 2 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
- 2 in *Journal of Library Automation*
- 16 in *Library Journal*
- 6 in *Library Trends*
- 2 in *Libri*
- 3 in *Scientific and Technical Libraries*
- 2 in *Special Libraries*

Assistants (36 Contributions)
*Subject Summary:* (15) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: materials and service in special collections, and, with some reference to current awareness, in science/technology—historians' information needs—the library's societal context. (6) EDUCATION: education for school librarianship—continuing education for academic and research library reference work—extended master's program. (4) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: cataloging and indexing science/technology materials—automated rare

Associates (33 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (10) salaries of/demand for LIBRARIANS. (5) EDUCATION: education for materials preservation—statistical report of library and Information students. (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service budgeting—implications of the information explosion for service—survey of a Hawaiian regional collection. (3) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT aided by citation analysis and online systems, and some on serials. (3) RESEARCH: bibliometric studies of pharmaceutical research and of U.N. document indexes and bibliographies. (2) materials PRESERVATION; some interest in research libraries. (2) the U.N. document SYSTEM. (2) a HISTORICAL STUDY on book ownership marks, and a historical bibliography. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: classification and indexing. (1) TECHNICAL SERVICES: economics of serials processing.

Professors (29 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (7) INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, some on youth, and some interest in the Freedom to Read Foundation. (6) EDUCATION: library education, some on preparing for work with media—programs at Columbia—extended master's programs—faculty. (5) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library governance and facility planning—materials for children and youth. (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: governance—views on the Library of Congress—public library economic setting—the library's societal context. (3) LIBRARIANS: salaries of/demand for librarians—school librarians and change. (2) HISTORY: a historical study on urban libraries—the public library's historical relationship to the humanities. (1) INDEPENDENT ADULT LEARNING. (1) school library STANDARDS.

Columbia—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: DLS (Doctor of Library Science).
Course Requirements: 10 courses including:
—Research methods
—Seminar in research methods
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Requirements are met in or outside the program per student needs. Foreign language(s), computer languages, statistics, or other competencies may be required per student needs.

Examination topics (all are required):
—History and function of libraries
—Resources and technical services
—Administration and management
—User services
—A specialized topic from an approved list

Columbia—Dissertation Survey

**DLS (20 Dissertations)**

**Subject Summary:** (8) HISTORICAL STUDIES on the New York Historical Society, the Engineering Societies Library, the federal depository library system, Senegalese libraries, archives, and documentation centers, Jamaican school libraries, the 18th-century American book trade, the New York City Russian language periodical press, and reading research and librarianship. (4) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: bibliographic control of U.N. system documentation—citation patterns and bibliographic control of population studies literature—LC, NICEM, and PRECIS subject and form headings for 16mm films—design principles for computerized bibliographic data input. (3) LIBRARIANS: research library staff attitudes toward collective bargaining—public librarians' local unions—public librarians' attitudes toward access to media. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: management attitudes toward business and industrial libraries—information needs and information seeking behavior of publishing industry personnel. (2) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: teaching about television and other media in school libraries—New York City school library support components. (1) implications for national PLANNING of Nigerian university library cooperation.

Columbia—Student Questionnaire

No response was received from Columbia to either the student questionnaire mailing or to follow-up letters.
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE  
DREXEL UNIVERSITY (PHILADELPHIA)  

Drexel—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(78.8)</td>
<td>(67.4)</td>
<td>(72.0)</td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(60.9)</td>
<td>(34.9)</td>
<td>(32.0)</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 27 journals with more than one contribution in each of 15 journals:

- 4 in ASLIB Proceedings
- 3 in Catholic Library World
- 2 in Collection Management
- 6 in Drexel Library Quarterly
- 3 in IEEE Transactions of Professional Communications
- 12 in JASIS
- 4 in Journal of Documentation
- 2 in Journal of Education for Librarianship
- 2 in Library Journal
- 2 in Library Quarterly
- 3 in Library Research
- 2 in Library Trends
- 2 in Public Library Quarterly
- 2 in School Library Journal
- 3 in School Library Media
- Quarterly

Assistants (23 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (6) RESEARCH: communicating research in education—bibliometric studies of youth materials, and of materials used by high school students in completing assignments—applications of bibliometrics for library service. (5) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library use, some on evaluation—materials for children. (3)
LIBRARIANS: demand for librarians—supervising school library service, and an MBO approach to school library staff supervision. (2) POLICY: implications of national bibliographic planning for research libraries—the White House Conference. (2) EDUCATION: library and information students' leadership style preferences—continuing education. (1) evaluating REFERENCE service. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION. (1) COOPERATION: the Consortium for Public Library Innovation. (1) PUBLISHING: the New Zealand book trade. (1) INFORMATION SCIENCE topics.

Associates (43 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (13) RESEARCH: bibliometrics and citation analysis, some on studies of library literature, science literatures, and on materials used by high school students in completing assignments—applications of bibliometrics for library service. (8) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: retrieval, some on system— in science/technology and on SDI—user aspects, including a bibliometric treatment of search output. (6) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library facility and materials use, some on evaluation and on budgeting. (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: materials in science/technology—use of science/technology materials by public managers—a review of an encyclopedia. (5) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS, including micrographics. (2) machine readable data in PUBLISHING. (1) evaluating REFERENCE service. (1) serials COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT. (1) CONSER program of COOPERATION in serials conservation. (1) societal context of library CENSORSHIP.

Professor (25 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (9) RESEARCH: public library research—bibliometrics and citation analysis, some on studies of hard science and of social and behavioral science literatures—applications of bibliometrics for library service. (4) REFERENCE, some on evaluation, and some interest in public libraries. (4) COOPERATION: information referral services. (3) EDUCATION, some on programs at Drexel. (3) COMMUNICATIONS and INFORMATION SCIENCE TOPICS. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library and information service management—public library evaluation.

Drexel—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 60 quarter hours, including:
—16-20 hours in one of three specialty areas of study
Areas of Study:

- Management of information resources, including "administrative theory, management techniques, and research and evaluation methods."
The relevant minor is "in a field such as organization behavior, public administration, or educational administration."

- Scholarly and professional communication, focusing on "the nature of information and information transfer, models for...service, social factors in the utilization of information, and communication and information theory." Study is also required in an outside area to which the specialization's "theoretical and methodological training is directly applicable."

- Information systems design and evaluation, "oriented toward information handling in terms of the organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information," and emphasizing systems analysis or design as well as the theoretical bases of information handling. The relevant minor is in an area such as "computer science, linguistics, or human factors."

Typically programs of study include fieldwork or internships "to provide a setting for the development of analytic and research abilities, not for administrative experience."

**Drexel—Dissertation Survey**

**Ph.D. (7 Dissertations)**

*Subject Summary:* (2) LIBRARIANS: relating achievement motivation theory to college and university librarians—analysis of public library decision-making processes. (2) OTHER TOPICS: bibliometric analysis of pharmaceutical research—bibliometric study of materials used by high school students in completing assignments. (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: impact of socioeconomic conditions on level of third world information activity. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: identifying measures that discriminate between different user experience levels. (1) COOPERATION: quality of member input OCLC monograph records.

**Drexel—Student Questionnaire**

*(9 of 10 Recipients Responded)*

*Reasons for Attending:* (7) program's reputation, (6) program's scholarly interests, (5) proximity to home, (3) particular faculty members, (3) offer of aid/job, (3) geographic preference, (1) no library work experience requirement, (1) "dumb luck." 1 respondent attended Drexel for a library/infor-
ation master's degree. 4 are very happy at Drexel, 3 are reasonably happy, 1 is reasonably happy to unhappy but will continue, and 1 is unhappy but will continue.

Curriculum-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (7 respondents): (1) student anticipates administration, systems analysis, bibliometrics, and research methods have provided useful academic and research "job skills," (1) program offers good support for information systems work, (1) entire faculty is qualified to teach research methods, (1) programs' nonstructured curriculum and the use of outside resources, (1) faculty tend to be specialized in information or computer science rather than in library science, (1) faculty's research orientation and treatment of information rather than libraries provides a broader context for considering information work, (1) most faculty are hardworking, helpful, dedicated, and valuable resources.

AREAS OF WEAKNESS (5 respondents): (2) information system design and development including human factors, (1) management, (1) information systems lacks a "coherent core," (1) faculty include too many bibliometricians, the subject lacks "practical value," (1) theoretical issues, philosophy of information science and scientific communication, (1) courses are specific, and students don't interact with all of the specialized faculty, (1) faculty member with a national reputation is an inadequate teacher and not worthwhile unless students are interested in the particular specialty taught.

AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (3 respondents): (2) yes, unspecified, (1) scientific and technical communication.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (8 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate.

Research-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (8 respondents): (4) faculty have varied research experience and many publications in such areas as management, systems, communications, and psychology, (1) indexing, (1) database development, (1) bibliometrics and citation analysis, (1) faculty are in the "forefront" of the study of scientific communication in the United States, (1) faculty are strong in research design and statistics, and in teaching analytic skills, (1) problem selection training, (1) program has grants and ongoing research in readers' services and information systems, (1) program offers ample student computer time, (1) faculty have rigorous scientific standards.

AREAS OF WEAKNESS (5 respondents): (2) information systems, including human factors, (1) library applications, (1) faculty have little background in networks and resource sharing, (1) library education, (1) faculty are not familiar with third world scientific communication, (1) faculty are weak in experimental design.

AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (3
respondents): (3) bibliometrics and citation analysis. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (9 respondents): (1) administration/very helpful, (1) online information retrieval/adequate, (1) evaluation of library network resource sharing programs/adequate, (1) personnel management/adequate, (1) human factors in database and information system design/adequate, (1) computer system design for unsophisticated users/adequate, (1) bibliometrics/very helpful, (1) scholarly communication and bibliometrics/very helpful, (1) third world scientific communication/inadequate.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (6 respondents): (5) faculty are generally open, approachable, personable, supportive, and willing to give good advice, (2) faculty are well known, in contact with the most important people in the field, and know what is happening elsewhere, (1) faculty often overlook student limitations, and are sometimes less concerned with students than with their own research, student considers this beneficial.
Florida—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(35.7)</td>
<td>(63.8)</td>
<td>(51.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(31.9)</td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions

The faculty have published in 20 journals with more than one contribution in each of 7 journals:

2 in Catholic Library World
6 in Florida Media Quarterly
2 in Journal of Education for Librarianship
2 in Library Resources & Technical Services
2 in Online Review
2 in RQ
10 in School Library Media Quarterly

Assistants (7 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (3) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: bibliography and indexes. (2) SYSTEMS: the International Food Information Service, and the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: materials for dairy farmers. (1) LIBRARIANS: international library and documentation organizations.

Associates (28 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (11) POLICY: national information planning and policy, some on NCLIS, and some interest in the role of state libraries, and in special libraries—the White House Conference. (6) COOPERATION:
library and information service networks—international cooperation—the Soviet library system. (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: subject cataloging, some on Library of Congress Subject Headings for black literature—AACR2. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: organizing career counseling service—societal context, library s.-regation. (2) LEGISLATION: federal legislation for service programs—impact of legislation on service management. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL. (1) AUTOMATION in the Illinois state library.

Professors (47 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (10) school library COOPERATION, some with public libraries. (7) EDUCATION: program quality, preparing for reference work, instruction for the physically handicapped, and, with some interest in school libraries, doctoral research—effect of American library education on South East Asian library development—the American Association of Library Schools. (6) LEGISLATION: Florida school library legislation—developing state legislation and accreditation programs for school libraries. (5) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: use by scientists, and comparisons of use by academics and industrial workers. (4) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library service, some on materials use—films for children. (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library service to blacks and the physically handicapped—state library development. (3) LIBRARIANS: school librarians, some on their instructional role—school library staff supervision. (2) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT, some interest in school libraries. (2) RESEARCH: current research in children's services—an energy research manpower directory. (1) REFERENCE. (1) school library BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION. (1) children's INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM. (1) library serial PUBLISHERS' criteria for accepting unsolicited manuscripts. (1) a HISTORY of the St. Augustine Library Association.

Florida—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 24 semester hours.
Students without competence in statistics are required to complete:
—Basic descriptive and inferential statistics applications
before entering the program.
Foreign language(s), and additional statistics and research tools may be required.
Florida—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (34 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (12) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: general open-system model for academic library management and research—use of library science dissertations and periodicals indexed in SSCI—identifying variables affecting college library budget decisions—guidelines for black college and university library development—black academic library service contributions to the black community—community college vocational/technical shop collections—statewide public library film service—a delphi study on planning for service to older adults—applications of selected environmental factors in library facility planning—delphi study on library facility planning by a university community—comparisons of practitioners' satisfaction with new buildings and with renovations—feasibility of a state property insurance plan for Louisiana public libraries. (5) LIBRARIANS: career profiles of women academic library directors—personality and leadership qualities in relation to management talent—relating school librarians' educational level to instructional competencies—librarian and union representative perceptions of collective bargaining proposals—handicapped librarians' careers. (5) EDUCATION: education in the United States and Canada for work with serials—attitudes of educators and practitioners on education for materials conservation—library science students' cognitive style—effects of role playing, language intensity, and cognitive complexity on attitude change—state library involvement with continuing education for public librarians. (3) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: case studies of exemplary public high school libraries—survey of Florida public school library resources for exceptional students—content analysis of American Indians in fiction for children and youth. (2) REFERENCE: Southwestern academic library reference service effectiveness—predicting reference accuracy among new reference librarians. (2) OTHER TOPICS: Puerto Rican colonial newspapers and journals as musicological research resource materials—bibliometric study of collaboration in cancer research. (2) HISTORICAL STUDIES on American academic librarianship, and American music librarianship. (1) effect of automated CIRCULATION on service environment. (1) Florida public community college presidents', deans', and library administrators' attitudes toward the 1972 two-year college library STANDARDS. (1) LEGISLATION: LSCA Title II cooperation in the Southeast.

Florida—Student Questionnaire

(4 of No More Than 7 Recipients Responded)

No list of recipients was received from, and three questionnaires were returned by the program's office.
Reasons for Attending: (2) proximity to home, (1) program's reputation, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) time required to complete degree, (1) geographic preference, (1) friends' recommendations. 1 respondent attended Florida for a library/information master's degree. 1 is very happy at Florida and 3 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (1 respondent): (1) all areas except information science, (1) faculty's helpfulness. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (3 respondents): (1) readers' services, (1) technical services, (1) information science, (1) research, (1) coursework doesn't prepare students for examinations, (1) faculty seem preoccupied with program development. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (4 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate, (1) technical services/inadequate.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (2 respondents): (2) half or most of the faculty are research oriented and publish. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty lack third world expertise, (1) information science. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (4 respondents): (1) administration/very helpful, (1) administrative problems/adequate, (1) public library services for children and youth/adequate, (1) bibliographic instruction for African students/very helpful.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (3 respondents): (2) faculty are available, open, and generally helpful and well prepared, (1) one faculty member is well known in library circles and, student anticipates, would be helpful with job placement.
Illinois—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(64.6)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(58.9)</td>
<td>(61.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(39.6)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
<td>(35.3)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 41 journals with more than one contribution in each of 14 journals:

- 4 in *American Libraries*
- 6 in *ASIS Bulletin*
- 3 in *Collection Management*
- 3 in *Government Publications Review*
- 8 in *Illinois Libraries*
- 8 in *JASIS*
- 8 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
- 3 in *Library Journal*
- 3 in *Library Quarterly*
- 10 in *Library Trends*
- 3 in *Online Review*
- 5 in *Public Library Quarterly*
- 2 in *School Media Quarterly*
- 5 in *Special Libraries*

**Assistants (48 Contributions)**

**Subject Summary:** (16) LIBRARIANS: school librarians’ workforce analysis—women and minorities, some in academic libraries—salaries and career patterns—profile of ALA members. (10) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: research collections of children’s books, social science collections, and government documents in academic libraries—special libraries for state
government—some on films, and service to Illinois women in public libraries—the library's context in an electronic society. (4) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: implications of artificial intelligence in retrieval—database directories. (4) EDUCATION, extended master's programs, and comparisons with other professions. (3) COPYRIGHT, some on duplicating television programs in schools. (3) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS, including public access. (3) RESEARCH: research and development in information retrieval—citation analysis. (2) effect of cable television ADVERTISING on public library circulation. (2) INFORMATION SCIENCE and COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS, including electronic information systems. (2) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS, including public access. (2) library service STANDARDS, some on rural public libraries. (1) evaluating REFERENCE service. (1) historical RESEARCH on 19th-century children's books.

**Associates (21 Contributions)**

Subject Summary: (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library work analysis—use of government documents—state and local document collections—historical children's book collections. (4) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: periodicals in school library programs—public library children's services. (3) EDUCATION: foundations, preparing for work with library automation, and optimizing student selection. (3) AUTOMATION TOPICS: planning for and public access to library automation—library minicomputers. (2) COOPERATION between school and public libraries. (2) library service STANDARDS, some on rural public libraries. (1) evaluating REFERENCE service. (1) historical RESEARCH on 19th-century children's books.

**Professors (90 Contributions)**

Subject Summary: (34) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service and use evaluation—future research libraries—American music history materials—agricultural librarianship—an evaluation of Goddard Space Flight Center information services—Alberta's alcohol abuse libraries—special libraries for state government, and state libraries—service to local decision-makers—public library service, planning, evaluation, and administration—public library humanities collections, and comparisons of United States and Canadian fiction and nonfiction holdings—evaluations of public library adult book use—organizing library support—the library's context in an electronic society. (9) library, information and documentation EDUCATION, some on foundations, computer programming, and doctoral research. (7) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: some on economics, and on evaluating system effectiveness—impact of online services on printed materials subscriptions. (7) COOPERATION: evaluations of the library networks of Illinois (ILLINET) and Virginia (VALNET), and an international agricultural information program.
(AGRIS)—public library cooperative cataloging and automated bibliographic networks—OCLC services in special libraries and information centers in the United States and Canada. (6) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: evaluation of collections and overlap in United States and Canadian public libraries, and in Canadian addiction libraries—materials budgets. (5) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS, including telecommunications. (5) RESEARCH: library research and investigative methods—scientific communication—content analysis of a library serial. (4) INFORMATION SCIENCE and COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS, including electronic information systems. (4) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: indexing, abstracting, and bibliography—subject access problems. (3) LIBRARIANS: librarians' future role—library administrators' acquisition of management skills. (2) public library REFERENCE service, some on evaluation. (2) HISTORICAL STUDIES on American music publication, and the printing press as an agent of change. (1) public library CHILDREN'S services. (1) electronic PUBLISHING.

Illinois—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 12 units (48 semester hours) including:
- 9 units in the generalization stage, consisting of:
  - The history of communications, media, and libraries
  - The bibliographic organization of information and library materials
  - The social basis of library and information science
  - The management of libraries and information
  - Seminar in library and information science (four registrations, and involving the preparation of a paper of "publishable quality" in each of the above four areas)
- Principles of research methods
- 3 or more units in an area of specialization. This requirement is met by courses in or outside the program per student needs

Also required is "instruction and practice in research methodologies."

Illinois—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (15 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: corporate headings with and without form subheadings—author indexing in mathematics—limits of subject retrieval in a large published index—instructor and text influences on undergraduate students' selection of subject descriptors—proposal for an American English/Persian transcription scheme for use in bibliographic control. (3) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT:
OPMENT: diachronous and synchronous study of obsolescence—selection of children’s books for school and public libraries—overlap and duplication among school and public library children’s collections. (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: range of adult public library users’ life and reading interests. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: value of the search request form in the search negotiation process. (1) effect of cable television ADVERTISING on public library circulation. (1) INFORMATION PROFESSIONALS: information specialists’ role in academic research. (1) EDUCATION: advisor influence on doctoral students’ use of literature and libraries. (1) OTHER TOPICS: information flow among design engineers. (1) a HISTORICAL STUDY on the role of the American Library Association in the sharing of research resources.

DLS (1 Dissertation)
Subject Summary: (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: use of community college libraries by part-time faculty.

Illinois—Student Questionnaire
(8 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (7) program’s reputation, (4) offer of aid/job, (3) particular faculty members, (2) program’s scholarly interests, (1) proximity to home, (1) seminar/paper approach eliminates examinations. 1 respondent attended Illinois for a library/information master’s degree. 6 are very happy at Illinois, and 2 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (5 respondents): (2) information science, (2) faculty are strong, with diverse interests, (1) information retrieval systems, (1) bibliography, (1) automation, (1) faculty have a strong research orientation. (1) faculty have a strong student orientation. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (4 respondents): (2) management, (1) music librarianship, (1) international aspects, (1) information science, (1) strong information science faculty are not very involved with doctoral courses, (1) research emphasis “pervades everything,” student considers that more emphasis is needed on information science and “the future,” AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (2 respondents): (2) history of books, printing, and libraries. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (5 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate.

Research—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (6 respondents): (4) faculty are strong, diverse, have many research interests, and have done extensive quality work, (2) faculty are strong in the areas of survey research and research methods, (1)
bibliography, (1) information science, (1) faculty, generally, have the ability to think critically, (1) faculty are willing to aid students. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (1 respondent): (1) some of the older faculty don't publish extensively. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) yes, unspecified. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (7 respondents): (1) readers' services/very helpful, (1) scholarly use of humanities materials/very helpful, (1) information needs analysis/very helpful, (1) music bibliography/very helpful, (1) collection development/very helpful, (1) developing "user friendly systems"/very helpful, (1) information science/adequate.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (4 respondents): (3) faculty are well known and regarded in professional circles, (2) faculty are committed to students, and very helpful, (1) faculty are exposed to the "practical environment."
Indiana—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(81.8)</td>
<td>(65.4)</td>
<td>(68.4)</td>
<td>(69.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td>(19.3)</td>
<td>(22.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal Contributions**
The faculty have published in 29 journals with more than one contribution in each of 18 journals:

- 8 in *American Libraries*
- 5 in *ASIS Bulletin*
- 6 in *College & Research Libraries*
- 5 in *Drexel Library Quarterly*
- 5 in *Information and Library Management*
- 5 in *Information Processing and Management*
- 2 in *Journal of Academic Librarianship*
- 4 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
- 5 in *Library Acquisitions for Librarianship*
- 6 in *Library Journal*
- 2 in *Library Quarterly*
- 2 in *Special Libraries*
- 2 in *Wilson Library Bulletin*

**Assistants (11 Contributions)**

*Subject Summary:* (5) library CENSORSHIP, some on the effect of reviews on selecting controversial materials, and some interest in public libraries. (3) RESEARCH, and its implications for service to children and youth. (1) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: media materials for youth. (1) school LIBRARIANS' ethics. (1) EDUCATION for acquisitions work.
Associates (26 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (10) EDUCATION: library education, some interest in
Britain—preparing for online searching and work with OCLC. (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service, some on evaluation, and some interest in public
libraries—potential of online encyclopedias. (3) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: retrieval in academic, public, and special libraries—managing online services. (3) RESEARCH funding, methods, and an
evaluation of a statistical software package (SPSS). (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: users' bibliographic needs—automatic indexing. (2) COOPERATION: academic and special library networks—the federal document depository system. (1) evaluating academic library REFERENCE service. (1) LIBRARIANS' salaries.

Professors (57 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (14) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT, some on mate-
rials costs and budgets, some on the effect of serials availability on library
and private subscriptions, and some interest in academic libraries. (10) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service planning and evaluation, some interest in special libraries—academic libraries, some on service budgeting—implications of collection growth for service—information use and management—social science materials. (10) LIBRARIANS: librarians in support positions—information specialists in industry—personnel man-
agement in libraries—reviews of library and information serials—a need
for a new library association. (6) EDUCATION, some on accreditation,
ranking schools, and extended master's programs. (4) POLICY: national
information policy—the role of government documents in a national
program. (4) RESEARCH: library and information research purposes, and
an agenda—research needs in cataloging—need to communicate research
results to practitioners. (3) COPYRIGHT, some on library photocopying.
(3) HISTORY: advances in library history—historical studies on Ameri-
can circulating libraries, and the early book trade. (1) SYSTEMS: federal,
state, and local document depositories. (1) college library STANDARDS.
(1) LEGISLATION: federal LSCA construction policies.

Indiana—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 45 semester hours including:
—20 or more hours in a major area of library service or information science
—15 hours in a minor area outside the program
—an introductory graduate level statistics course
“Outside courses of special interest” may be selected from an approved list.  
One of the following additional research skills is also required:  
— a reading knowledge of a foreign language  
— 6 hours of statistical methods beyond the introductory course

Indiana—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (17 Dissertations)

Subject Summary:  (6) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: applications of Markov models for academic library social science monograph use—social scientists’ use and nonuse of government documents in academic libraries—developing scales to measure college faculty attitudes toward the library’s undergraduate educational role—predicting universities’ support of their libraries during periods of economic decline—Canadian teacher education institutions’ curriculum materials centers—relationship between community college faculties’ library use and student ratings.  (4) HISTORICAL STUDIES on the origin and growth of Bengalese libraries, decision-making in the establishment of OCLC, Chicago’s library school, and Lebanese university publishing.  (3) LIBRARIANS: female and male academic library administrators’ individual and institutional variables—relationship between academic librarians’ collective bargaining environments and professional development activities—a statistical study of factors affecting librarians’ salaries.  (1) CHILDREN: single parent families in contemporary fiction for youth.  (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: feedback mechanism aided search dialog in an online subject catalog.  (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: strategies for attaining quantitative adequacy of college library collections.  (1) LEGISLATION, ETC.: effect of a 1970 Nigerian military government decree on national library development.

Indiana—Student Questionnaire

(7 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending:  (4) proximity to home, (2) program’s scholarly interests, (2) program’s reputation, (2) particular faculty members, (2) geographic preference, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) already employed at Indiana, (1) faculty interest in student’s proposed program of study.  2 respondents attended Indiana for a library/information master’s degree.  2 are very happy at Indiana, and 5 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum—Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (7 respondents): (1) faculty have broad professional experience as practitioners, teachers, and scholars, (1) faculty are
well rounded, and strong in management, children's services, reference, censorship, and information science. (1) faculty are building up information science and research components without weakening other program areas. (1) research orientation of seminars is helpful. (1) program is flexible, and the faculty believe in student directed study. (1) faculty are willing to sponsor independent studies, even in areas of peripheral interest. (1) many opportunities are available for study in areas outside the program. (1) faculty see the information process in a broader perspective than the library setting. (1) faculty have had direct involvement in major professional events. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (6 respondents): (1) management, (2) faculty don't have public library experience, public library coursework is given by part-time staff, (2) bibliometrics, (1) records management, (1) technical services, (1) information technology and database management, (1) information theory, (1) information studies, (1) yes, unspecified.

AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY: (1 respondent): (1) children's services, (1) some technical services. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (7 respondents): (consensus) very good, (1) readers' services/adequate, (1) technical services/inadequate.

Research-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (5 respondents): (2) faculty are well published, (1) faculty are "well versed" in methodology, (1) faculty offer helpful advice on choice of projects, (1) student's statistics professor/ outside advisor's methodological knowledge complements the subject knowledge of the information science advisor, (1) faculty's strong research orientation has influenced student's attitude toward understanding and applying research, (1) faculty are well published in student's specialty, international librarianship, and seem capable of assisting with student's research. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (6 respondents): (3) students are not made aware of faculty research or given opportunities for participation, (2) bibliometrics, (1) public library service, (1) emerging management theories, (1) information theory, (1) methodology, but student considers that outside statistics courses have provided good preparation, (1) faculty tend to believe research must follow "the paradigms they're accustomed to," (1) faculty have allowed the research center to become inactive, (1) faculty publish much but do little research. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (2 respondents): (2) library history and descriptive studies, (1) information science. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (7 respondents): (1) academic library management/adequate, (1) records management/adequate to inadequate, (1) public library children's services/very helpful, (1) international librarianship with interest in collection development/very helpful, (1) effects of library automation on library
organizational behavior/very helpful, (1) bibliometrics and citation analysis/very helpful, (1) library history/very helpful.

**Other Concerns—Response Summary**

**AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS** (6 respondents): (5) faculty are accessible, considerate, relatively warm, supportive, encouraging, and seem interested in students as individuals and in their success, (2) faculty don’t provide emotional support or opportunities for informal person-to-person interaction, (1) student would like more contact with areas outside the program, (1) faculty have “do as I recommend, not as I do” attitude, (1) faculty are well represented in national organizations.
COLLEGE OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND (COLLEGE PARK)

Maryland—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(84.6)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(64.4)</td>
<td>(70.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(53.8)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
<td>(36.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal Contributions**

The faculty have published in 29 journals with more than one contribution in each of 12 journals:

2 in *American Archivist*  
5 in *Indexer*  
4 in *International Classification*  
2 in *International Forum on Information & Documentation*  
6 in *JASIS*  
5 in *Journal of Education*  
for Librarianship

2 in *Journal of Library Administration*  
3 in *Journal of Library History*  
6 in *Library Research*  
4 in *Library Resources & Technical Services*  
2 in *Library Trends*  
3 in *RQ*

**Assistants (26 Contributions)**

Subject Summary: (9) EDUCATION: library education, some on preparing for service in archives, for work with rare books, and for materials conservation—library and information students' cognitive style. (4) LIBRARIANS: information professionals' and reference librarians' cognitive style. (3) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library planning—television in Maryland schools. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on the Peabody Public Library, Baltimore, an early press, and monasteries
and the arts. (2) LEGISLATION: federal LSCA funds for public library service. (2) archival AUTOMATION. (2) quantitative RESEARCH. (1) REFERENCE.

Associates (1 Contribution)

Subject Summary: (1) EDUCATION: encouraging historical study of children’s books.

Professors (59 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (22) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: non-Roman and multiscrit bibliographic control—international bibliography—subject cataloging—AACR2 tracings in existing catalogs—classification—indexing, and encyclopedia indexes. (18) SERVICE, USE, T TC: evaluating library service—scientific information service planning—document delivery—directories and encyclopedia of information sources in various subjects—public library urban information service, and advocacy of the poor—the library’s societal context, and the public library’s mission in a democratic society: (4) library and information EDUCATION, some on preparing for service in business and in technology. (3) SCHOOL LIBRARIES, some on planning and budgeting. (3) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, some on SDI in fields with severe information scatter. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on an early library, and indexing. (2) LIBRARIANS: librarians’ opinions on intellectual freedom—a review of recent library literature. (1) public library REFERENCE services. (1) library MARKETING. (1) COOPERATION in classification. (1) RESEARCH: citation analysis of JASIS and a German counterpart.

Maryland—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 24-36 semester hours including:
—9 or more hours in research methods and statistics, including:
—Seminar in research methods and data analysis
—2 major areas of study:
—Communications and information transfer
—Information storage and retrieval
—Minor areas of study (3 are required):
—Computer science
—Linguistics
—Psychology
—Philosophy
—Mass communications and journalism
—Educational/instructional communication
—Administration and management
—Operations research
—Economics
—Applied behavioral science
—Social and political processes
—History
—Literature
—Education of information professionals
—Research methods (beyond the basic requirements)

Within each minor area a specific focus may be defined including:
—children, the urban public, farmers, scientists, schools, universities and
colleges, government agencies, business and other organizations,
bibliographic data and document access, data and information analysis
centers, organizational data and records

"Some areas require coursework in other departments and some depend
almost entirely on outside coursework."

Maryland—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (10 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (3) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: comparison of
methods of archival subject retrieval—social/cultural factors affecting
Middle Eastern Dewey Decimal Classification adaptations—
comprehension of printed index entries. (2) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL:
a pattern model for man-machine interaction during online
searching—AID, Associative Interactive Dictionary for online searching.
(1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: Finnish industrial information flow. (1)
LIBRARIANS: principals', teachers', and school librarians' perceptions of
the school librarians' role. (1) EDUCATION: crosscultural study of Uni-
ited States and Nigerian library and information students' values. (1) PUBL-
ISHING: scientists' interactions with the journal publishing process. (1)
OTHER TOPICS: annual reviews as indicators of scientific discipline
structure.

Maryland—Student Questionnaire (3 of 4 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (2) program's reputation, (2) proximity to home,
(1) program's scholarly interests, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) geographic preference. 2 respondents attended Maryland for a library/information master's
degree. 1 is very happy at Maryland and 2 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum—Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (1 respondent): (1) several faculty possess strong
backgrounds and good reputations in student's area of interest, user-system interface. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (1 respondent): (1) decision-making, (1) thesaurus building, (1) communications theory, (1) faculty are generally weak in lecturing and are not responsive to questions. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (3 respondents): (consensus) very helpful.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty do little research, but what is done is “quite good,” (1) some faculty are “sharp” and provide good guidance, others are “shallow.” STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (3 respondents): (1) information use in noncommercial organizations/adequate, (1) information storage and retrieval systems/very helpful, (1) user-system interface/very helpful.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty “lack philosophical depth,” (1) faculty have many contacts in business and industry.
Michigan—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
<td>(70.4)</td>
<td>(67.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Contributions</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Contributions</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Contributions</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(14.8)</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 20 journals with more than one contribution in each of 5 journals:

3 in Illinois Libraries 4 in Library Resources &
8 in Journal of Education Technical Services
for Librarianship 3 in Media Spectrum
3 in Library Quarterly

Assistants (18 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: public library service to adults and to meet citizen group information needs. (3) REFERENCE: evaluating reference service—reference materials—Illinois public library reference service and librarians. (3) EDUCATION: education for service management and for public librarianship—continuing education. (2) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: children's services—public library student use. (2) LIBRARIANS: librarians' job burnout—the effect of library directors' management theory on midmanagement behavior. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: planning for an online catalog. (1) COOPERATION: name authority in OCLC participating libraries. (1) new information delivery TECHNOLOGY.
Associates (8 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (3) SYSTEMS: information systems, and science information use, internationally, and in the third world—user influence on Brazilian information systems. (2) EDUCATION for nonbook cataloging. (1) compiling bibliographies from INFORMATION RETRIEVAL system output. (1) third world information POLICY. (1) citation uses in literary RESEARCH.

Professors (27 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (13) EDUCATION: library education, some on preparing for information retrieval, and on computer-assisted instruction in reference work—programs at Michigan, some on preparing for school librarianship, and on doctoral research—extended master's programs—faculty statistical survey and salaries—predicting students' success in library school. (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service in medicine and gerontology—ancient research collections. (3) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: descriptive cataloging. (2) REFERENCE service, some on developing and managing humanities reference collections. (1) future of SCHOOL LIBRARIES. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL systems in the humanities and social sciences. (1) PRESERVATION. (1) school LIBRARIANS' instructional role. (1) PUBLISHING fraud. (1) a HISTORICAL biography.

Michigan—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 36 semester hours including:
—1 graduate level statistics course
—6-20 hours in an outside area such as higher education, business administration, and communications science

One foreign language is required.

Michigan—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (21 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: provision of library resources for national patterns of academic research—university social science collections in Hong Kong—relationship between institutional commitment to minority studies programs and minority studies collections—transfer of public policy information to community citizen groups—general encyclopedias' treatment of controversial topics. (4) LIBRARIANS: academic library bibliographers' and others' job
satisfaction—academic and public library middle management role concepts—large public library management development programs—law, library science, and social work journal article contributor affiliation and contribution nature. (3) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: student reading achievement related to school library programs and staff—exceptional student library service in southern states—librarians' responses to alternative literary conventions in fiction for children and youth. (3) OTHER TOPICS: empirical test of two philosophically derived advice dimensions—effects of quantitative and nonquantitative literacy on adopting technological innovations—centroid scaling of plate tectonics citation data. (2) HISTORICAL STUDIES on a Cleveland Public Library trustee and his memorial collection, and publication and retail book advertisements in a Virginia newspaper. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: effect of databases on Brazilian libraries. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: effect of public library bibliographic accessibility on physical accessibility. (1) effect of BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION in government document use on use and on user satisfaction. (1) Michigan public high school library selection policies and CENSORSHIP.

Michigan—Student Questionnaire
(2 of an Unspecified Number of Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (2) proximity to home, (1) program's reputation, (1) particular faculty members. Neither respondent attended Michigan for a library/information master's degree. Both are very happy at Michigan.

Curriculum-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (1 respondent): (1) any weaknesses in research methods or in coursework can be overcome in areas outside the program, (1) faculty are flexible in directing independent studies, (1) faculty have national prominence. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) program lacks a strong international component, (1) information policy, (1) management of microforms, (1) library and information science education, (1) research, (1) faculty's emphasis is on a traditional view of the field, (1) faculty are overtaxed with committee work, and have limited time for students. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (2 respondents): (consensus) very helpful.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (2 respondents): (1) faculty have a variety of capabilities and are familiar with a variety of methodologies, (1) faculty are able to get funding, (1) faculty are interested in student comments on their research, (1) faculty are well versed in and excited about their areas, and
encourage excitement in students, (1) faculty have Ph.D.s. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (2 respondents): (1) international information issues/very helpful, (1) unspecified/very helpful.

Other Concerns—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty are active in local, national, and international activities and on university committees, (1) faculty are usually able to work as a team, (1) faculty exhibit fairness and show consideration for individual student needs and interests, (1) faculty lack time for students.
THE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

North Carolina—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(73.9%)</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
<td>(68.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(34.8%)</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal Contributions**

The faculty have published in 29 journals with more than one contribution in each of 13 journals:

- 2 in *American Libraries*
- 2 in *Catholic Library World* for *Librarianship*
- 2 in *Collection Building*
- 2 in *College & Research Libraries*
- 3 in *JASIS*
- 2 in *Journal of Academic Librarianship*
- 4 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
- 5 in *Journal of Library History*
- 3 in *Library Journal*
- 2 in *Library Quarterly*
- 3 in *North Carolina Libraries*
- 2 in *School Library Journal*
- 2 in *Wilson Library Bulletin*

**Assistants (2 Contributions)**

*Subject Summary:* (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: cataloging and classification. (1) EDUCATION for online cataloging.

**Associates (23 Contributions)**

*Subject Summary:* (8) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library service and budgeting—children’s services, some on advocacy, and some interest in the Soviet Union. (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL:
automatic indexing, some on authority control applications—automatic
thesaurus generation. (4) EDUCATION: education for youth and medical
librarianship, and for work with nonprint materials—programs at North
Carolina. (2) LIBRARIANS: exchange mission to the Soviet Union—
AASL membership. (1) SERVICE to science researchers. (1) evaluating
INFORMATION RETRIEVAL system effectiveness. (1) REFERENCE
materials in health science. (1) national recommendations for school
library COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT.

Professors (45 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (12) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library service planning
and evaluation—materials’ use—public library humanities collections—
North Carolina public library users—the library’s societal context and
responsibilities, including reference to the pursuit of happiness and to
multiculturalism. (9) EDUCATION: education for youth librarianship—
extended master’s programs, some on North Carolina’s—faculty evalua-
tion. (6) LIBRARIANS: librarians, and writers on library
topics—librarians’ opinions on copyright—Association of Research
Libraries, and ALA’s American Library Trustee Division. (5) HISTORI-
CAL STUDIES on libraries for women, fees in American libraries, and two
historical biographies—writing library history. (3) COLLECTION
DEVELOPMENT, some interest in academic library nonprint materials.
(3) STANDARDS: ACRL college and junior college library standards—
ALA standards for high school libraries. (2) public library CHILDREN’S
services. (2) library censorship and INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM. (1)
COOPERATION between junior college and public libraries. (1) COM-
MUNICATIONS TOPICS. (1) RESEARCH on public library children’s
services.

North Carolina—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 30-36 semester hours including:
—Methodologies for research in librarianship
—Seminar in research design
—Additional research methodologies per student needs.
In addition to basic course requirements:
—Foreign language(s)
—At least 1 college-level statistics course
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A knowledge of computer or information science equivalent to that required in the school's master's program are required.

Interdisciplinary programs including work in areas outside the program "are encouraged."

Possible areas of study include:
- Management of libraries
- Library automation
- Analysis and provision of library materials
- Library history
- Services and materials for children and youth

Examination topics (all are required) include:
- Role of the library in society
- Management and administration of libraries
- History of libraries and library materials
- Research methods

North Carolina—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (2 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (1) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: relationship of science or natural history museum libraries to the museums' educational programs. (1) library school faculties' and deans' attitudes toward continuing EDUCATION.

North Carolina—Student Questionnaire
(10 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (5) program's reputation, (5) particular faculty members, (4) offer of aid/job, (3) program's scholarly interests, (3) proximity to home, (2) are already employed at North Carolina, (1) geographic preference, (1) student could design own course of study, (1) faculty provide high level of support. None of the respondents attended North Carolina for a library/information master's degree. 5 are very happy at North Carolina, 4 are reasonably happy, and 1 is unhappy and is undecided about continuing.

Curriculum—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (10 respondents): (6) faculty are famous, authoritative, knowledgeable, and experienced in all areas of library science, committed to teaching and research, and the school's greatest strength, (4)
library history, (3) academic library administration, (2) management, (1) use studies, (1) libraries in society, (1) children's services, (1) collection development, (1) buildings, (1) statistics, (1) "intangible strengths" include intellectual challenge, and out of class informal discussions with faculty, (1) faculty are willing to tailor independent studies to student needs, (1) faculty are broadminded, (1) faculty are approachable. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (9 respondents): (6) program doesn't have faculty to support work in information science, (3) research methods and "practical research," (2) program doesn't offer doctoral level coursework in administration, (2) faculty are older, tired of teaching, and pay little attention to students or their interests, (1) library automation, (1) program doesn't offer doctoral level coursework in statistics or in library history, (1) faculty are not adequately research oriented, they include too many historians, (1) faculty members with power use it personally, not professionally. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent) (1) computer programming. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (8 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and Adequate, (3) information science/inadequate.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (7 respondents): (3) library history, the faculty include one or two strong historians, (2) academic library administration, (1) work in "practical areas," (1) the library and higher education, (1) use studies, (1) social aspects of libraries, librarians, and library education, (1) indexing and abstracting, (1) intellectual freedom, (1) citation analyses of humanities literatures, (1) faculty have a wide variety of research interests, (1) faculty are approachable, and the program has a comfortable atmosphere. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (7 respondents): (2) library automation, (2) faculty are not familiar with either social research methodology or statistics, and don't wish to teach research courses, (2) students are not always made aware of faculty research, and are dissatisfied with the lack of opportunities for participation, (1) administration, (1) information science, (1) social research done in the program is "too narrow methodologically," and the historical research "tends toward the trivial," (1) faculty are doing little research currently. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (10 respondents): (2) academic library administration/very helpful, (1) administration/adequate, (1) academic library organization/very helpful, (1) academic library special collections/very helpful, (1) special libraries/adequate, (1) public library management under fiscal restraint/very helpful, (1) school library administration/very helpful, (1) online bibliographic catalog access points/adequate, (1) citation analysis of humanities research/very helpful.
Other-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (7 respondents): (5) two faculty members with information science backgrounds were due to join the program during the 1983 academic year, (5) program draws on strengths in outside areas, (4) faculty are flexible, easy to work with, open to ideas, concerned for the broad intellectual development of students, and always available for professional discussion, (3) the faculty are prestigious, are involved in professional activities, and have many contacts, (2) students have observed little or no faculty infighting, (1) students are on all the school’s committees and their views are considered, (1) faculty are involved in continuing education and campus committees, (1) faculty fail to act as guides or mentors for most, not all, students, student resents having to “play to faculty egos.”
## Pittsburgh—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(40.9)</td>
<td>(24.2)</td>
<td>(33.7)</td>
<td>(32.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(43.6)</td>
<td>(44.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Journal Contributions

The faculty have published in 30 journals with more than one contribution in each of 12 journals:

- 2 in *American Libraries*
- 3 in *ASIS Bulletin*
- 2 in *Catholic Library World*
- 2 in *Drexel Library Quarterly*
- 2 in *Info: Reports & Bibliographies*
- 2 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
- 5 in *Library Acquisitions*
- 2 in *Library Trends*
- 2 in *Public Libraries*
- 6 in *Publisher's Weekly*
- 3 in *School Library Journal*
- 2 in *Top of the News*

### Assistants (22 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (7) PUBLISHING TOPICS, (6) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: materials use, some on serials, and some interest in studies at Pittsburgh. (5) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, some on evaluating system effectiveness. (2) COOPERATION: information networks, and network simulation. (2) information EDUCATION, and programs at Pittsburgh. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: human assisted thesaurus generation. (1) AUTOMATION TOPICS: computer graphics.
Associates (33 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (13) LIBRARIANS: librarians and information professionals, some on online searchers and youth counselors, and on malpractice liability—volumes of the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science. (7) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library planning and evaluation—children's materials, rights, and advocacy—children's services at Baltimore County Public Library. (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: career information service—large institution management information systems. (4) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS, including librarians' acceptance and user aspects, and telefacsimile. (2) COOPERATION: network technology and human factors—children's materials sharing. (1) ADVERTISING: library promotion on children's television. (1) RESEARCH: statistical methods and analysis.

Professors (101 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (28) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library and information service economics, budgeting, and management—evaluating materials use, some on studies at Pittsburgh—use of secondary publications—medical libraries—libraries in New York State—the library's societal context. (25) LIBRARIANS: librarians and information professionals, some on online searchers and information consultants, and on occupational surveys—school librarians' instructional role and career planning—American Library Association, and school librarians' associations—volumes of the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science. (10) EDUCATION: library and information education, some on preparing for reference work, and for information counseling—doctoral research—programs at Pittsburgh—Beta Phi Mu. (7) COOPERATION: information network governance, evaluation, and simulation—cooperation between school and public libraries—cataloging and searching in OCLC. (7) library AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY topics, including school library applications. (6) SCHOOL LIBRARIES, some on planning, budgeting, and evaluation. (6) PLANNING: national library and information planning—the White House Conference, some interest in academic libraries—the National Periodicals Center. (3) INDEPENDENT ADULT LEARNING. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: cataloging, some on subject cataloging and classification. (2) REFERENCE service and reference books. (2) computer assisted composition in PUBLISHING—the future of the information industry. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: MEDLARS in special libraries. (1) INFORMATION SCIENCE TOPICS. (1) a HISTORY of the American Association of School Librarians.
Pittsburgh—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offerings: Ph.D. in Library Science (from the Department of Library Science); Ph.D. in Information Science (from the Interdisciplinary Department of Information Science).

The Ph.D. in library science prepares students "for advanced work in research, teaching, bibliography, administration, or information processing." The Ph.D. in information science "offers advanced graduate study and professional specialization in the science of information." This program focuses on information systems problems and on human information processing and information processing principles.

Ph.D. in Library Science

Course Requirements: 36 semester hours including:
- 24 hours in library and information science (12 at the doctoral level) and including study in a major examination area
- 12 hours in a cognate (minor) area in or outside the program

The major or minor area may be satisfied by coursework in the Interdisciplinary Department of Information Science. A language requirement is met by proficiency in foreign language(s), linguistics, or computer languages per student needs.

Examination topics (4 are required):
- Administrative services in libraries and information centers
- Behavioral science
- Communications science
- Education for librarianship and information science
- Historical studies
- Information science
- International and comparative study in librarianship
- Librarianship for youth
- Resources of libraries
- Subject analysis
- Technical services in libraries

Ph.D. in Information Science

Course Requirements: 36 semester hours including:
- 12 hours of graduate level study in information science
- 18 hours of doctoral level seminars
- 6 hours in linguistics courses, generally taken outside the program in the Linguistics Department
Mathematical proficiency required for admission to the program is, typically, demonstrated by coursework in two of the following areas:

- Integral and differential calculus
- Linear and modern algebra
- Mathematical and symbolic logic

Examination topics (all are required):

- Theoretical structure of the field
- Behavioral and philosophical foundations
- Research methodology and statistics
- Information systems and technology

Pittsburgh—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (67 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (12) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: university library faculty use—faculty attitudes toward Pennsylvania academic libraries—user attitudes toward resources and services in Saudi university libraries—attitudes on independent study using academic libraries—academic librarians' attitudes toward service to older adults—new media in Nigerian university libraries—case studies in closing corporate libraries—pilot study of public libraries—methodological study of issues related to user fees—subscriptions' attitudes toward videotex—information technology in Saudi Arabia—rural Malays' reading habits and media exposure. (10) COOPERATION: behavioral components of library network development—systematic analysis of academic library shared online cataloging—school libraries in multitype library networks—descriptions of or plans for various cooperative service efforts in Sweden, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. (10) LIBRARIANS: library and information sciences' general humanistic methods and common philosophy—monitoring Spanish information/documentation human resources—managerial job satisfaction—job satisfaction of academic library paraprofessionals in public and technical service departments—impact of collective bargaining on Pennsylvania academic librarians—Alabama public community college academic deans', library directors', and department chairs' perceptions of the library directors' role—public librarians' orientation toward lower class users—school librarians' curricular role in the Virgin Islands—elementary school librarians' role with gifted students—New York State school librarians' attitudes on library networking and technology. (7) OTHER TOPICS: an information transfer paradigm—construction of knowledge transfer functions—potential utility of an information theoretic complexity measure—pattern discovery in living and artificial pattern recognition systems—academic educators' communication
behavior—University of Pittsburgh physics department's acquisition of scientific information—bibliometric study of science/technology corporate entries in OCLC. (6) EDUCATION: students' attitudes toward library and information scientists' behavioral approach—training women library students for career achievement—design of an introductory information science course and course materials—technical services education—library school faculty perceptions of faculty continuing education—a school librarians' conference as a continuing education vehicle. (5) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: Pennsylvania combined school/public libraries—North Carolina principals', teachers', and librarians' attitudes toward school library services—comparing Kentucky school library resources with state and regional standards—recommendations for development of Iranian public high school libraries—developing measures of adolescents' reading orientation. (3) BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION: method of teaching library skills in conjunction with freshman English—effect of computer-assisted instruction on college library users' attitudes and use—effect of microform instruction programs on user acceptance. (3) STANDARDS: academic library administrators' attitudes toward the adequacy of Middle States Association library evaluation—proposal for Saudi university library standards—developing uniform bibliographic principles for internationally compatible standards. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on OCLC's governance, functions, financing, and technology, Japanese education for librarianship, and the Cleveland book trade. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: social science subject relations—medical subject access systems. (2) LEGISLATION: impact of ESEA Title II funds on Pennsylvania public school libraries—effect of 1965 Higher Education Act Title IIIB fellowships/traineeships on minority recruitment. (1) method of evaluating academic REFERENCE and information effectiveness. (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: methods to evaluate Latin American Library collections. (1) an adaptive model of information POLICY.

Pittsburgh—Student Questionnaire
(9 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (5) program's reputation, (5) proximity to home, (3) particular faculty members, (2) program's scholarly interests, (2) offer of aid/job, (1) no language requirement, (1) for student's own benefit. 5 respondents attended Pittsburgh for a library/information master's degree. 1 is very happy at Pittsburgh, and 8 are reasonably happy.
**Curriculum-Response Summary**

**AREAS OF STRENGTH** (5 respondents): (2) school media, and children's materials and services, (2) information science, (1) behavioral and communications science. (1) faculty have strong backgrounds in the areas they teach, (1) faculty are heavily research oriented, research is stressed in every seminar course, and students learn to evaluate research, (1) faculty have national renown, and are involved in national organizations.

**AREAS OF WEAKNESS** (4 respondents): (2) research course is “incomprehensible” and provides little knowledge of statistical methods, (1) lack of internships in top management activities, (1) faculty’s management skills, (1) finance and planning, (1) subject analysis, (1) library systems analysis and evaluation, (1) computer programming, (1) social implications of technological developments in communications and computer science, (1) information science is not completely integrated into library science coursework, (1) library architecture, (1) program’s limited facilities restrict the range of areas of study, (1) faculty’s teaching techniques are poor, and give little evidence of understanding learning theory, faculty are unable to communicate course content, (1) faculty are busy with nonteaching responsibilities and give students low priority.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY** (9 respondents): (consensus) very good and adequate, (1) readers’ services/inadequate, (1) administration/inadequate.

**Research-Response Summary**

**AREAS OF STRENGTH** (4 respondents): (1) faculty do “voluminous” field research in library science, (1) some faculty are specialized in student’s area of interest, attitudinal studies, (1) information science, (1) faculty place strong emphasis on research methodology, question formulation, bias control, statistics, (1) faculty research and publish, and support student research, (1) faculty are “among the leadership” of the profession.

**AREAS OF WEAKNESS** (2 respondents): (1) evaluation, (1) subject analysis, (1) automation, (1) program’s financial shortage, (1) program’s limited facilities restrict the range of areas of research.

**STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT** (8 respondents): (1) school media program evaluation/very helpful, (1) library management/adequate, (1) subject analysis/adequate, (1) attitudinal studies in library and information science/adequate, (1) management of technology/very helpful, (1) success of and satisfaction with automated functions/very helpful, (1) library history/very helpful, (1) history of library education/very helpful.

**Other Concerns-Response Summary**

**AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS** (6 respondents): (2) faculty have good communication with students, are willing to work with them, and offer support for students’ needs and frustrations, (1) student in the...
library science program with a strong interest in information science "wasn't disappointed," (1) program doesn't have enough faculty, some areas aren't well covered, (1) program's relationship to others, such as education, educational communications and technology, and public administration, helps to make it worthwhile. (1) faculty are active in ALA, ASIS, AELT, etc., which is helpful in getting graduates jobs, (1) faculty are supportive, but students must be aware of their personal likes and dislikes when choosing advisors and examination and dissertation committees, (1) students have good rapport.
Rutgers—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contribution</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(76.9)</td>
<td>(58.8)</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>(71.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(17.6)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions

The faculty have published in 19 journals with more than one contribution in each of 9 journals:

2 in Collection Building
2 in Indexer
4 in JASIS
2 in Library Journal
2 in Library Research
2 in Library Trends
4 in New Jersey Libraries
2 in Public Library Quarterly
2 in RQ

Assistants (13 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (4) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: public library service, some on planning, and some interest in older adults—materials in aging. (3) EDUCATION: library education at Rutgers for service to older adults—continuing education, some on public library collection development and applications of bibliometrics. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on the federal depository system, Office of War Information libraries, and the OSS periodicals reproduction program. (2) LIBRARIANS' leadership behavior. (1) library MARKETING.
Associates (17 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (5) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: automated catalogs—catalog evaluation by undergraduate users—classification of library and information education and research—database indexing. (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: service evaluation, some interest in public libraries—government information service planning. (3) RESEARCH: bibliometrics, some on predicting scientific/technical journal article translations. (2) EDUCATION: education for indexing—program reorganization at Rutgers. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL systems in the humanities and social sciences. (1) government information service MARKETING. (1) library serials PUBLISHERS' criteria for accepting unsolicited manuscripts. (1) COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS.

Professors (15 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (6) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library and information service, some on planning, and some interest in research libraries, and in public libraries—societal context of information, with some reference to computers, and some interest in Japan. (4) AUTOMATION and TECHNOLOGY TOPICS: information management, telecommunications and facsimile, and holography. (2) EDUCATION: planning continuing education programs—program reorganization at Rutgers. (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT. (1) national PLANNING: National Inventory of Library Needs. (1) RESEARCH: bibliometric laws.

Rutgers—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 24-30 semester hours including:
- Research methods
- Seminar in information science I
- Statistical methods in education I

All courses necessary to satisfy requirements (excepting statistics courses given by the Graduate School of Education) are given by the program, but opportunities for study in outside areas are available. Foreign languages may be required per student needs.

Examination Topics:
- Research methods (is required as are two of):
- Technical services
- Readers' services
- Information science
Rutgers—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (22 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (6) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: communication apprehension and acquisition of information in the academic library—land grant institutions' library relationships and institutional self study—land grant institutions' library evaluation via user satisfaction and resource allocation—formal information system use by scientists and engineers—goal programming approach to information service planning and evaluation—measuring public library use via the patron as unit of analysis. (5) LIBRARIANS: oral history study of university library executive succession—motivation of academic library managers to manage—Northeastern public library leadership, organization, and the role of change—an instrument to measure public librarians' perceptions of organizational climate—public librarians' perceptions of organizational climate and ability to estimate user needs. (5) OTHER TOPICS: linguistic investigation of information science—citation study of productivity impact of library and information science doctoral dissertations—women's studies communication and information patterns—bibliometric approach to biblical and ancient Near East research literature—reliability factors in adverse drug reaction reporting. (2) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: goal programming approach to allocating academic library acquisitions funds—relationships between categories of academic library selectors and use of selected materials. (1) accuracy of Northeastern college library REFERENCE/information telephone service. (1) INDEPENDENT ADULT LEARNING: critical incidents in assisted adult library learning. (1) COOPERATION: multitype library network performance, organization, and attitude factors. (1) CENSORSHIP: book reviews and public library selection of potentially controversial materials.

Rutgers—Student Questionnaire
(4 of an Unspecified Number of Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (2) program's scholarly interests, (1) program's reputation, (1) particular faculty members, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) time required to complete degree, (1) already employed at Rutgers, (1) proximity to home, (1) employer reimburses Rutgers' tuition. None of the respondents attended Rutgers for a library/information master's degree. 2 are very happy at Rutgers, and 2 are reasonably happy.
Curriculum-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (4 respondents): (2) most faculty are active in the field and bring their experience to courses, (2) faculty are accessible, and helpful, (1) "frequent overhauls" have kept seminars current, (1) all faculty have contributed to the literature and most still do, (1) faculty are all well trained, and experienced, (1) most faculty are current, issue oriented, and sound thinkers. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (3 respondents): (1) administration, (1) new technologies, (1) information science, (1) disorganized teaching, courses are without organization or outline, (1) merger (with an undergraduate communications department) has occupied too much faculty time, students have too little access to the faculty. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (2 respondents): (1) readers' services, (1) media. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (3 respondents): (consensus) very helpful.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (3 respondents): (1) faculty ensure basic research competencies as is promised in the catalog, (1) faculty are "well versed" in research, and are capable of providing guidance in this area, (1) faculty are determined that all students should complete their dissertation research, and "their record in this area is pretty good," (1) faculty have done, and still do, research, (1) student's intended thesis advisor is involved in research. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (4 respondents): (1) reference service/very helpful, (1) effect of decision-making style on productivity/adequate, (1) ergonomic workstation design/very helpful, (1) evolution of library education/very helpful.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (2 respondents): "rigor is not for the faculty's own sake, but to get the most out of students," (1) faculty have a "generally positive approach," (1) monthly colloquia allow for more informal contact with some faculty, but student would like more faculty to participate.
The faculty have published in 12 journals with more than one contribution in each of 3 journals:

- 3 in *JASIS*
- 2 in *LASIE*
- 2 in *Journal of Library History*

**Associates (17 Contributions)**

*Subject Summary:* (3) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL systems in science/technology, mental health, and special education. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on the Library of Congress during the Kennedy administration, the American Library Association, and a Chicago mayor. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: book indexes as information retrieval systems—minicomputer aided thesaurus construction. (2) INFORMATION SCIENCE and COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS. (2) LIBRARIANS and INFORMATION PROFESSIONALS: American Society for Information Science, and ALA's History Roundtable. (2) EDUCATION: education for information transfer—library and information faculty doctorates. (1) standard selection sources for undergraduate library COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT. (1) information SYSTEMS and networks. (1) hazards of mailed survey RESEARCH.
Professors (7 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library service to state government—public library service planning. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: bibliography and indexes—an index of illustrations. (1) EDUCATION for information transfer. (1) INFORMATION SCIENCE TOPICS.

Southern California—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offerings: Ph.D., DLA (Doctor of Library Administration).

The Ph.D. in Library Science prepares "researchers, theorists, and educators." The DLA prepares students to "perform more effectively as managers of libraries and other information systems." "While a Ph.D. dissertation must develop from a theoretical base, the DLA project may be a problem centered study relating to a particular aspect of professional concern."

Ph.D. in Library Science

Course Requirements: 30 semester hours:
- 20 hours of doctoral seminars including:
  - Sociology of information
  - Information psychology
  - Information organization management
  - Information engineering
  - Doctoral research methods
  - Advanced research methods
- 10 hours of electives including:
  - History of education for the information professions
  - Additional coursework in one of the first four areas above taken in or outside the program

Doctor of Library Administration

Course Requirements: 30 semester hours:
- 20 hours of doctoral seminars including:
  - Sociology of information
  - Information psychology
  - Information organization management
  - Information engineering
  - Advanced research methods
- 10 hours of electives including:
Advanced management of library and information systems
Doctoral research methods
Additional coursework taken in the program or outside in such areas as public administration, business, education, communications, social sciences, and computer sciences

Ph.D. or DLA students with "skills and techniques" oriented master's degrees may be required to complete remedial master's level coursework in addition to basic requirements.

Ph.D. and DLA examination topics (3 are required) include:
- Information transfer
- Human information processing behavior
- Information systems management
- Information transfer technologies

Southern California—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (12 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: contingency management theory comparison of academic libraries—implications of the information transfer processes of music school and of instructional technology faculties for library service design. (3) LIBRARIANS: effect of library directors' management theory on midmanagement behavior—academic library managers' intrinsic job satisfaction—southern California librarians' occupational and self concepts. (2) COOPERATION: California state colleges' and universities' adoption of OCLC—name authority work in OCLC. (2) HISTORICAL STUDIES on women and the founding of California social libraries, and on Hawaiian public and state libraries. (1) Southeast Asian library EDUCATION. (1) OTHER TOPICS: effect of information system type on decision-makers' uncertainties.

DLS (6 Dissertations)

Subject Summary: (1) CHILDREN: high school student use of a New Mexico academic library. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION: aptitude treatment interactions in instruction to use the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. (1) COOPERATION: feasibility study for an Islamic nation library resource sharing network. (1) community college and college/university LIBRARIANS' job satisfaction. (1) LEGISLATION: fiscal impact of general revenue sharing funds on public libraries. (1) OTHER TOPICS: bibliometric study of two library serials.
Southern California—Student Questionnaire
(5 of an Unspecified Number of Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (2) program's scholarly interests, (2) particular faculty members, (2) proximity to home, (1) program's reputation, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) already employed at Southern California. 2 respondents attended Southern California for a library/information master's degree. 2 are very happy at Southern California, and 3 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (2 respondents): (1) coursework offers a sound social science theory base, (1) faculty “push” coursework in outside areas, they recognize their own limited research skills and knowledge, (1) faculty are disgusted with most library science doctoral level coursework, which is “narrowly defined,” (1) three faculty members understand the curriculum and are very versatile, three others haven’t fully accepted information transfer but are strong in some areas and generally support the curriculum, (1) faculty are interested and show zeal and dedication. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (1 respondent): (1) one faculty member is a “liability to students and the school.” OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (5 respondents): (consensus) very helpful.

Research—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (3 respondents): (3) faculty are willing and able to counsel, encourage, and assist students with their research and to give good “conceptual support,” (2) faculty are experienced researchers, and most are involved in research in all areas of social and information science, (1) good applied and theoretical research sites are available. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty don't have "good research criteria," (1) program has no money, (1) only a few faculty have published with any regularity, (1) yes, unspecified. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) yes, unspecified. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (5 respondents): (1) community college faculty information seeking behavior and interaction with information collections/very helpful, (1) corporate information management/very helpful, (1) bibliographic instruction/very helpful, (1) symbolic interaction in communication, and its impact on automation/very helpful, (1) information science research/adequate.

Other Concerns—Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (3 respondents): (1) the Ph.D. in library science is narrow, and isolated from “true academic goals,” (1) faculty are fairly evenly mixed, some have done significant
research while others spend more time on teaching; (1) too many library science faculty members have library science Ph.D.s, the program needs more faculty with backgrounds in public administration, management information systems, sociology, and political science; (1) two-thirds of the faculty are actively involved in professional organizations; (1) most of the faculty are either involved in local information services or university activities; (1) several faculty consult in such areas as community analysis, records management, and database systems; (1) faculty possess a constructive team spirit and belief in the program that fosters a scholarly environment.
Syracuse—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>6 (40.0)</td>
<td>17 (39.5)</td>
<td>25 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(39.5)</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>(30.2)</td>
<td>(34.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 20 journals with more than one contribution in each of 4 journals:

2 in *American Libraries*  2 in *JASIS*
3 in *Cataloguing Australia*  2 in *Library Journal*

Assistants (3 Contributions)
*Subject Summary*: (2) RESEARCH: research records use—citation analysis, predicting relatedness between cited and citing works. (1) INFORMATION SCIENCE TOPICS: information as an integral aspect of management and organization.

Associates (15 Contributions)
*Subject Summary*: (4) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, (4) RESEARCH: research in information retrieval, and in information science—federal information science research funding. (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library economics—public library service—the library’s societal context. (3) LIBRARIANS: librarians, some on career patterns—profile of ALA members. (1) LEGISLATION: regulatory restraints on consumer information service.
Professors (43 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (9) SERVICE: ETC.: gerontology and health information service planning, evaluation—service in international policies; information counseling—societal context of information, addressing information inequity. (8) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: retrieval, some on system planning, the impact of document representations on search output, and on presearch aspects—systems in environmental science. (7) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: automated catalogs, some on subject retrieval and "friendly" systems—Library of Congress Subject Headings. (6) EDUCATION: library and information education, some interest in Britain—education for art librarianship, and, with some interest in the third world, environmental information service. (4) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: school library evaluation, management, and directional signs—children's media materials. (3) COOPERATION: gerontology, health, and environmental information service cooperation. (3) LIBRARIANS: special librarians as information managers—evaluating school librarians. (3) RESEARCH: the research process—crosscultural communication and international research cooperation in information science.

Syracuse—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D. (in Information Transfer).

Course Requirements: 48-60 semester hours including:
—Seminar in behavioral science
—Seminar in research methods
—Seminar in information systems
—Practicum in research (4 semesters) which typically includes "designing a research project, proposal writing, data collection and analysis, and writing a research report"
—A teaching practicum (1 or 2 semesters) which includes teaching master's level courses and serving as a teaching assistant.

Students are "encouraged to complete at least one piece of original research and to submit a paper for publication prior to beginning work on the dissertation." Coursework in outside areas is "encouraged." There are no language or research tool requirements for admission. "Quantitative methods and computer languages are taught as an integral part of the program." Up to one-half of required coursework hours may be transferred from previous academic experience, "if they form an integral part of the student's program."
Syracuse—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (13 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (6) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: retrieval systems’ concept space as a model of human concept relations—artificial intelligence techniques in retrieval systems—term conflation for retrieval—organizational setting of subscribers to an SDI service—interactive retrieval system users’ characteristics and behaviors—multiattribute study of user satisfaction with medical library literature searches. (4) OTHER TOPICS: expectancies and values as predictors of motivation of predecisional information search—effect of metainformation cost change on decision task information and metainformation preference—noun phrases as content indicators—ontological and propositional approach to information and misinformation. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: computer assisted construction of a guide to essential attributes of medieval art themes and concepts—impact of undergraduate users’ person and situation characteristics on their evaluations of catalogs. (1) COOPERATION; interorganizational impact of computerized information networks’ processing on international banking.

Syracuse—Student Questionnaire
(9 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (5) program’s scholarly interests, (5) offer of aid/job, (5) proximity to home, (4) program’s reputation, (2) particular faculty members, (1) no language requirement, (1) already employed at Syracuse, (1) geographic preference. 3 respondents attended Syracuse for a library/information master’s degree. 6 are very happy at Syracuse, and 3 are reasonably happy.

Curriculum-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (9 respondents): (5) research methods, (3) faculty are strong in research orientation and practice, and in their primary fields, (2) faculty and technological support are strong in information retrieval and in information systems development, (2) faculty are well known in the field, and their involvement in professional associations enriches their course and research input, (1) faculty are moderately strong in behavioral science and policy, (1) faculty have the strength and self confidence to allow students plenty of academic freedom, students can develop personalized and rigorous programs of study with applicable research experience, (1) faculty are heavily involved in research in information science, and students are given the opportunity to participate as colleagues, this carries
over into the seminars on topical research interests. Weaknesses can be overcome in areas outside the program. With backgrounds in communications, the faculty are excellent for the curriculum. Faculty are always available. AREAS OF WEAKNESS: (2) linguistics, (1) artificial intelligence, (1) not enough faculty are specialized in information science related subject areas, (1) cognitive psychology.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (9 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate.

Research-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH (8 respondents): (4) research methods and design and statistics give students a strong research grounding, (2) students are involved in research and have funded projects to work on, (2) faculty are able scientists, rather than historians, (2) faculty’s multidisciplinary backgrounds provide innovative research opportunities, (1) information retrieval, (1) information studies, (1) faculty are strong in advising on research projects and funding, (1) all faculty are engaged in research, (1) faculty have a high regard for “methodologically correct” research, (1) faculty show strong support for learning, (1) faculty are helpful, (1) school is alive and a good place to be. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (3 respondents): (1) faculty are moderate to weak in human factors, (1) faculty have limited interest in student’s area of interest, visual information processing, but research methods training makes up for this, (1) students are likely to be heavily influenced by a few members of the small faculty. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) some specific aspects of indexing policy. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (9 respondents): (1) information used in decision-making/adequate, (1) problems in computerized retrieval services and related database management systems/very helpful, (1) probabilistic information retrieval techniques/very helpful, (1) automatic indexing/very helpful, (1) machine understanding of natural language/very helpful, (1) information system end users/very helpful, (1) user-system interface/very helpful, (1) linguistic aspects of queries and texts/very helpful, (1) visual information processing/adequate.

Other Concerns-Response Summary
AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (5 respondents): (2) faculty are supportive, encouraging, and helpful, (1) program has a strong dean, effective program administration and committee work, and caring advisors, (1) faculty are supportive of students who are learning how to teach, (1) faculty and students provide an exciting work environment.
Faculty of Library and Information Science
University of Toronto

Toronto—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(80.8)</td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Contributions
The faculty have published in 21 journals with more than one contribution in each of 10 journals:

5 in Argus
5 in Canadian Journal of Information Science
9 in Canadian Library Journal
2 in Cataloging & Classification Quarterly

2 in Educational Libraries Bulletin
3 in JASIS
4 in Library Research
2 in Moccasin Telegraph
8 in Ontario Library Review
2 in Top of the News

Assistants (11 Contributions)
Subject Summary: (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: educational information service and use in Canada—users' information seeking behavior—educational research materials, including ERIC, in Canada. (5) educational information SYSTEMS in Ontario. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: presearch aspects. (1) INFORMATION PROFESSIONALS: information consultants for educators. (1) EDUCATION for information consultants.
Associates (26 Contributions)  
Subject Summary: (8) EDUCATION: library and information education in the United States and Canada—education for acquisitions work, a research methods course component in statistics, and directed public library fieldwork in Ontario—doctoral research, some interest in Iran. (6) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: subject cataloging in Canada—comparisons of PRECIS and Library of Congress Subject Heading access effectiveness—classification—book indexing. (5) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: library service, some on administration—service to South Asians in Canada—educational communications materials use. (2) INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, some on evaluating controversial children’s materials. (2) AUTOMATION TOPICS: viewdata system design and videotex in Canada. (1) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL. (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT. (1) COOPERATION: the future of union catalogs.

Professors (35 Contributions)  

Toronto—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 9 or 10 semester-long courses (referred to as half-courses) including:
—Research colloquia I and II
—Major subject (1 is required):
—Social environment and libraries including:
—Libraries and their publics
Libraries and their relationships with other information agencies
Librarianship and librarianship in the historical context
The library in the political process
Information resources and library collections
The literature of science and technology
The literature of the social sciences
The literature of the humanities
Children's literature
Library administration
Models, simulation, and decision-making in libraries
The utilization of human resources in libraries
Communications science and the library's organization

Minor subjects (2 are required):
- First minor subject: 2 half-courses from appropriate master's level coursework
- Second minor subject: 2 half-courses, typically in an outside area

Students with master's degrees "earned in two or three semesters, or by ten to sixteen half-courses," will complete remedial master's level coursework in addition to the basic requirements. One foreign language, typically French, is required.

Toronto—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (6 Dissertations)

Subject Summary. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: accessibility of Toronto land-use planning publications—espoused theory and theory in use of public library service to older adults in Ontario and New York State. (1) CHILDREN: information seeking by adolescents of different socio-economic classes in a Canadian urban center. (1) Interpersonal communication in the REFERENCE interview. (1) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: public library book selection in Alberta and Ontario. (1) Ontario elementary school LIBRARIANS' role perceptions, role conflict, and effectiveness.

Toronto—Student Questionnaire

Toronto declined to distribute questionnaires to students.
### Wisconsin—Faculty Publication Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Contributions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(85.7)</td>
<td>(81.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Works of Joint Responsibility</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Journal Contributions

The faculty have published in 23 journals with more than one contribution in each of 9 journals:

- 5 in *College & Research Libraries*
- 2 in *Library Quarterly*
- 2 in *Library Research*
- 3 in *Database*
- 2 in *Louisiana Library*
- 3 in *Journal of Education for Librarianship*  
  - *Association Bulletin*
- 2 in *Journal of Library History*
- 3 in *Wilson Library Bulletin*

### Assistants (10 Contributions)

**Subject Summary:**
1. SERVICE, USE, ETC.: public library service and use, some on planning and evaluation, and on adult services.
2. HISTORICAL STUDIES: on library service in Wisconsin, the establishment of Wisconsin's library school, and public documents in library education at Wisconsin.
3. EDUCATION for library planning.
4. PUBLIC LIBRARY RESEARCH.
Associates (3 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (2) EDUCATION: library and information education economics—education in Greece. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: catalog use.

Professors (35 Contributions)

Subject Summary: (6) LIBRARIANS: library staff development in Louisiana—American Library Association priorities—reviews of library serials. (6) EDUCATION: library and information education, some on preparing for state librarianship, and for service cooperation—multicultural education—continuing reference education—programs at Wisconsin. (5) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: reviews of databases and of a database directory. (5) REFERENCE materials, some on books and biographical directories. (4) HISTORY: a historical study on 18th-century collection development. (3) CENSORSHIP AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, some interest in youth. (2) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: public library service, applications of collection growth for service. (2) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: using bibliometrics to group subject literatures into relevant collections—locating rare materials. (2) COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: using bibliometrics to group subject literatures into relevant collections—locating rare materials. (2) BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL: Library of Congress Subject Headings. (1) COOPERATION: ALM Periodicals Bank. (1) map library AUTOMATION.

Wisconsin—Program Curriculum Summary

Current Offering: Ph.D.

Course Requirements: 27 semester hours including:
—A library and information science major which may involve coursework in an outside area and including:
—2 or more library school doctoral level seminars
—Research methods in librarianship
—A minor field, typically 12 hours, in one or more outside areas.

Two of the following research skills are also required:
—Foreign language(s)
—Computer programming languages
—6 hours in statistics (typically “strongly recommended”)
—6 hours in research design and methodology in an outside area

Examination topics (4 are required) include:
—Foundations
Wisconsin—Dissertation Survey

Ph.D. (14 Dissertations)
Subject Summary: (3) SERVICE, USE, ETC.: user study of social science data archives—sources of variability in level of United States public library development—adult reading behavior and ego stage development. (3) SCHOOL LIBRARIES and CHILDREN: secondary school administrators' attitudes toward school librarians and library services—impact of library materials selected in response to student interests in disabilities and mainstreaming on student attitudes—determining the presence of positive self concept in elementary school libraries. (3) HISTORICAL STUDIES on developing Indian Sanskrit manuscript libraries, American influence, via the Carnegie Corp., on New Zealand librarianship, and the genesis of American public library children's services. (2) LIBRARIANS: unstable environments and centralization of decision-making in large academic libraries—relationship between public librarians' individual professionalism and attitudes toward social change information advocacy. (2) OTHER TOPICS: bibliometric and historical approaches to identifying important quantum mechanics literature—a scientometric model of interdisciplinarity of two applied sciences. (1) BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION: comparison of lecture and programmed basic catalog card and bibliographic index information instruction.

Wisconsin—Student Questionnaire
(7 of 10 Recipients Responded)

Reasons for Attending: (3) program's reputation, (3) geographic preference, (3) proximity to home, (2) particular faculty members, (1) program's scholarly interests, (1) offer of aid/job, (1) already employed at Wisconsin, (1) could attend part-time. 1 respondent attended Wisconsin for a library/information master's degree. 2 are very happy at Wisconsin, and 5 are reasonably happy.
Curriculum-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH (5 respondents): (2) program offers good independent study opportunities, (1) readers and technical services courses are "fairly good," (1) faculty have good public library and research knowledge, (1) faculty are open to needs and change within the profession. AREAS OF WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) special librarianship, (1) information studies, (1) research methods, (1) program has few coursework opportunities due to limited student enrollment. OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY (6 respondents): (consensus) very helpful and adequate, (1) information studies/inadequate.

Research-Response Summary

AREAS OF WEAKNESS (3 respondents): (2) much abstract faculty talk about research but they do little, there is a "continually increasing need" for research in the program, (1) student has observed no faculty research strengths, (1) students are not made aware of faculty research, or given opportunities for participation. AREAS OF LIMITED APPLICABILITY (1 respondent): (1) yes, unspecified. STUDENT INTERESTS/FACULTY SUPPORT (4 respondents): (1) public library administration/adequate, (1) libraries in the political process/adequate, (1) information provision in technical services/very helpful, (1) unspecified/very helpful.

Other Concerns-Response Summary

AREAS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS (2 respondents): (1) faculty are "competent and occasionally outstanding," (1) faculty are more concerned with infighting than with teaching or research, (1) faculty are willing to spend time with students.
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