User Expectations of the Martin University Library

by
Philip N. Williams
Indianapolis, IN

The purpose of this study was to record the expectations of students and faculty in determining future directions for the Martin University Library. The library was built almost exclusively from donations, and donations remain the way of obtaining funds for collection building at the time of the writing of this article.

Largely because the library has operated without a budget, the library director has not felt the urgent need to write a formal collection development policy. The data generated by the survey reported in this article could provide a basis for writing a collection development policy when it is necessitated by the exigencies of having to implement a realized budget.

The question of what directions should be taken by the Martin University Library in the future is comprised a number of subquestions. (1) What roles do users of the library expect the library to fulfill in an academic setting? For example, to what depth do library users expect the staff to assist and instruct them in research methodology? (2) What media formats will students be asking to use as they carry out their individual research projects? (3) What media are teachers likely to use in the classroom? In other words, what potential resources will the classroom demand of the library as a resource center? (4) Generally, what subject interests are held by the majority of library users? (5) Which media formats do library users prefer to use? (6) What are library user's favored styles of learning? (7) To what extent would students and faculty like to be involved in the selection of library materials? The answer to the last of these questions would bear a direct relationship to the formation of a faculty advisory committee, which Martin University does not now have, and to the formation of a Friends of the Library organization, which is also absent in the library's support system as it exists today.

Collectively, the data that have been gathered could contribute to the writing of a collection development policy, a collection management policy, and other policies relating to the day-to-day operations of the Martin University Library.

Setting for the Survey: The University

A private, not-for-profit, nondenominational, liberal arts university, Martin University was founded in the spirit of education as ministry. Instructional programs focus on serving adults, minorities, and low-income individuals.

Martin University is eighteen years old, making it the youngest university in the State of Indiana; it has 550 FTE students, making it the smallest university in the state of Indiana[1]; and it is the only predominantly African-American institution of higher learning in the State of Indiana.[2]

With the introduction of three master's degree programs in 1990, Martin Center College, the forerunner of the present school, achieved university status and was appropriately renamed Martin University.[3]

Most Martin University students come from the very lowest of socioeconomic levels. They are also nontraditional students, the average age of a Martin University student is forty years.[4]

Remedial instruction ranges from formal courses which do not count toward a Martin University degree,[5] to supplementary tutoring programs in English and mathematics, taught by staff specializing in remedial instruction.[6] At the higher end of the academic ladder Martin University offers three master's degree programs, including a unique degree, the Master of Arts program in Community Psychology, (the only program of its kind in Indiana) which studies the "theories and principles needed to help people in various settings to achieve maximum mental health."[7]

Education and nursing programs are offered in cooperation with the University of Indianapolis.[8] Transfer-of-credit is offered to Ivy Tech graduates so that they can complete baccalaureate degrees at Martin University.[9]

Martin University has two campuses other than its main campus at 2171 Avondale Place, Indianapolis. The original Martin Center now houses the community outreach programs of the university. The third and most recently established campus is the Lady Elizabeth Campus, located within the Indiana Women's Prison.

When one reviews Martin University's commitment to the imprisoned, the ill, the non-traditional student, and those who have been deprived of education by conflicting responsibilities of work and family, one begins to respect the downward reach of the institution. The most significant statistic that can be

presented in support of Martin University's effectiveness is that "[e]ighty-five percent of the students are the first in their families to attend a college or university."[10] Martin University fills an academic niche untouched by others.

Setting for the Survey: The Library[11]

The founding of Martin University represents a grassroots movement beginning with seven students as part of the ministry of a social service center, Martin Center, which still exists as a separate entity. The library began with donations of print and non-print materials. The university president and its academic dean went through donor's basements and attics, collecting materials that might contribute to an academic library collection. The first professional librarian was hired in 1993. She has managed to catalog the roughly classified assemblage she was given, in its entirety. Special items included are *The Journal of Negro History* (not indexed in commonly published indexes) and the religious collection. The Martin University Library contains 9,570 volumes, of which 3,079 are in the Reverend R.T. Andrews, Jr. religious collection.

The university librarian has three goals to reach in the next five years: to be moved out of the basement, to have a steady budget, and to be less dependent on donations. When she has a budget, she will have to write a collection development policy that is realistic in guiding the library's purchasing.

Review of Related Research

This author's greatest surprise was the scarcity of research materials related to the areas of investigation mentioned in the introduction. Susan P. Besemer, who directly shares the author's research concern for how libraries are perceived by users, states that her "search identified only a few citations [which she fails to review] similar to the...study" she undertook.[12] The only reference Besemer chose to relate offers an explanation for the paucity of research studies: "It may well be that many academic libraries are conducting useful studies for their own in-house needs, but the lack of any substantial published material in this field hinders the development of a comprehensive body of knowledge relating to audiovisual library management."[13] The lack of published studies is such that Besemer offers her short article "as a start at doing user studies of AV service facilities in academic settings."[14]

State University of New York

In 1982, the librarian of the Independent Learning Center (ILC) of the E. H. Butler Library of the State University of New York at Buffalo "undertook to study the faculty and student use of the facility and their perceptions regarding ILC services."[15] The ILC operated as an audiovisual reserve room, supplied

audiovisual resources (audiocassettes, videocassettes, slides, record discs, and curriculum media), circulated library audiovisual software, provided reference service, and offered limited production service for slides and a recording room for audiotapes. A questionnaire was developed for distribution to students at various campus locations and an identical questionnaire with pre-addressed return labels was mailed to all full-time faculty members. A distribution to students of 500 questionnaires (with a 62% response rate) was intended to be representative, but did not meet scientific standards for randomness.[16] The faculty's 26% response rate from 500 mailed forms "prevents any valid statistical inferences from being made...but...allows for some useful observations."[17]

Besemer's findings which pertain directly to perceptions of the library's roles in an academic setting and learning styles favored by library users (two of this author's areas of interest) are:

1. The major purpose of the ILC as perceived by students was that of providing instructional materials to students (75.2% of respondents), and that of providing instructional materials to faculty (58.6% of respondents). The least recognized purpose was that of providing reference services for audiovisual materials (54.2% of respondents).[18]

2. Concerning a question regarding learning styles, most students indicated reading to be their preferred way of learning (41.1%) of the respondents). Listening was second (37.9%), viewing third, (30.5%).[19]

3. Faculty viewed the purposes of the ILC as providing instructional materials for students (71.3% of respondents), providing instructional materials for faculty (75.9% of respondents), and providing reference service (58.3% of respondents).[20]

4. Faculty also prefer to learn through reading. However, 26.9% selected viewing as a preferred way of learning; and 18.5% selected listening.[21]

Besemer's percentages indicating preferred ways of learning would have taken on an added dimension had they been compared to preferences for media formats, simply as a check for consistency of responses.

Georgia State University

Beyond general perceptions of the library, of great importance to real expectations is the faculty and student's use of media. How a person intends to teach or study places direct demands on the nature of a library and its collections. In this respect, a second study conducted by Grace Agnew, William E. Meneely, and Lyn Thaxton at the Pullen Library of Georgia State University, provides highly relevant information, both in terms of the present study's design, and as a source of comparative statistics.

The Pullen Library, having the advantage of being planned as a media center from its beginning, wished to involve its 986 full-time and part-time faculty members in the development of a collection development policy, "with resulting implications for facility design."[22]

As a means of assessing needs, a media committee consisting of librarians, a representative from the nursing faculty, and a representative from the Instructional Resources Center, developed a short questionnaire for faculty members who did not use (or did not intend to use) audiovisual media for instructional purposes. The hope was that a short questionnaire would increase the response rate, hopefully capturing the responses of those who would "otherwise simply not respond."[23] A longer questionnaire inquiring about types of media used was developed for faculty members currently using (or intending to use) audiovisual media.[24]

In addition, twenty-one individuals from different departments, all of whom had indicated a strong interest in the use of audiovisual media, were personally interviewed by collection development librarians. "These personal interviews...expanded on, and provided a necessary human element to the data derived from the questionnaires."[25]

Seventy departments were divided into seven broad categories for the purpose of data analysis: arts and literature, general sciences, business, social sciences, education, health science, and "other." Responses were fairly evenly distributed among the groups.[26]

Of relevance to the question of selection priorities for materials as recommended by library users, is the prioritization of media for library acquisitions found in the Georgia State University study. When print materials were included as possible items for library acquisition, most faculty members "selected books as the first priority, followed by periodicals, audiovisual media, microforms, and maps. The seven faculty categories prioritized acquisitions in the same order, except for health sciences, which ranked periodicals first...and books second."[27]

The popularity of videocassettes is worth discussion at length:

Videocassettes proved to be the most heavily used medium by questionnaire respondents, as well as by faculty members who were interviewed. One hundred and eight respondents (56.2%) use one or more videocassettes each quarter. Interviews indicated the 1/2" VHS format is preferred.

Several faculty members indicated during interviews that videocassettes are preferable to films. Some faculty noted that they could identify major videos in their fields and supported the idea of previewing videocassettes before purchase. Interest in off-the-air taping of television programs and in locally produced videocassettes of university workshops and noted speakers was strong.

Other media heavily used by the 102 respondents include the following: films (50.5%), slide sets (41.1%), audiocassettes (38%), commercial overhead transparencies (24%), slide/tape programs (21.9%), and games and simulations (20.3%).

Videocassettes are heavily used by all faculty categories, but especially by health sciences, education, and business.[28]

University of Michigan

Another survey addressed the perception of the library's role in the academic setting of a university. In this third study, Margo Crist, Peggy Daub, and Barbara MacAdams of the University of Michigan see "an emerging imperative for libraries of all types to build in an ability to clearly show responsiveness to customers in decision making."[29] Roberts and Wilson, quoted by Crist, Daub, and MacAdams, suggest that user studies should be seen as "a normal method of obtaining management data at regularly repeated intervals."[30]

Crist, Daub, and MacAdams conducted a user study "to collect baseline information on how our users view the library."[31] A committee of public service librarians and the external relations officer of the University of Michigan launched a year-long study. A clear use of key informant information appears in the following statement:

> Before collecting data through reliable surveying techniques, the committee sought to gather frank opinions, casual observations, compliments, complaints, and concrete suggestions from a representative cross section of the user community to help shape subsequent portions of the review.[32]

This preliminary survey paved the way for two main phases of the continuing study: guided discussion with small focus groups, and a telephone survey of a random sample of library users.

Fifty-three people who were invited to participate by librarians, faculty members, and departmental chairs, gathered in nine focus groups to discuss

issues relating to the university library. Participants represented faculty, gradu-
ate students, and undergraduate students. Open-ended questions were posed to
initiate discussion.[33]

The user study committee engaged a marketing firm to design, conduct,
and analyze a telephone survey intended to investigate the findings that
emerged from the focus groups. A total of 351 individuals were surveyed,
including 159 undergraduate students, 128 graduate students, and sixty-four
faculty members. An attempt was made to "gauge levels of satisfaction among
users that would be representative of the university community as a whole."[34]
Posed were fifty-three questions in which users were asked to indicate levels of
satisfaction on a Likert scale.

Data showed that "patrons value the library's collection above all else."[35]
Virtually all of the participants in the focus groups considered journals very
important to their work.[36] (No statistics are given in the article of Crist, Daub,
and MacAdams, but it should be noted, books are not even mentioned.)
Greatest improvements needed were: "availability of terminals, ongoing training
and communication with users, and a more user-friendly interface."[37] One
finding was relevant to this author's present study concerning patron participa-
tion in the selection of library materials. It is hoped that the results found at
the University of Michigan would prove true for Martin University; specifi-
cally, "users expressed appreciation at being asked for their views, strengthening
their perception that an outstanding library results from an implicit collabora-
tion between users and staff."[38]

Two uses for survey data are recommended to Martin University, just as
they were thought valuable by the researchers at the University of Michigan:
* Incorporate the results...into strategic planning for public services....
* Publicize the study initiative and its results, institutionalizing the
   process of soliciting input from the user community on library deci-
   sions affecting their research and study.[40]

Methodology

The author of this paper designed a questionnaire using three types of
questions: (1) questions which established a collective count in which the
respondent was free to select as many options as he wanted (citing the specific
questions to record categories of subject matter or reading interests and the
range of those interests and to affirm perceived roles to be played by the li-
brary); (2) questions requiring a ranking of alternatives (citing the specific
questions — priorities assigned to media software as objects for purchase,

media formats desired as research resources by students, preferences for instructional media on the part of teachers, and preferences in ways of learning). As a variation of the ranking type of question, a Likert Scale was included as a way for respondents to declare their perception of the importance of the library. (3) Lastly, yes/no questions were included to record the perceived desirability of being asked to recommend titles for purchase, to do so on a continuing basis, and to record the respondents' desire for additional bibliographical instruction. (See questionnaire at the end of this article.)

One section of the questionnaire asked respondents to list titles of books, periodicals, videotapes, etc., that they would recommend the library purchase. The inclusion of this section had a psychological benefit — namely, respondents were given a chance to recommend titles, to perform that act before being asked whether they wanted to do so, and in doing so found comfort in performing the act. The completed list of titles will be passed on to the Martin University librarian as a list of patron suggestions. This investigator's real interest was the level of comfort found in the act of making recommendations and the desire to continue doing so.

There were minimal demographic questions in the questionnaire. Chiefly, comparisons were made between faculty and students. Additionally, librarians often assume that reading interests split along gender lines, so gender information was sought. Age seemed important since the average age of a Martin University student is forty. Obviously, variations from an established norm should be easy to detect.

In review, the survey (1) recorded the priorities users assigned to the purchase of various media available to the Martin University Library, (2) identified the styles of learning (primarily sensory) favored by the users of the library to see how those perceptions might correspond to priorities assigned in the selection of media, (3) provided a record of the reading interests of students and faculty as a guide to future collection activities on the part of library staff, and (4) allowed students and faculty an opportunity to actually recommend specific titles for future purchase.

Separately, faculty members were asked to rank their preferences among the various instructional media that might be utilized in today's classroom, hence creating a record of what future classroom demands on the library might be in terms of resources needed. Also separately, students were asked to rank their preferences in terms of resource formats they would like to see available in the library for their personal research. The survey explored the what-could-be side

of library services and resources and future needs. The conclusions of this study will set forth the what-should-be statements according to the values of users.

Additionally, the survey recorded the student's and faculty member's perceptions of the roles that the library should play in an academic program. With this knowledge, and a knowledge of what subject matters and media formats users desire, the library and its staff should be in an excellent position to write a realistic collection development policy.

Another matter that was explored was the extent to which students and faculty would like to be involved in the selection of new materials. The results could be used in determining whether a faculty advisory committee should be organized, or in determining whether students should be involved in the selection process. To what level and in what form the library responds are other matters that might find their way into written policy statements.

Procedures

Forty-five questionnaires were distributed to faculty mailboxes in the Message Center of Martin University. Twenty-five questionnaires were returned through the library's mailbox or through a collection box at the main entrance of the administrative building. Twenty-five of the forty-five questionnaires were returned (a return rate of 55.5%).

Questionnaires were handed out by this author principally at the main entrance of Martin University's administrative building (which is also the main classroom facility) throughout the work week beginning March 10, 1995. The hours of distribution alternated: 4:30 p.m. on Friday, 8:30 a.m. on Saturday, 11:30 a.m. on the following Monday, and followed the same pattern for five days. Halfway through the week, three instructors volunteered to distribute questionnaires in their classes. These offers were accepted since the instructors carried more authority than someone unknown to the students, promising, it seemed, a higher percentage of returned questionnaires. Two-hundred questionnaires were distributed to students (over a third of the FTE enrollment of the university); sixty-five were returned directly to teachers or placed in the collection box (a 32.5% return rate).

Setting up time for interviewing was the last attempt at data gathering. Fliers soliciting interviewees were placed on bulletin boards, at major entryways of three buildings, and in the break room where students could pick them up. Fliers were distributed four days in advance of the interview day. Between 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. the interviewer remained in a room of the administration building.

Few of the interview questions were in narrative format. More than half were simply a list of items, e.g., desirability of the location of the library, convenience of library use (for example, ease of finding books on the shelf), desirable hours of operation, etc. The interviewer tried to frame a few open-ended questions, e.g., "What would you like to see in the way of added services?"

It should be noted that the interview as used in this current study is not equivalent to the key informant (or focus group) interviews of Crist, Daub, and MacAdams. Their interviews preceded the survey and provided information on areas of concern used in the construction of this survey. In this current study, the interview was used as it was in the survey conducted at Georgia State University, i.e., simply as an added means of data gathering.

Problems Encountered and Acknowledged

The original intention had been to distribute 250 questionnaires. However, only 200 were distributed. This author previously mentioned that he accepted the offers of three teachers to distribute questionnaires to their classes. Unfortunately, the teachers had asked not for "just enough" questionnaires to match the number of students, but a few extra questionnaires "to be safe." The author found out about the excess number after the questionnaires were collected and the extras were returned to him. With the extras in hand and a reported possible twenty questionnaires that somehow disappeared, it is estimated that approximately fifty questionnaires were never distributed. It is only hoped at this point that the original reason for having accepted the teachers' offers held true, i.e., that a higher return of questionnaires was achieved when they were distributed by persons with authority.

Scoring questions requiring rankings necessitated the establishment of minimum standards for accepting responses. If the respondent, when asked to respond with numbers to indicate priorities, checked options rather than numbering, the responses could not be accepted. If the respondent, as frequently occurred, ranked five items using the same number, and six items using the same number, indicating only a top and a bottom, the responses were not accepted since multiple items shared a common rank, thus not resulting in a ranking. If a respondent constructed a ranking and failed to complete the full possible sequence (e.g., "1" to "14"), the part of the ranking completed was accepted and recorded since the responses did represent a setting of priorities.

Were the author to redesign the questionnaire, he would eliminate the

choice "other audiovisual media;" or he would leave a blank space allowing the respondent to name the "other media" which the author now acknowledges, need not even be audiovisual. There seemed to be some sensitivity on the part of three faculty members concerning designating themselves as male or female. Perhaps the question was perceived as sexist. The item had been included because librarians often think of reading interests along gender lines. This study can in no way prove or disprove such traditional notions.

Analysis of the Results

Of twenty-five faculty members responding, twelve were male; ten were female. There were three who chose not to identify their gender. Two faculty members were between eighteen and twenty-nine years of age; seven were between thirty and forty-nine; and fifteen (or 60%), were over fifty. One faculty member did not give an age. Of sixty-five students responding, sixteen were male; forty-three (or 66.2%) were female. Twenty-three students reported being between eighteen and twenty-nine; five reported being over fifty; and thirty-three (or 50.8%) reported being between thirty and forty-nine years of age.

Faculty members could be grouped in seven general departmental categories: English and the humanities (six faculty), science and mathematics (six faculty), psychology (five faculty), business (four faculty), social sciences (two faculty), music and fine arts (two faculty), and education (one faculty). One faculty member did not designate a department; another was affiliated with two departments.

Students could be placed in thirteen groups by their selected majors: business (eleven students), psychology and psychological counseling (eleven students), nursing and health education (ten students), religion and religious counseling (six students), education (five students), criminal justice (five students), English (three students), computer science (two students), early childhood development (one student), biology (one student), pre-med (one student), mathematics (one student), and communications (one student). Some students did not have declared majors.

A survey of personal reading interests among faculty members indicated the top three reading interests were: education (ten selections), fine arts (nine selections), with health sciences and psychology tied as third-level choices (eight selections each). The lowest-level reading interests were philosophy (one selection) and, tied for second lowest, mathematics, computer studies, and communications (four selections each).

The following presents the ranking of all personal reading interests for the faculty:

Table 1
Ranking of Favored Reading Interests (Faculty)

Reading Interest	# of Selections	Percentages
Education	10	10.4
Fine Arts	9	9.4
Health Sciences	8	8.3
Psychology	8	8.3
Natural Sciences	7	7.3
The Humanities	7	7.3
Languages	7	7.3
Music	6	6.3
Religion	6	6.3
Social Sciences	5	5.2
Business	5	5.2
Environmental Studies	5	5.2
Communications	4	4.2
Computer Studiens	4	4.2
Mathematics	4	4.2
Philosophy	1	1.0

The high percentage that chose education as an area of reading interest is hardly surprising but the high interest of the faculty in the fine arts might be. Surprising to the author is the low position of philosophy, simply because of its kinship to religion, which holds a high priority in a university offering an M.A. in Urban Ministry Studies, as well as undergraduate degrees in religion.

For students, [See Table 2] the highest declared personal reading interests were: religion (thirty selections), education (twenty-nine selections), and psychology (twenty-seven selections). Lowest reading interests were: environmental studies (five selections), mathematics (six selections), and fine arts (nine selections). Table 2 presents the ranking for personal reading interests of the student body.

Religion is of greater interest to the student body than it is to the faculty. Indeed, the first three of the top-named interests all indicate areas of public service and thought. In the case of the student body, the surprise might be the low position (last selected) given to environmental studies, an apparent contradiction of the popularity assumed for such studies.

The author had theorized that faculty members had a greater diversity of interests than students. Statistical analysis proved the oposite. A student had 4.2

Table 2
Ranking of Favored Reading Interests (Students)

Reading Interest	# of Selections	Percentages
Religion	30	11.1
Education	29	10.7
Psychology	27	10.0
Business	26	9.6
Communications	22	8.1
Music	22	8.1
The Humanities	20	7.4
Health Sciences	15	5.6
Social Sciences	14	5.2
Philosophy	14	5.2
Languages	12	4.4
Computer Studies	11	4.1
Fine Arts	9	3.3
Natural Sciences	6	2.2
Environmental Studies	5	1.9

reading interests; a faculty member had 3.8 reading interests. Ranking questions are harder to interpret. The percentages, based on division by the total number of selections for all media for all choice levels (i.e., 207 for faculty responses, 683 for student responses), are less, closer, slimmer in difference. For questions asking what media should be favored in buying library materials, these were the results, illustrative of the point just made about the closeness of priorities:

Table 3
Priorities of Media for Purchase as Ranked by Faculty

Choice Level	Medium	# of Selections	Percentages
#1	Books	8	3.9
#2	Computer-Assisted Instruction	6	2.9
#3	Journals & Magazines	5	2.4
#4	Journals & Magazines	4	1.9
#5	CD-ROMs	5	2.4
#6	Videos	4	2.4
#7	Compact Discs	3	1.4
#8	Compact Discs, Audiotapes	4 (each)	1.9 (each)
#9	Records, Audiotapes, Microforms, Maps Flat Art	2 (each)	1.0 (each)
#10	Audiotapes	3	1.4
#11	Maps, Flat Art, Other Audiovisual	3 (each)	1.4 (each)
#12	Games and Simulations	4	1.9
#13	Flat Art, Other Audiovisual	4 (each)	1.9 (each)
#14	Other Audiovisual	3	1.4

The selection of priorities for media purchase from students are different, although there are the same number of ties among the choice levels:

Table 4			
Priorities of Media for Purchase as Ranked by Students			
Choice Level	*Medium*	*# of Selections*	*Percentages*
#1	Books	35	5.1
#2	Journals & Magazines	18	2.6
#3	Newspapers	13	1.9
#4	Videotapes	12	1.8
#5	Newspapers, Audiotapes	6 (each)	0.9 (each)
#6	Videotapes, Audiotapes	8 (each)	1.2 (each)
#7	Videotapes, CD-ROMs, Compact Discs, Audiotapes	6 (each)	0.9 (each)
#8	Records	10	1.5
#9	Compact Discs	10	1.5
#10	Microforms	6	0.9
#11	Maps, Flat Art	9 (each)	1.3 (each)
#12	Flat Art	11	1.6
#13	Games and Simulations	18	2.6
#14	Other Audiovisual	18	2.6

Notable is the priority given to books by both faculty members and students. As the top-ranked medium, their authority if not their popularity remains unchallenged among materials to considered for purchase. Journals and magazines are solidly in third and fourth positions as items of purchase among faculty members. They are ranked even higher by students as a second priority for purchasing. Newspapers were never ranked higher than another medium on any choice level by faculty; hence, they disappear from the ranked media listed. Faculty members do have a high regard for computer-assisted instruction (CAI) (choice #2 level); CAI is apparently not highly regarded or recognized by students. Surprisingly perhaps, is the fact that videocassettes never rise above third choice among faculty members; and games and simulations never rise above fourth choice among students.

When students were asked to designate the priorities they would assign to various media as favored source materials for completing classwork assignments, they gave the answers displayed in Table 5.

Table 5
Media Favored for Personal Study by Students

Choice Level	Medium	# of Selections	Percentages
#1	Books	21	4.2
#2	Journals & Magazines	16	3.2
#3	Books	11	2.2
#4	Encyclopedia Articles	13	2.6
#5	Videocassettes	10	2.0
#6	Audiocassettes	13	2.6
#7	Audiocassettes	10	2.0
#8	Flat Art	13	2.6
#9	Flat Art	11	2.2
#10	Other Audiovisual	24	4.8

It is immediately noted that there is only one top-ranked medium at each choice level, although that medium may command more than one choice level. The percentages given become higher, mainly because a lower divisor (495) is being used, indicative of the fact that fewer choice levels are being asked for in this section.

Books still assert themselves on two choice levels, as do audiocassettes and flat art. Flat art makes a surprisingly strong showing. Disappearing from Table 5 are newspapers, films, and CD-ROMs; they simply did not command a top number of selections on any choice level.

When faculty members were asked to designate their preferences among media for use in classroom instruction, videos attained the priority ranking that many would automatically assign to them.

Preferred Media for Classroom Instruction (Faculty)

With the addition of percentages calculated with a divisor of 237 (the total number of selections that were made for all media on all choice levels), the reader is offered the following:

Table 6
Preferred Media for Classroom Instruction (Faculty)
(With the addition of percentages calculated with a divisor of 237,
the total number of selections that were made for all media on all choice levels.)

Choice Level	Medium	# of Selections	Percentages
#1	Videocassettes	12	5.1
#2	Films	5	2.1
#3	Filmstrips, Compact Discs	4 (each)	1.7 (each)
#4	Films	4	1.7
#5	Slide/Tape Presentations	3	1.3
#6	Slides	4	1.7
#7	Filmstrips, Transparencies	3 (each)	1.3 (each)
#8	Compact Discs, Audiotapes, Slide/Tape Presentations	3 (each)	1.3 (each)
#9	Compact Discs	5	2.1
#10	Filmstrip/Tape Presentations	5	2.1
#11	Kits and Models	5	2.1
#12	Other Audiovisual	5	2.1
#13	Records, Kits & Models, Other Audiovisual	1 (each)	0.4 (each)

It is in this table reporting teacher preferences for media use when instructing that videocassettes claim the superiority they demonstrated in the study at Georgia State University, in which "[v]ideocassettes proved to be the most heavily used medium by questionnaire respondents, as well as by faculty members in personal interviews."[40]

Of course, older media are not necessarily forgotten. Filmstrips claim a high place in Table 6, selected as a third-level choice and on two other choice levels. Films also showed a presence as second and fourth-level choices. Additionally, slides and slide/tape presentations make a strong showing as fifth and sixth level choices. Videos may lead, but they do not eradicate older media.

The last sizeable section and table is a return to the selection of as many options as seemed appropriate (i.e., the collective-count inquiry), as opposed to ranking. In calculating the percentages, the total of responses for all eight proposed roles that could be provided by the library was used as a divisor (123 for faculty, 321 for students) -- i.e., the percent of all selections made:

Table 7
Perception of Roles of the Library (by Faculty)

Perceived Role	# of Selections	Percentages
Reference Service	24	19.5
Assist and Instruct Students in Research	20	16.3
Place to Find Items to be Checked Out	18	14.6
A Place for Study	16	13.0
Provision of Instructional Materials	16	13.0
Provision of Non-Assigned or Recreational Reading	11	8.9
Place for Small Group Study	10	8.1
Programs (Speakers, Films, Etc.)	8	6.5

For the students, the results were as follows:

Table 8
Perception of Roles of the Library (by Students)

Perceived Role	# of Selections	Percentages
Reference Service	50	15.6
A Place for Study	50	15.6
Assist and Instruct Students in Research	49	15.3
Provision of Instructional Materials	47	14.6
Place for Small Group Study	36	11.2
Place to Find Items to be Checked Out	34	10.6
Provision of Non-Assigned or Recreational Reading	28	8.7
Programs (Speakers, Films, Etc.)	27	8.4

Both faculty and students see the provision of reference services as the top function of the library. Assisting and instructing students in research methods also ranks high - it is the second choice for faculty members and the third choice for students. A place for study ranked higher for students (second highest) than it did with faculty members (fourth). It seems reasonable that the place for study role is perceived more strongly by those who use the library for that purpose. The role of providing instructional materials is perceived almost equally by both groups (fifth for faculty members, fourth for students).

Viewing the library as a place for finding items to be checked out was included by the author half facetiously at first; but in reality, many may well view the library in that way.

Students perceive the library as a place for small group study more so than

do faculty members; however, there could be a critical difference in the reasons (group study assigned by faculty for class projects versus groups organized by students among themselves). Using the library for recreational reading is ranked higher by faculty. Neither students nor faculty view the library as a center for programming at any appreciable level.

Faculty members declared their preferred ways of learning to be reading, thirteen responses (52%); viewing, ten responses (40%); listening, nine responses (36%); followed by practical experience, seven responses (28%). The divisor is the number of faculty members responding (twenty-five).

For students, method of learning preference was reading, seventeen responses (26.2%). Listening and practical experience were tied for second place, sixteen responses (24.6% each). Viewing was last, fourteen responses (21.5%). The divisor is the number of students responding (sixty-five).

In some concluding matters, after having been given the opportunity to recommend media titles, seventeen faculty members (81%) declared they liked being asked to recommend media titles. One faculty member was not sure. In answer to the same question, thirty-eight students (70.4%) liked being asked to recommend media titles.

When asked, "Do you feel you should be asked to recommend titles on a continuing basis?" nineteen faculty (90.5%) felt they should be asked on a continuing basis. Forty students (72.7%) felt they should be asked to recommend titles to the library on a continuing basis.

The greatest number of faculty members and students rank the library as extremely important, fourteen (58.3%) for faculty; and thirty-seven, (60.7%) for students. Three (12.5%) faculty members ranked the library as very important; fifteen students (24.6%) ranked the library as very important. Six faculty members (25%) ranked the library as important; seven students (11.5%) ranked the library as important. One faculty member saw the library as "somewhat" important; one student also ranked the library as low. Only one person, a student, ranked the library as not important at all.

Concerning the last question, "Do you desire instruction in how to use the library beyond what is regularly offered?" fifteen faculty members (65.2%) replied no; eight (34.8%) replied yes. However, of one of the most significant statistics coming out of this study, forty-five students (77.6%) indicated the desire for more bibliographic instruction.

Comments Made in Interviews and Voluntarily Written On Questionnaire [41]

Many student comments indicated the desire for a larger library facility: "More seating...larger area." Most comments were bluntly stated: "Get the library out of the basement." "The library shouldn't be in the basement." Two interviewees were vociferous on the need for a new location.

One interviewee wanted evening hours for the library, which will not be possible until a second librarian is hired or a student clerk is added to the staff. One interviewee wanted "more updated" resources, which will probably be impossible until the library has a budget with which it can purchase materials. Some suggestions seem totally impossible; e.g., "windows" in a basement?

Other suggestions did seem possible. One interviewee wanted foliage, which could be provided. One suggested that the level of awareness of the library might be lifted by a regularly published column in Martin University's newsletter, *The Martin University Communicator,* in which new materials could be reviewed. One interviewee saw the possibility of extracurricular programming (film programs, plays, lectures, etc.) -- a suggestion that drew little support from others.

Other suggestions for new directions in the development of services and resources were assistance in the production of audio and video tapes, provision of facilities for listening to and viewing tapes, and online access to other libraries. Catalogs to software seemed a minimum provision to one student.

Specific requests for printed materials included books covering resume preparation and career planning, reserve copies of required textbooks, and extra or supplementary reading.

One interviewee felt, "The library should be in one building; there should be a computer system joining Martin University to IUPUI (Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis) and its medical library; there should be study rooms and weekend hours." Those suggestions came from a Martin University student who drives to IUPUI regularly to use its libraries.

As far as faculty comments, one faculty member would like to see more books, magazines, and videocassettes. Another is understanding of the real situation "to the extent that money and space allow." One faculty member, in response to the question about bibliographic instruction, would like to know how to access other libraries, including Indiana University at Bloomington.

The library is valued. One faculty member writes, "I bring in my class every semester." The persons interviewed seemed to find the library, including the Library of Congress Classification System, easy to use.

Students wrote of "space," and "renovation." One suspects these words echo back to the seemingly unanimous declaration: "Get the library of the basement."

Summary of the Data

The author would like to point to some similarities between this and Besemer's study which she could not make because of the limitation of the number of areas in which she collected data. Both faculty members and students in her study and at Martin University declared reading to be their preferred way of learning. Both groups, when given an opportunity to set priorities from options which included printed materials, gave first priority to books. (See Tables 3 and 4). Students gave journals and magazines second priority. Faculty members gave third priority to journals and magazines, a departure from the pattern observed at Georgia State University by Agnew, Meneely, and Thaxton. The high ranking of computer-assisted instruction for media purchases by Martin University faculty stands out. Of course, students had an additional opportunity to prioritize a set of options which included printed media, that of media for personal study (see Table 5) and again, books rose to top priority. Journals and magazines remained as second. In conclusion, what the respondents reported as a preferred way of learning was supported by their selections of top-rated media. Consistency is proof.

A survey of faculty personal reading interests showed education (a professional interest, assuredly), fine arts, health sciences and psychology (tied for third) to occupy the top three levels of interest. (See Table 1). The high priority of fine arts seems a surprise.

For students, the highest three areas of personal reading interests were religion, education, and psychology. For this group, fine arts fell to the bottom of priorities, along with environmental studies and natural sciences. (See Table 2). A person senses a possible commitment to community service in the top three selections, especially since psychology was selected by majors in counseling, religion, education, health care, nursing, criminal justice, as well as psychology. It seems reasonable that students are open to more reading interests while faculty members are professionally interested in the fields with which they are identified.

When media use was viewed within the application of classroom instructional purposes (the same frame of reference found in the study of Agnew, Meneely, and Thaxton at Georgia State University), videocassettes rose to top priority among the media selected. (See Table 6). Films and filmstrips claimed surprisingly high priorities. Computer-assisted instruction dropped out of the list, simply because that medium was too distributed as a selection; it could not command a priority position on any choice level.

Both faculty members and students assigned top priority to the library's role as a provider of reference services (the least recognized role according to faculty and students in Besemer's study of an audiovisual library component at the State University of New York at Buffalo). Assisting and instructing students in methods of research appeared as second priority for faculty members at Martin University and as third choice of students. (See Tables 7 and 8). The designation of this latter role is further supported by the answer to the question, "Do you desire instruction in how to use the library beyond what is regularly offered?" which evoked an extremely high "yes" response (77.6%). A person wonders whether adding a library staff member -- a person willing to work weekends and evenings while dedicating himself to writing brochures and other instructional materials -- or a member of the English department who would be willing to write formal courses in bibliographic instruction, should be considered in meeting what is a very pronounced need for instruction as expressed by students in the survey.

The majority of faculty members and students liked being asked to recommend media titles for the library and would like to continue to do so. The positive responses to the two questions covering the willingness to make recommendations range from 70.4% to 90.5%.

A great number of faculty members and students rank the library as being extremely important (60.7% of students, 58.7% of faculty). The author suspects there are the makings of a faculty advisory committee and a Friends of the Library group somewhere in that supportive vote.

Questionnaire

Your university is planning for the next century. We would appreciate your input. Your suggestions will be given full consideration. Thank you for your cooperation.

Check One: _____ I am a student.   _____ I am a faculty member.

Check One: _____ Male   _____ Female

Check One (age group in years): _____ 18 to 29   _____ 30 to 49   _____ 50 or over

For Students to Complete: My major subject of study is: _____

For Faculty to Complete: My department is: _____

For All Respondents to Answer:

My personal interest are (check more than one, if necessary):

_____ Business	_____ Natural Sciences
_____ Education	_____ Environmental Studies
_____ Communications	_____ The Humanities
_____ Computer Studies	_____ Languages
_____ Health Sciences	_____ Fine Arts
_____ Mathematics	_____ Music
_____ Social Sciences	_____ Philosophy
_____ Psychology	_____ Religion

For All Respondents to Answer:

Please suppose that your library had just been granted $500,000 to spend as the staff wanted. Indicate to the staff how you feel the money should be spent, marking "1" for most desirable, to "14" for least desirable.

_____ Books	_____ Phono Disks (Records)
_____ Journals & Magazines	_____ Audio Tapes
_____ Newspapers	_____ Microforms
_____ Video Tapes	_____ Maps
_____ CD-ROMs	_____ Art Prints, Still Photos, Flat Visuals
_____ Computer-Assisted Instructional Programs	_____ Games/Simulations
_____ Compact Disks	_____ Other Audiovisual Devices

For Students to Complete:

If I wanted to write a short report on Nelson Mandela, I would most like to find (rank in order of preference from "1" for most desirable to "10" for least desirable):

_____ An Encyclopedia Article	_____ Audiorecording/Interviews
_____ Newspaper Articles	_____ Film of Subject
_____ Journal or Magazine	_____ Mounted or Flat Photo Items
_____ Books	_____ CD-ROM on African Affairs
_____ Video Recording/Interview	_____ Other Audiovisual Devices

For All Respondents:

My preferred way to learn is (rank from "1," favorite, to "4," least favorite:

_____ Reading   _____ Listening   _____ Viewing   _____ Practical Experience

For Faculty Members to Complete:

Of the following items which could be used with classroom (or group) presentations, please indicate which you would be most inclined to use, from "1," most inclined to use, to "13," least inclined to use.

_____ Video Tapes	_____ Compact Discs
_____ Computer-Assisted	_____ Audio Tapes
Instructional Programs	_____ Phono Discs (Records)
_____ Films	_____ Slide/Tape Programs
_____ Filmstrips	_____ Filmstrip/Tape Programs
_____ Transparencies	_____ Kits and Models
_____ Slides	_____ Other Audiovisual Devices

For All Respondents:

Please recommend a few titles you would like to see added to the library, and please specify the format in which you know the titled item (that is: it is a book; it is a journal; it is a film; it is a CD-ROM product; and so on).

For All Respondents:

Do you like being asked to recommend titles? _____ Yes _____ No
Do you feel you should be asked to recommend titles on a continuing basis?
    _____ Yes _____ No

For All Respondents:

In my opinion, the purpose of the library is (check more than one, if necessary):

    _____ To Provide a Place for Study
    _____ To Provide Instructional Materials
    _____ To Provide Reference Services
    _____ To Assist and Instruct Students in Research
    _____ To Provide a Place for Small Group Study
    _____ To Provide Non-Assigned or Recreational Reading
    _____ To Provide Programs (Speakers, Films, Etc.)
    _____ To Provide a Place to Find Items to be Checked Out

For All Respondents:

How important is the library to you?

_____ Extremely _____ Very _____Important _____ Somewhat _____Not at All

Do you desire instruction in how to use the library beyond what is regularly offered?

_____ Yes _____ No

The library thanks you for your cooperation in completing this survey form. We are building toward the new Centruy, your library, and you.

Works Cited

Agnew, Grace; William E. Meneely; and Lyn Thaxton. "Faculty Audiovisual Materials Use and Collection Planning at Georgia State University." *Collection Management* 11 (1989): 151-74.

Besemer, Susan P. "Academic Library Media Usage: Faculty and Student Use of the Independent Learning Center." Report -- Research/Technical, ERIC, ED 226 744.

Crist, Margo; Peggy Daub; and Barbara MacAdams. "User Studies: Check and Future Perfect." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 68 (February 1994): 38-41.

Hardin, Boniface. Fundraising letter, February 1995.

"History of Martin University." *Indianapolis Register,* January 1995, advertising supplement.

Martin University: Community Psychology. [brochure]. Indianapolis: Martin University, n.d.

Martin University: 1994-1997 Academic Catalog. Indianapolis: Martin University, 1994.

"The Scope of Martin University." *Indianapolis Register.* January 1995, advertising supplement.

"Students." *Indianapolis Register.* January 1995, advertising supplement.

Students of Martin University. Interviews by the author, 24 March 1995.

"Summer Tutoring Results in Higher Retention." *The Martin University Communicator* 7 (November/December 1994): 5.

Thompson, Sandi, Martin University Librarian. Interview by the author, 25 February 1995.

Endnotes

1. Rev. Fr. Boniface Hardin
2. "The Scope of Martin University"
3. "History of Martin University"
4. Martin University: Community Psychology

5. Martin University: 1994-1997 Academic Catalog
6. "Summer Tutoring Results in Higher Retention"
7. Martin University: Community Psychology
8. "Scope of Martin University."
9. Ibid.
10. "Students"
11. Sandi Thompson
12. Susan P. Besemer
13. Sarah Greene, "Thoughts on Audiovisual User Studies," *Audiovisual Librarian* 6 (1980):61-62, quoted in Susan P. Besemer, p. 4-5.
14. Susan Besemer, p 5.
15. Ibid., 4.
16. Ibid., 6.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid, 7.
19. Ibid, 8.
20. Ibid., 9.
21. Ibid.
22. Grace Agnes, William E. Meneely, and Lyn Thaxton, p. 153-154.
23. Ibid., 154.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., 155.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., 157.
28. Ibid.
29. Margo Crist, Peggy Daub, and Barbara MacAdams, p. 28.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., 39.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., 40.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., 41.
39. Ibid.
40. Agnew, Meneely, and Thaxton, "Faculty Audiovisual Materials Use," 157.
41. Students of Martin University, interview with the author.