Research Notes

Teaching Faculty Perceptions of Academic Librarians at Memphis State University

Robert T. Ivey

In recent years academic librarians have shown increasing concern over how their teaching faculty colleagues perceive their role in the university community. Four surveys conducted on university and college campuses since the 1980s have identified attitudes held by teaching faculty. A survey conducted at Memphis State University (MSU) in the spring and fall of 1990 repeated earlier survey questions and added original questions evaluating the MSU Libraries' adequacy, librarians' service, and the library collection. The Memphis State survey supplements previous findings highlighting similarities and differences in teaching faculty's perceptions and suggesting strategies to promote better understanding of academic librarians' roles.

any recent studies focus on the public's perception of librarians. Academic librarians show increasing concern over how they are perceived by their faculty colleagues. Several constant factors affect the relationship between librarians and teaching faculty. They include the number of academic librarians, the strength or weakness of the collection, and the size of the institution, the faculty, the student body, and the library facility. Currently, diminishing financial resources strain this relationship even further. As early as 1968, Florence Holbrook cited Robert Leigh's observation that much of the librarian's unfavorable image can be ascribed to the fact that the nonprofessional library worker is more visible, and subsequently, patrons cannot determine who is a librarian and who is not.[1] Faculty cannot easily distinguish between librarians and support staff. Robert Blackburn noted that teaching faculty and librarians clash because of the roles they play, competing ends, and character differences.[2] In 1969 Maurice Marchant traced conflict between teaching faculty and librarians to anything that diminished faculty's control over students.[3]

In 1981 Mary Biggs cited several sources of conflict between teaching faculty and

---

librarians. According to Biggs, teaching faculty and academic librarians have conflicting views over how the library should be managed. They differ in opinion about who should control book selection. Because few librarians hold doctoral degrees, teaching faculty see this difference in minimal intellectual achievement reflected in librarians' lower publication rates, which makes librarians in their opinion less qualified to control book selection. Also, teaching faculty unfairly judge librarians when they fail to purchase necessary book materials with scant funds.[4]

Faculty cannot easily distinguish between librarians and support staff.

Rebecca Kellogg observes that administrators do not think about librarians; they think about libraries.[5] John Lanning characterizes teaching faculty-librarian relations as distant, ineffective, and driven by frustration.[6] According to Lanning, faculty consider librarians only in a service role and dwell on the frustration of not having journals and monographs they wish for their research and teaching projects. Consequently, a frustrated faculty member does not solicit librarians' experience and expertise; a close working relationship between teaching faculty and librarians may be impossible to achieve.

Lanning suggested several ways to improve the teaching faculty-academic librarian relationship: 1) an increase of dialogue between faculty and librarians, 2) an increased knowledge by librarians of skills required by departmental accrediting agencies, 3) serving on curriculum committees, 4) working in tandem with university departments seeking new approaches to common problems of limited resources and heavy workloads, and 5) librarians and teaching faculty teaching courses in information literacy.[7]

Anne Commerton extolls library instruction as a means of building a partnership with teaching faculty and suggested that librarians attend faculty meetings and informal functions and be a part of the academic procession at graduation.[8] Jinnie Y. Davis and Stella Bentley advised that librarians become involved in the teaching process by lecturing to individual classes and by obtaining membership in committees outside the library.[9]

PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS STUDY

If teaching faculty have mistaken impressions of academic librarians, librarians must strive to identify these misconceptions in order to change them. This survey of teaching faculty's perceptions of academic librarians conducted at Memphis State University attempts to determine whether teaching faculty there shares the same attitudes as their teaching faculty colleagues at universities and colleges previously surveyed.

Librarians at Memphis State follow many of the policies recommended by librarians cited above to promote better librarian-teaching faculty relations. Memphis State librarians teach courses in bibliographic instruction, serve on university committees, including the faculty senate, and participate in the academic procession at commencement. Several librarians teach in other university departments: English, foreign languages, education, sociology, and music. Data collected at Memphis State when compared with data collected in prior surveys reveal similarities and differences in teaching faculty's perceptions and misconceptions of academic librarians that might suggest strategies for change that would foster better librarian-teaching faculty relations everywhere.

THE LITERATURE

Since the early 1980s several studies have examined teaching faculty's perceptions of academic librarians on college and university campuses. M. Cathy Cook in 1981 surveyed teaching faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and concluded that an overwhelming majority of faculty believed that service was the most important function

of librarians and were unaware of the amount of instruction given to students to help them more effectively use the library.[10]

John Budd and Patricia Coutant's 1981 study at Southwestern Louisiana University, where—like their colleagues at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale—librarians also have faculty status, reveals that the faculties of the Colleges of Education and of Humanities view librarians' contributions as more substantial than do faculty in the Colleges of Business and Technology.[11]

A survey conducted at the University of Manitoba by Gaby Divay, Ada M. Ducas, and Nicole Michaud-Oystryk, which questioned 1,095 faculty and produced 633 usable responses, reveals that although students are referred to librarians at a high rate and faculty valued librarians' teaching assistance, faculty do not view librarians as major contributors to the educational process.[12] Very few faculty consider librarians to be their academic equals and see them mainly in their service role. The vast majority of faculty consider librarians to be professionals, but not academics. These researchers detected widespread confusion as to who among library personnel were the trained staff and who were their professionally educated colleagues. Thus, the supervisory employee in charge of interlibrary loan or behind the circulation desk may or may not have been a librarian. The authors conclude, "As long as the faculty are themselves ill-informed about [who is a librarian], they cannot be expected to appreciate the librarians' contribution as fully as would be desirable."[13]

A recent survey of faculty perceptions of librarians conducted at Albion College in Albion, Michigan, by Larry R. Oberg, Mary Kay Schleiter, and Michael Van Houten used many of the same questions of the Cook and the Divay, Ducas, and Michaud-Oystryk surveys.[14] Results show that teaching faculty neither view librarians as academic equals nor consider them as central to the teaching and research mission of the college. The authors acknowledged that faculty still focus on the most visible operations of the library, that is, functions not indicative of the academic nature of librarians' work. The authors conclude that "librarians must make the invisible visible. They must settle upon their role, perform it consistently, and communicate it unambiguously. When they do, their unique services and abilities will come to be understood and valued by their communities."[15]

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Memphis State University was founded in 1912 as a teachers' training college. Memphis State Libraries serve approximately 20,578 students and 880 full-time teaching faculty members which include 105 instructors, 271 assistant professors, 229 associate professors, and 275 professors. The main library includes five other branches: Chemistry, Engineering, Math, Music, and Speech and Hearing. The library collection contains approximately 1,000,000 volumes. Memphis State library staff includes 28 full-time professional librarians, 82 classified staff, and 1 temporary, classified staff person. *Librarian* refers to all library faculty holding at least the terminal master's degree in library science. Since 1970, librarians at Memphis State have had faculty rank and are tenured or tenure-track. A second master's in a subject field is required for promotion and tenure.

METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument used included twenty-three questions, most of them taken from the Cook, Divay, Ducas, and Michaud-Oystryk and the Oberg, Schleiter, and Van Houten surveys. The survey instrument also included original questions evaluating the Memphis State Libraries' collection and library service as compared to other libraries used by survey respondents. The questionnaire was distributed in the fall of 1990 to all teaching faculty. A cover letter stated that all results would be reported in aggregate format and that respondents' confidentiality would be respected. All 880 full-time teaching faculty were

TABLE 1
RESPONDENTS TO SURVEY

College	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	%
College of Arts and Sciences	52	45	49	20	166	43
College of Education	24	22	12	8	66	17
Fogelman Business School	19	13	17	4	53	14
College of Communication	14	16	14	2	46	12
Herff College of Engineering	10	7	11	2	30	8
School of Nursing	0	4	4	0	8	2
Department of Audiology	3	1	3	1	8	2
School of Law	1	0	3	0	4	1
Military Science	0	1	1	2	4	1
Grand total					385	100

(8 undeclared)

asked to respond. Finally, 395 surveys were returned with 393 of them usable, yielding a response rate of 45 percent.

Three hundred eighty-five of the respondents declared a rank and a departmental affiliation. Of these respondents, 43 percent were from the College of Arts and Sciences, 17 percent from the College of Education, 14 percent from the Fogelman School of Business, 12 percent from the College of Communication, 8 percent from the College of Engineering, 2 percent from the School of Nursing, 2 percent from the Department of Audiology, and 1 percent each from the School of Law and School of Military Science. The remaining surveys came from faculty in special programs who did not state an affiliation. Among the respondents, 32 percent were full professors, 28 percent were associate professors, 30 percent assistant professors, and 10 percent were instructors. (See table 1.)

As in the Oberg, Schleiter, Van Houten study, three prominent groups of individuals whose professional status might have influenced their perceptions of Memphis State librarians were distinguishable. The first group, based on rank, was composed of professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors. The second group was composed of faculty who characterized themselves as teaching oriented (17 percent), research oriented (42 percent), and equally teaching and re-search oriented (41 percent). The third group was comprised of frequent users, faculty who used the library on a daily or weekly basis (62 percent), and infrequent users who used the library monthly, or less frequently (38 percent). Of the frequent users, 39 percent were professors, 21 percent were associate professors, 29 percent were assistant professors, and 11 percent were instructors. Of the infrequent users 35 percent were professors, 21 percent were associate professors, 31 percent were assistant professors, and 13 percent were instructors.

SURVEY RESULTS

Teaching faculty value librarians' service at Memphis State, but not as highly as faculty at other institutions value the services offered by their librarians. Only 47 percent of the Memphis State teaching faculty respondents found librarians useful or very useful in keeping them informed of changes in the library. (See table 2.) Only 24 percent found librarians useful or very useful in keeping them informed of new publications in their discipline, and only 50 percent found librarians useful or very useful in assisting them in their teaching activities. These percentages compare unfavorably with percentages reported at smaller Albion College, which were 93 percent, 76 percent, and 74 percent respectively.[16] At the University of Mani-

TABLE 2
"HOW USEFUL ARE LIBRARIANS IN KEEPING YOU INFORMED ABOUT
CHANGES IN THE LIBRARY, OF NEW PUBLICATIONS IN YOUR DISCIPLINE,
IN ASSISTING WITH YOUR TEACHING ACTIVITIES?"

	Very Useful		Useful		Neutral		Of Little Use		Not Useful	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Changes (N = 388)	50	12.9	132	34.0	89	22.9	73	18.8	44	11.4
Publications (N = 388)	31	8.0	61	15.8	85	21.9	105	27.0	106	27.3
Teaching Assistance (N = 385)	66	17.1	128	33.2	103	26.9	51	13.2	37	9.6

toba, percentages were lower than at Albion College, but higher than those at Memphis State. Of the Manitoba respondents, 62 percent claimed that librarians were useful or very useful in keeping them informed of changes in the library; 38 percent had a favorable opinion about being informed of new publications in their disciplines, and like Memphis State, a lower percentage of faculty (50 percent) believed that librarians assisted them in their teaching activities.[17] Of the respondents at Memphis State, 53 percent consider librarians as neutral, of little use, or not useful at keeping them informed of changes in the library. As for being informed of new publications in their discipline, 76 percent find librarians neutral, of little use, or not useful. Fifty percent of the faculty find librarians to be either neutral, of little use, or not useful in assisting with their activities.

Teaching faculty value librarians' service at Memphis State, but not as highly as faculty at other institutions do.

In contrast to Albion College, more teaching-oriented faculty than research-oriented faculty respondents find librarians very useful or useful in keeping them informed of new publications in their discipline (79 percent versus 30 percent). Slightly more (53 percent) of the teaching-oriented respondents find librarians more useful to their teaching activities than do the research-oriented respondents (50 percent). Albion College figures for these data are 74 percent and

54 percent. Obviously, at Memphis State teaching-oriented faculty do not find librarians to be much more useful in assisting with their teaching activities than research-oriented faculty. Of 372 respondents, teaching-research-oriented faculty consider librarians significantly less useful in informing them about changes in the library than teaching-oriented faculty. This is probably because teaching-research-oriented faculty may expect more information from librarians and may become frustrated when it is not forthcoming.

When the Scheffé significance test was applied to these three groups, a significant difference emerged between groups 1 and 3, or C in table 3. Of 369 respondents, Scheffé showed that research-oriented faculty find librarians to be significantly less effective in assisting with their teaching activities than teaching-oriented faculty, groups 1 and 2, A in table 3. Evidently, research-oriented faculty rely more on themselves in their teaching activities and may have a lower opinion of librarians' ability to assist with their teaching activities.

At Memphis State, 44 percent of the respondents refer students to a librarian almost daily or several times a month. Another 33 percent refer students to a librarian about once a month or several times a year, and the rest (17 percent) almost never refer students to a librarian. Only the first figure compares favorably with the University of Manitoba, where the figures are 30 percent, 42 percent, and 20 percent respectively. As for librarians' contributions to the education of their students, respondents at Memphis State (62 percent) believe that

TABLE 3
PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS BASED ON FACULTY ORIENTATION

	Teaching-Oriented (Group 1)	Mean Research-Oriented (Group 2)	Teaching-Research Oriented (Group 3)	D.F.	F-Test	P	Scheffé
How useful are librarians about library changes?							
1 = very useful;							
5 = not useful	2.5	2.88	2.94	2,372	3.2848	.0385	C
How often do you refer students to a librarian?							
1 = almost daily;							
5 = almost never	3.07	3.32	2.84	2,372	5.9	.0003	B
How much are librarians involved in the education of your students?							
1 = very substanially;							
5 = none	3.0	3.36	3.06	2,371	4.98	.0073	A, B
How important is the librarian's public service role?							
1 = high;							
4 = low	2.31	2.73	2.83	2,340	3.89	.0212	C
How important is the librarian's role in your research?							No
1 = very important;							
5 = unimportant	2.27	2.20	2.16	2,372	.2559	.7743	groups
How useful are librarians in assisting with your teaching activities?							
1 = very useful;							
5 = not useful	2.42	2.86	2.59	2,369	3.87	.0215	A

Scheffé significance between groups: A = Groups 1 and 2; B = Groups 2 and 3; and C = Groups 1 and 3

librarians have some to very substantial involvement in the education of their students as compared with 63 percent of the faculty at the University of Manitoba. Of the Memphis State respondents, 38 percent believe that librarians have only some involvement in the education of their students as compared with 42 percent at the University of Manitoba. A disappointingly low 23 percent of Memphis State respondents believe that librarians have made more than some contribution to the education of their students, only a little better than the low 21 percent reported at the University of Manitoba. This reflects either low expectations of librarians by teaching faculty or a misunderstanding of their abilities and responsibilities as noted by the authors of the University of Manitoba survey.[18] Teaching faculty may have low expectations of librarians because many librarians are not educated in the faculty's particu-

lar disciplines and teaching faculty may not expect librarians to be very knowledgeable in these disciplines.

Assistant professors refer students to a librarian significantly less frequently than professors, group 1, and associate professors, group 2 (Scheffé test B, D). This phenomenon possibly might be attributed to assistant professors' lack of confidence in librarians' abilities due to a shorter time at the institution and in the profession, and less long-term, personal contact with librarians than their faculty colleagues in the upper ranks. Research-oriented respondents refer students to a librarian significantly less often than teaching-research-oriented respondents (see table 3). Research-oriented respondents also find librarians to be significantly less involved in the education of their students than either teaching-oriented or teaching-research-oriented respondents, groups 1 and 2 and groups

TABLE 4
PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS BASED ON FACULTY RANK

	Professor (Group 1)	Mean Associate Professor (Group 2)	Scores Assistant Professor (Group 3)	Instructor (Group 4)	D.F.	F-Test	P	Scheffé
Does the library fulfill your needs?								
1 = always;								
4 = rarely	2.17	2.31	2.39	2.2	3,383	2.9	.0031	A
How does the collection rate comparatively?								
1 = superior;								
4 = poor	3.0	3.17	3.3	2.6	3,374	8.45	.0000	B, E, F
How does librarians' service rate comparatively?								
1 = excellent;								
4 = poor	2.21	2.44	2.5	2.22	3,368	2.69	.0460	A,B
How useful are librarians about library changes?								
1 = very useful;								No
5 = not useful	2.72	2.78	3.0	2.7	3,380	1.5	.2121	groups
How useful are librarians about new publications?								
1 = very useful;								
5 = not useful	3.47	3.26	3.73	3.62	3,381	2.72	.0437	D
How often do you refer students to a librarian?								
1 = almost daily;								
5 = almost never	2.87	2.91	3.38	3.4	3,380	5.04	.0019	B, D

Scheffé significance between groups: A = Groups 1 and 2; B = Groups 1 and 3; C = Groups 1 and 4; D = Groups 2 and 3; and E = Groups 2 and 4

2 and 3. Research-oriented faculty probably believe that they are more capable than librarians of educating their students and they rely less on librarians for assistance in their teaching activities than do their teaching-oriented colleagues. As for frequent-infrequent users, frequent users referred students to a librarian significantly more often than infrequent users. It may be that frequent users have more confidence in librarians' abilities than do infrequent users, who may be more apathetic about library service and librarians (see tables 4, 5a, and 5b).

In a series of original questions, respondents were asked to rate the adequacy of Memphis State libraries and service offered by Memphis State librarians as compared with service at academic libraries they had used in the past. Only 5 percent believe that the library always fulfills their needs. Sixty-six percent answered that the library service meets their needs most of the time,

26 percent indicate sometimes, and only 3 percent answered that service rarely meets their requirements. Concerning librarians' service, a little over half of the respondents rate it as excellent or above average (19 percent and 36 percent respectively). Thirty-six percent rate service as good and only 9 percent think it is poor.

Significant differences emerge between respondents holding different faculty ranks. Professors rate library adequacy significantly higher than either assistant professors or associate professors. The latter two groups rank library service significantly lower than professors (see table 4). It could be that lower ranks are working for tenure and promotion and are more productive. Thus, they have higher expectations of librarians' service than do professors, and are more inclined to be disappointed when their needs are not met immediately. Faculty employed longest at Memphis State find librarians' service better

TABLE 5 A
PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS BASED ON FREQUENCY OF USE

	Mean Frequent Users	Scores Infrequent Users	D.F.	T-Test	P
How often do you refer students to a librarian?					
1 = almost daily;					
5 = almost never	2.89	3.38	386	-3.85	.000
How much are librarians involved in the education of your students?					
1 = very substantially;					
5 = none	3.09	3.3	383	-2.03	.043
What should librarians' role be in book selection?					
0 = no control;					
25 = total control	11.74	12.63	386	-2.89	.004
How important is the librarian in your research?					
1 = very important;					
5 = unimportant	2.02	2.48	385	-4.21	.000
How many MSU librarians do you know by name?					
0 to 28	2.98	1.66	378.52	7.01	.000

TABLE 5 B
PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS BASED ON FREQUENCY OF USE

	Frequent Users % yes	Infrequent Users % yes	D.F.	T-Test	P
Involvement with librarians in reference assistance?	90.9	84.7	391	1.786	.074
Involvement with librarians in collection development?	44.9	34.0	391	2.173	.03
Involvement with librarians in library instruction and orientation?	28.4	18.0	391	3.01	.0027
Involvement with librarians in library policy issues?	13.6	4.0	391	3.53	.000
Involvement with librarians in private social functions?	15.2	8.9	391	2.25	.0248
Use of the chemistry branch?	7.0	1.5	391	3.031	.0072

than faculty employed for less time. Faculty serving for less than five years and those serving between five and ten years find librarians' service significantly less adequate than faculty serving for more than fifteen years. Such figures may indicate that as teaching faculty use the library over the years and become better acquainted with librarians, they may perceive that librarians' service improves. Also, longer-term faculty's needs change as they teach and develop their courses, and consequently, they may rely less on librarians' service than the lower ranks (see table 6).

ROLE

Many of the duties formerly performed by librarians, including cataloging duties, interlibrary loan, circulation, and reserve book tasks, are being performed today by paraprofessionals. Standard reference questions are also being answered by paraprofessionals, leaving reference librarians free to do consultations, computerized database

TABLE 6
PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARIANS BASED ON YEARS ON FACULTY

	-5 Years (Group 1)	Mean 5–10 Years (Group 2)	Scores 5–15 Years (Group 3)	+15 Years (Group 4)	D.F.	F-Test	P	Scheffé
Does the library fulfill your needs?								
1 = always;								
4 = rarely	2.36	2.39	2.27	2.10	3,385	5.48	.0011	C, E
How does the library collection rate compared with libraries you have used?								
1 = superior;								
4 = poor	3.22	3.25	3.26	2.79	3,375	8.57	.0000	C, E, F
How does librarians' service rate compared with service elsewhere?								
1 = excellent;								
4 = poor	2.52	2.43	2.44	2.04	3,369	7.3	.0001	C, E

Scheffé significance between groups: A = Groups 1 and 2; B = Groups 1 and 3; C = Groups 1 and 4; D = Groups 2 and 3; E = Groups 2 and 4; and F = Groups 3 and 4

searching, and library instruction. As noted by Oberg, Schleiter, and Van Houten, these changes in the workflow have not been communicated effectively to faculty. This lack of communication contributes to misconceptions about the role of librarians and support staff.[19] Thus, as Divay, Ducas, and Michaud-Oystryk observe, faculty may not distinguish between support staff and the professionally educated librarian. Faculty may assume that a person in charge of a particular area has professional status and may not recognize the professional standing of a librarian performing "invisible" activities such as collection development or cataloging.[20]

When asked whether librarians should conduct research, 71 percent of the respondents thought that librarians should conduct some kind of research.

Memphis State respondents, when asked to rate librarians' roles on a scale of 1 to 4, highest to lowest priority, give highest priority to university service (57 percent), followed by research (40 percent), public service (19 percent), teaching (16 percent), management (15 percent), and administration (8 percent). At the University of Illinois, Carbondale, M. Cathy Cook finds that 85 percent of faculty perceive the duties of librarians to be primarily university service, followed by research at 8 percent, teaching at 5 percent, and library organization and management at 2 percent.[21]

In contrast to Albion College statistics, teaching-oriented respondents at Memphis State rate teaching as a higher priority for librarians (51 percent) than research-oriented (44 percent) or teaching-research-oriented respondents (44 percent). A significantly higher portion of teaching-research-oriented faculty see public service as a higher priority for librarians than teaching-oriented faculty (see table 3). Like the Albion College statistics, however, frequent library users (53 percent) are more likely to assign teaching a high or higher priority than infrequent library users (38 percent). Infrequent users may have lower expectations of librarians and may not expect them to teach.

When asked whether librarians should conduct research, 71 percent of the respondents believe that librarians should conduct some kind of research. This compares with the Albion College study where 85 percent of the respondents state that librarians should conduct research. Very few faculty respondents (15, or 4 percent),

believe that librarians should conduct no research. Only 13 percent believe that librarians should conduct research on practical and scholarly topics. Nineteen percent believe that librarians should focus research on practical topics, and 12 percent, scholarly topics. Only one faculty member believes that librarians should conduct research in other disciplines.

When faculty were asked about the importance of librarians' assistance in faculty research, 70 percent of the respondents replied that librarians were important or very important to their research. Only 14 percent claim that librarians are of little importance or unimportant, while 10 percent are neutral. This compares favorably with Albion College where 64 percent of the respondents find librarians very important or important to the conduct of their research. By rank, 70 percent of the professors responding found librarians important or very important to their research. Seventy-five percent of the associate professors rely on librarians while 63 percent of the assistant professors affirm the importance of librarians to their research. Only 65 percent of the instructors report that librarians provide significant research assistance.

BOOK SELECTION AND THE MEMPHIS STATE COLLECTION

After one-third of the annual book budget at Memphis State has been allocated to the library departments, the remaining two-thirds are distributed to other university units based on an allocation formula. The associate director of libraries informs each college dean of funds allocated after final approval of the budget. Then, requests are submitted to Acquisitions by faculty liaisons for each college or department. In a year of budgetary constraint such as 1991–92, each department was allocated only $3,500.

Most faculty at Memphis State seemed aware that book funds came from the library budget, and many knew that an allocation formula was applied to determine the amount that each department received for book purchases. The

authors of the Albion College survey article claim that until two years prior to the survey, many faculty were unaware that monies for book purchases came from library accounts and that librarians had control over book selection. Consequently, when asked about book selection, 94 percent of the Albion College faculty when asked stated that teaching faculty should have responsibility for selecting course-related books, and 95 percent wanted to retain teaching faculty control over selection of books related to the respondents' research. Such high percentages, according to the survey authors, reflect faculty's recent realization of the fact that librarians control book selection in times of limited expenditure.[22]

At Memphis State, 69 percent of the teaching faculty respondents claim primary or share responsibility with librarians for selecting reference books.

At Memphis State, 69 percent of the teaching faculty respondents claim primary or shared responsibility with librarians for selecting reference books. Faculty respondents also believe that librarians should have primary or equal responsibility for the selection of general interest books (95 percent). Of the respondents, 65 percent said that librarians and teaching faculty should have primary and shared responsibility for book selection on interdisciplinary subjects. At Memphis State, fewer teaching faculty respondents (76 percent compared to 94 percent at Albion College) state that they should control book selection on course-related subjects. Only 9 percent want to share this responsibility with librarians. No significant differences emerge based on rank or faculty orientation. Significant differences were reported, however, between frequent and infrequent users, with infrequent users allowing librarians a greater responsibility for book control than frequent users. This is obviously a service that infrequent users expect automatically (see tables 5a and 5b).

This survey corroborates the findings of Jinnie Davis and Stella Bentley that newer faculty members rate the library collection as less adequate in their areas than their longer-serving faculty colleagues and that faculty having the most years of service are the most satisfied with the collection.[23] At Memphis State, a significantly lower number of faculty respondents serving fewer than five years, between five and ten years, and between ten and fifteen years, found the collection poor. Faculty at MSU for more than fifteen years found it significantly better (see table 6).

As hypothesized by Davis and Bentley, faculty members with more years of service at a university may express greater satisfaction with the library's collection because they have participated in building the collection. Their attitude may also reflect a certain complacency toward the status quo. Among teaching faculty, professors with the highest rank rate the library collection significantly higher than their colleagues (see table 4), which may also reflect higher participation in collection building and lower use of the collection.

ACADEMIC EQUALS

Librarians at Memphis State have held faculty status since 1970 and the requirements for promotion and tenure are the same as those for teaching faculty. Prior studies have revealed that even when librarians have faculty status, teaching faculty do not consider them their academic equals. This survey reveals that 90 percent of the Memphis State respondents do not believe librarians to be their academic equals, as indicated in table 7.

TABLE 7
RANK OF LIBRARIANS BY FACULTY

	N	%
Academics equal with teaching faculty	37	9.5
Professionals	255	65.4
Semiprofessionals	40	10.3
Clerks	4	1.0
Other	54	13.8
Total	390	100.0

This was the lowest percentage in all surveys to date. However, 75 percent consider librarians professionals or semi-professionals (paraprofessionals).

Budd and Coutant, in their survey at Southeastern Louisiana University, report that 38 percent of the faculty see librarians as their academic equals, 60 percent as professionals, and 20 percent as semi- or paraprofessionals. More librarians are viewed as semi- or paraprofessionals at Memphis State than at SLU.

In order to achieve more recognition in the university, academic librarians need to increase their visibility in print by publishing more extensively in library and other professional journals.

Memphis State figures are similar to Albion College statistics in the second category (29 percent, 68 percent, 2 percent) and Southern Illinois at Carbondale (28 percent, 65 percent, 7 percent), but differ from the three categories specified by the University of Manitoba survey, which include academics (15 percent), professionals (85 percent), and nonprofessionals (18 percent). Fewer faculty respondents at Memphis State rate librarians as their academic equals than at the University of Manitoba, where 15 percent of the faculty view them as academic equals, or at Albion College, where 29 percent hold such a view. Neither Albion nor University of Manitoba grants librarians faculty rank. Only one of the Memphis State faculty respondents classified librarians as clerks, and a surprising 14 percent identified them as "other."

Of the publication-oriented faculty, only 7 percent see librarians as their equals; however, 68 percent consider them as professionals. Only 3 percent of the teaching-oriented faculty see librarians as their academic equals, while 60 percent accept them as professionals. Of the frequent library users responding, 13 percent rate librarians as academics and 64 percent as professionals. Seven percent of the infrequent users classified librarians

as academics; 65 percent of the occasional users called them professionals. Percentages of teaching-oriented and research-oriented faculty are so close that this factor does not appear to influence how faculty view librarians, unlike the situation at smaller Albion College.

CONTACTS

There is less contact between librarians and teaching faculty at Memphis State both in and out of the university setting than at any institution previously surveyed. Obviously greater contact is possible at a small college like Albion. At Memphis State, no teaching faculty respondent knew more than nine of the twenty-eight librarians by name, and only 2 percent knew as many as nine. On the average, infrequent users knew one librarian (see table 5a).

Inside the library, the greatest contact between librarians and faculty is in reference assistance (89 percent) followed by computerized literature searching (60 percent), collection development (41 percent), library instruction and orientation (24 percent), and library policy issues (10 percent). These figures resemble the University of Manitoba survey, of which 90 percent of the respondents had contact with librarians in reference assistance and 51 percent in computerized literature searching. Collection development contact at the University of Manitoba is 47 percent. Albion College's 71 percent contact might be explained by the smaller number of teaching faculty and librarians and by the college's collection assessment and faculty liaison program.

By rank, responding professors at Memphis State report significantly greater contact in computerized literature searching (22 percent) than other groups, while assistant professors (14 percent) have significantly less. In library instruction and orientation, instructors have significantly more contact (49 percent) than other groups. No significant differences emerge by rank in contacts outside the library.

At MSU, respondents characterizing their research as teaching-oriented have had significantly fewer contacts in collection development than the publication-oriented faculty (23 percent versus 42 percent). Research-oriented respondents have had significantly fewer contacts in library instruction and orientation than have teaching-oriented faculty (15 percent versus 33 percent). Publication-oriented respondents report a significantly lower level of contact (6 percent) in faculty and departmental meetings. Faculty describing themselves as both teaching-and-research-oriented acknowledge a significantly higher level of contact with librarians in university social functions (22 percent) than research-oriented faculty, who report a significantly lower level (11 percent).

Outside the library, figures were lower at MSU than at Albion College, where a greater number of contacts occur in faculty and departmental meetings (71 percent). Figures at Memphis State are lower in all areas. The greatest number of contacts occurs in what the survey terms "other" (29 percent), followed by faculty and university committee meetings (26 percent), university social functions (16 percent), and private social functions (12 percent). Unlike Albion College, the fewest number of contacts occurred at faculty and departmental meetings (11 percent versus 71 percent). The University of Manitoba reports that 51 percent of the faculty had contact with librarians at faculty and departmental meetings. Figures at Memphis State show a lower level of contact at university social functions (16 percent) than the 47 percent reported at the University of Manitoba and the 69 percent reported at Albion College. The only significant difference between frequent and infrequent users outside the library occurs in private social functions with frequent users reporting a significantly higher level of contact than infrequent users (see table 5b). Such dramatically lower figures in contacts between librarians and teaching faculty might explain the many misconceptions of librarians on the part of teaching faculty at Memphis State. For example, one survey respondent complained about the erroneous

classification of journals at Memphis State, although Memphis State Libraries does not classify its journals.

CONCLUSION

Many of the findings of the Memphis State survey corroborate those of the earlier surveys, although figures are lower in most areas, especially in librarian-teaching faculty contacts. This might indicate a greater degree of apathy toward the library and librarians than occurs elsewhere. Teaching faculty do not perceive librarians as academics, even though the librarians have faculty status, but value the services librarians provide. It may be that a high percentage of teaching faculty do not believe that librarians should have faculty status. They believe that librarians' highest function should be university service, the lowest, administration. While they do not disapprove of librarians selecting books, like faculty at other institutions, they believe that teaching faculty should have primary responsibility for most book selection on interdisciplinary subjects. If teaching faculty have little contact with librarians inside or outside the university, one may ask how they can understand and appreciate librarians' contributions to the academic community.

One way to achieve more recognition in the university would be for academic librarians to increase their visibility by publishing more extensively in library and other professional journals. Another way is to become more active in the classroom by teaching courses in many academic disciplines. Librarians must also strive for more university service by participating in university committees with their teaching-faculty colleagues. In so doing they can increase contacts with peers, and thereby better define their academic roles. They must extend public service to the community with presentations and lectures.

In sum, librarians must work toward marketing their skills while promoting the teaching and research mission of the university. Only when they make the invisible visible will academic librarians be regarded as peers by their teaching-faculty colleagues.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Florence Holbrook, "Faculty Image of the Academic Librarian," *Southeastern Librarian* 18 (Fall 1968): 183.
2. Robert T. Blackburn, "College Libraries—Indicted Failures: Some Reasons—and a Possible Solution," *College & Research Libraries* 29 (May 1968): 172.
3. Maurice P. Marchant, "Faculty-Librarian Conflict," *Library Journal* 94 (Sept. 1, 1969): 2887.
4. Mary Biggs, "Sources of Tension and Conflict between Librarians and Faculty," *Journal of Higher Education* 2 (Apr. 1981): 183–201.
5. Rebecca Kellogg, "Faculty Members and Academic Librarians: Distinctive Differences," *College & Research Libraries* 10 (Nov. 1987): 604.
6. John A. Lanning, "The Library-Faculty Partnership in Curriculum Development," *College & Research Libraries* News 1 (Jan. 1988): 7.
7. Ibid.
8. B. Anne Commerton, "Building Faculty/Library Relationships: Forging the Bond," *The Bookmark* 45 (Fall 1986): 20.
9. Jinnie Y. Davis and Stella Bentley, "Factors Affecting Faculty Perceptions of Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 40 (Nov. 1979): 531.
10. M. Cathy Cook, "Rank, Status, and Contributions of Academic Librarians as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale," *College & Research Libraries* 42 (May 1981): 221.
11. John Budd and Patricia Coutant, *Faculty Perceptions of Librarians: A Survey* (Bethesda, Md.:ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED215 697, 1981), abstract.
12. Gaby Divay, Ada M. Ducas, and Nicole Michaud-Oystryck, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at the University of Manitoba," *College & Research Libraries* 48 (Jan. 1987): 27–35.

13. Ibid., 34.
14. Larry R. Oberg, Mary Kay Schleiter, and Michael Van Houten, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at Albion College: Status, Role, Contributions, and Contacts," *College & Research Libraries* 50 (Mar. 1989): 215–30.
15. Ibid., 226.
16. Ibid., 219.
17. Divay, Ducas, and Michaud-Oystryk, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at the University of Manitoba," 30.
18. Ibid., 31.
19. Oberg, Schleiter, and Van Houten, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at Albion College," 218.
20. Divay, Ducas, and Michaud-Oystryk, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at the University of Manitoba, 32.
21. Cook, "Rank, Status, and Contributions of Academic Librarians as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale," 219.
22. Oberg, Schleiter, and Van Houten, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at Albion College," 218.
23. Davis and Bentley, "Factors Affecting Faculty Perceptions of Academic Librarians," 531.