Western Michigan University

Western Michigan University

ScholarWorks at WMU

12-1973

A Survey of Graduate Students in Two Library Schools to Determine the Factors Considered of Primary Importance in the Selection of a Library School

Katherine V. Shaw
Western Michigan University

Recommended Citation

A SURVEY OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN
TWO LIBRARY SCHOOLS TO DETERMINE
THE FACTORS CONSIDERED OF PRIMARY
IMPORTANCE IN THE SELECTION OF A
LIBRARY SCHOOL

by

Katherine V. Shaw

A Project Report
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in Partial fulfillment
of the
Specialist in Education Degree

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Laurel Grotzinger, Chairman of my Specialist Committee, for her constant support and encouragement.

I also appreciate the counsel and assistance of the members of my committee, Eleanor McKinney and Mildred Winslow.

I should like also to express my gratitude to Marilyn Miller and Karen Shelly for their steadfast support and help throught the project.

The financial benefits of a Fellowship, and the intellectual training from the faculty of the School of Librarianship have made graduate study a pleasure.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

MASTERS THESIS   M-5252

SHAW, Katherine Virginia Beckner
    A SURVEY OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN TWO LIBRARY
    SCHOOLS TO DETERMINE THE FACTORS CONSIDERED
    OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE IN THE SELECTION OF
    A LIBRARY SCHOOL.

    Western Michigan University, Ed.S., 1973
    Library Science

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

DEDICATION

To my sons, especially to Jim

for his patience and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued

LIST OF TABLES

iii

THE PROBLEM AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

During the undergraduate enrollment boom of the 1960's,
thousands of students graduated who are currently eligible to
attend graduate school, but all who are eligible are not making
applications for admissions. In the 1970's, because of decreas-
ing enrollments and other economic factors, many professional
and graduate schools in the country need to consider means of
attracting those prospective students to their campuses if they
wish to maintain current enrollments or increase. This investi-
gation relates to that problem and in particular to the fact
reported by Berleson[1] that during the 1960's most graduate stu-
dents were concentrated in "less than 100 prestigious schools"
in the country.

Today, these "100" schools do not seek nor are they able to
accommodate the needs of all graduate students who are presently
eligible, much less the anticipated future enrollment. There-
fore, some 700 universities and colleges of lesser prestige that
may be attempting to recruit students for their graduate programs
need to determine the major factors which concern graduate stu-
dents when they make application for graduate study.

---

[1]Bernard Berelson. Graduate Education in the United States
(New York: McGraw Hill Corp., 1960), p. 131.

1

The Purpose and Objectives of the Study

This investigation, then, addresses itself to one specific question: What are the primary factors which influence a graduate library student's choice of a professional or graduate school? With a choice of fifty six accredited library schools as well as other professional schools, what factors were considered most important to graduate library students in two schools in Michigan which have American Library Association accredited programs. If these factors are identified, then these two library schools, and perhaps others, can build on their own unique strengths and may attract students who will be successful in graduate study and will contribute to their profession in the future. Because the study is limited to a survey of students in two Michigan schools it basically provides information to these two institutions. The schools were selected because they represented two distinct types of library schools and also because of their common geographical location.

There is a definite scarcity of data about the selection of graduate schools by library school students as well as by students in other professional fields. Therefore this study proposes, first, to provide information to library schools which will assist them in acquiring a better understanding of their full-time students by identifying specific concerns of those students. To accomplish this objective, the students enrolled in two selected library schools were surveyed to determine, in retrospect, the student's reasons for selecting one particular library school

over another.

Clearly, the objectivity of the student's responses may be limited by his/her ability to know, to remember, and to report accurately. If, for instance, a student is in his/her last semester of study, his/her recollection of casual factors may be influenced by his/her present circumstances; he/she must rely on his/her memory. However, it has been assumed for the purposes of this study that a reliable response may be expected from this method since Gropper[1] has shown, in a check for memory bias of first and second year graduate and professional students, that there are no significant differences in responses to several related questions. Gropper's findings confirm that retrospective objective evaluations can be obtained of students' perceptions and decision making processes prior to entering graduate study.

Secondly, this study is designed to identify, through the eyes of the students, certain strengths and weaknesses of the library schools studied. Obviously, if the library school administration knows why a full-time student selects that school over another, or can deduce why he/she would not select it, the administration hopefully might modify some of its procedures so that its library school would be more attractive to prospective students.

Furthermore, if supplied with these data, library schools

---

[1]George L. Gropper and Robert Fitzpatrick, Who Goes to Graduate School? (Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research, 1959), p. 6.

might be able to develop more meaningful admissions standards which would attract rather than repel capable students. Or, they might be able to improve their recruiting practices so that some schools would not be accused as suggested by Robinson[1], of selecting low-quality students who are poorly prepared or are psychological misfits.

Sufficient meaningful data regarding programs offered may be useful in curricular re-evaluation as it relates to preparation of librarians for the fluctuating job market. If students choose a school because it is within their own state, or if they choose it because of a particular program being offered by the school which they see as meeting a market or personal need, or—conversely—if there are negative factors influencing students of which the school is not even aware, the faculty might take appropriate measures to strengthen the positive and correct or modify the negative factors. Harlow[2] has suggested that library educators must find suitable candidates and then prepare them for responsible performances by developing active behavioral patterns based upon essential understandings, insights, and methodologies which are vital to human experiences and to the library profession. Insofar as the data gathered by this study could help in

---

[1]Charles W. Robinson. "A Realistic and Mature Selection Process," Journal of Education for Librarianship, V, No. 2 (Fall, 1964) 87-90.

[2]Neal Harlow, "Design on the Curriculum" in Education for Librarianship: the Design of the Curriculum," ed. by Herbert Goldhor (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1971), pp. 4-5.

the initial recruitment of students, this study may make a
meaningful contribution to library education literature.

Related Literature Research

In an effort to answer some of the questions related to the
factors which influence an individual's decision to attend grad-
uate library school, the author researched the following sources:
1) Research in Education (ERIC) 1963-1973; 2) Dissertation
Abstracts, 1953-1973; 3) Education Index, 1968-1973; and 4)
Library Literature, 1960-1973. None of these sources revealed
any studies on master's degree students in librarianship.

One study of doctoral candidates in education rather than
librarianship, that of Brown[1], proved interesting to the author
because its findings paralleled-- or seemed to lend support to--
some basic assumptions held by this author which were based
largely upon personal experience and interviews. Brown discov-
ered that the combined percentages of "most considered" and
"considered" factors influencing Ph.D. candidates in making the
selection of schools of education were: 1) the offering of a
particular program required for personal goal satisfaction,
(54.3%); 2) the reputation of the university, (53.9%); 3) prox-
imity of the university, (49.8%); 4) reputation of the particular
departments, (48.4%); and 5) reputation of individual staff,

---

[1]Laurence Brown, Doctoral Graduates in Education: an Inquiry
into their Motives, Aspirations, and Perceptions of the Program.
(Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1966), p. 92.

$(46.5\%).$[1]

Since no research studies were located relating to librarianship two institutional surveys which related to master's degree students were utilized. Leontine Carroll, in an institutional survey at Atlanta University, found that graduate library students were influenced by four factors in her school: reputation of the university; reputation of the library school; geographical location; and costs.[2] Another departmental survey,[3] conducted in the fall of 1972, indicated that of the 108 students enrolled in the Western Michigan University School of Librarianship, seventy four students reported geographical location to be the major influencing their matriculation at Western Michigan University. Secondly, they indicated some consideration of the specific aspects of the programs being offered. Other major reasons for enrollment included recommendations of former students or professional librarians and financial aid.

<div align="center">Hypotheses</div>

The scarcity of related research on the subject of factors influencing graduate students' choice of library schools indicates the need for more comprehensive surveys such as the one under-

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Leontine Carroll cited in Sarah Wallace, So You Want to be a Librarian (New York: Harper, 1963), p. 38.

[3]Ardith Embs, Unpublished administrative Survey (Kalamazoo; Western Michigan University, Fall, 1972), p. 1.

taken by this author. However, the absence of tested survey instruments required that this survey be constructed "from scratch," that is, the author's best guesses as to why students choose graduate schools plus those factors revealed from the literature survey. The thirty-two statements included in the final survey instrument were derived largely from personal experience and from interviews with students, fellow teachers and professional librarians. After compiling the list of thirty-two statements, the author hypothesized that certain of these items would be identified by the population surveyed as primary factors. They were:

1. Accreditation of programs by the American Library Association

2. No thesis or other research paper requirement for graduation

3. The opportunity to specialize in a field, i.e. map, law

4. Geographic location

5. Reputation of the library school

6. Reputation of the university

These were not ranked in order of importance but were considered to be the major primary factors which would be identified by the respondents as reasons for selecting one school as opposed to another school of their choice.

On the other hand, the author assumed that the two factors: "desired to continue family tradition of attending the university," and "physical facilities were excellent, e.g. equipment, classrooms," would not be selected as primary considerations by the respondents. Finally, whether the respondents would select the

factor "desired to study under a particular individual" as Ph.D. candidates in education had done was questionable. The survey was then used to test these suppositions.

The following chapter describes the methodology used in this study, including the survey instrument.

METHODOLOGY

The Survey Questionnaire

The research methodology selected for this study was basically descriptive. A survey questionnaire was utilized which itemized the various factors which were assumed to influence the process of selection of a graduate library school by master's degree candidates in librarianship. The items on the questionnaire, based on personal experience and interviews, fall naturally into three categories: educational, economic, and sociological.

Educational factors

For simplification, certain items on the questionnaire are referred to hereafter as educational factors. These factors concern matters directly related to the universities and library schools and their entrance and graduation requirements and various curricular programs. Arbitrarily numbered 1-14, 16, and 32, the educational factors read as follows:

1. Overall reputation of the University was excellent
2. Library school had an excellent reputation
3. Desired to study under a particular individual
4. Recognized leadership (within the profession) of the faculty, director, or deans
5. Admission would be accepted with a lower grade point
6. School had an ALA accredited program
7. School had fewer special requirements, i.e. foreign language, statistics, Graduate Record Exam
8. No thesis or major research project was required for graduation

9

9. School offered opportunity to specialize in a field, i.e. law, map, medical librarianship, school media/ information science
10. School offered flexible programming with electives out-side the department
11. School offered program and degree particularly desired
12. Program could be completed on a part-time basis
13. Program could be completed with fewer semester hours
14. Was attracted by effective recruiting techniques, i.e. journal announcements, correspondence, interviews, bulletins
16. Physical facilities were excellent, i.e. equipment, classrooms
32. Believed I would not be admitted to other schools

Economic factors

Certain other items included on the questionnaire, dealing primarily with financial considerations, are referred to hereafter as economic factors. Items 15, 17-22, and 25 all imply costs for the student and read as follows:

15. School had relatively low tuition costs vs. those of other schools
17. Assistantships/fellowships or other financial aids were available
18. Had job placement opportunities vs. those of other schools
19. Had opportunity in area for work for self and/or spouse
20. Had appealing geographical location; cultural and recreational facilities
21. Had adequate living facilities near or on campus
22. Convenient transportation about campus or community was available
25. Desired to live with or near family and relatives in the area

Sociological factors

Factors such as environmental conditions, family relation-ships, peer pressure—all of which might affect a student's decision regarding choice of a graduate school—are all referred

to hereafter as sociological factors. Numbered 23, 24 and 26-31,
the sociological factors read as follows:

23. School was located away from major metropolitan areas
24. Campus was deemed relatively safe for students to move about day or night
26. Desired to continue family tradition of attending the university
27. Desired to relocate away from family or relatives
28. School was highly recommended by a professional librarian
29. School was recommended by friends
30. Completed undergraduate education in university and desired to remain for graduate study
31. Completed undergraduate education in one university and desired to make a change

Questionnaire Format

After the original thirty-two questions were pretested with
Western Michigan University's School of Librarianship faculty
and with five of the mid-term graduates from Western Michigan
University's School of Librarianship, certain questions were
reworded for clarity, and a marksense sheet was employed for ease
in tabulating responses. The thirty-two statements were printed
on the left side of the sheet with space to the right of each
question containing a five-category response. The five possible
responses were: 1) Primary Consideration; 2) Important Considera-
tion; 3) Minor Consideration; 4) Did not apply; and 5) Not a
Consideration. Students could mark answers by merely penciling
in blanks following the number which best indicated their
response (Appendix 1).

The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix
2) so that the only instructions given by the investigator to the

students were to "read the letter carefully," to announce a "10
minute time limit," and to ask each student to "please sign
either the questionnaire or the accompanying cover letter," so
that a roster of names of the persons completing the survey
could be compiled for verification purposes. (Appendix 3)

Students were assured of anonymity and were advised that
this request was made to insure a method for follow-up purposes
should there be an excessive number of non-returns.

Survey Population

The population chosen for this study included all the full-
time graduate students enrolled during the Winter Semester, 1973,
at the School of Library Science, University of Michigan, Ann
Arbor, and at the School of Librarianship, Western Michigan
University, Kalamazoo.

The author chose these two Michigan schools for several
reasons. First the schools appeared to be representative of
two different types of accredited library schools. One is a
long established school; the other is a second generation school
with its major growth occuring since 1955. Second, since the
two schools were located within the same state, their proximity
allowed for personal administration of the survey instrument—a
factor which the author deemed necessary to insure a high rate
of return. Also, by sampling the combined population of both
schools, which included library science students from most states
and many foreign countries, the author was assured of the added

dimension of non-resident responses. Although part-time students completed the questionnaire, their responses have been sorted out for reasons which will be explained later.

The similarities and diversities of the schools proved interesting. Both schools are located in the southern half of Michigan's lower peninsula; their programs are accredited by the American Library Association; and their students came from Michigan, other states and many foreign countries. Otherwise the schools appear quite different.

The University of Michigan, the major state university, is nearly twice the size of Western Michigan University in student population, and is located near a large metropolitan area. The Department of Library Science was first accredited by the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association in 1928. In 1948 the fifth year Master of Arts degree in Library Science and the Doctor of Philosophy degree were inaugurated. The University enjoys a national reputation for excellence and its School of Library Science has been ranked traditionally among the top schools nationally. It has discontinued its undergraduate programs in library science stressing only its graduate programs.

Western Michigan University, on the other hand, was noted originally (and is still identified by many) as a teacher training institution and it is not widely known nationally, having received university status as recently as 1957. Drawing its students largely from a rural area, the Department of Librarian-

ship was established in 1945 and accredited in 1948 for its under-
graduate program in librarianship in order to provide librarians
primarily for the public schools of Michigan. Rapid growth and
expansion of the University resulted in a graduate library
science program which began in 1958. However, it continues to
offer an undergraduate major in librarianship and despite its
general purpose approach the School of Librarianship is still
distinguished by specialized programs in school librarianship
with the added dimension of international librarianship. Whether
it is an accurate assessment of the situation or not, there is a
general "feeling" that the University of Michigan is more broadly
based in its programs than is Western Michigan University.

Student enrollment figures for Winter Session, 1973, indi-
cate a total of 335 full-time and part-time master's degree stu-
dents at the University of Michigan School of Library Science
and 172 full-time and part-time master's degree students at the
Western Michigan University School of Librarianship. According
to its 1972-73 catalog, the University of Michigan's faculty and
staff consisted of 44 people, approximately one-half of whom
were designated as visiting professors, instructors, or lecturers
in library science. For the same period, Western Michigan Uni-
versity identified its faculty and staff as consisting of 17
regular members and 16 visiting professors and lecturers.

Each school requires that applicants have a bachelor's
degree, preferably with a concentration in liberal arts, from an
accredited college or university. The University of Michigan

requires a grade point average of 3.0, and Western Michigan University requires one of 2.6. These are interpreted respectively as a B and B- average. Both schools provide alternative admission procedures for applicants who fall slightly short of the prescribed admissions requirements.

Procedure

The writer experienced no difficulties in obtaining the cooperation of Western Michigan University's library school faculty and staff, who felt that the study might be beneficial to both schools. The author's initial contact with the University of Michigan's Dean of the Library School revealed a similar interest in the investigation. Further contacts in person, by phone, and by correspondence assured excellent cooperation from the University of Michigan's faculty and staff.

The investigator visited two days on the campus of the University of Michigan during February, 1973. A list of all students enrolled in the department and a schedule of classes were provided by the Dean prior to the visit. There were approximately 236 full-time and part-time students surveyed in the master's degree program at the University of Michigan.

At Western Michigan University, during the last week of February, 1973, 130 full-time and part-time students were surveyed. In a few instances at both schools, when classes met concurrently and could not be surveyed personally by the investigator, the instructors were asked to administer the questionnaire to their

classes.   In these cases, they were given a copy of written instructions to read to the classes (Appendix 3).

The completed response sheets were given to Western Michigan University's Testing Service where responses were coded and transferred to IBM cards for use in the "COLCNT" program. "COLCNT" is a program which counts the frequency of values in one column variables and prints them in tabular form with percentages.   Its principle use is in replacing the familiar column counter on a statistical card sorter.   In some cases, the sums of percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding by the computer program.

The "COLCNT" program was run for all full-time students at both schools (Appendix 4).   To be considered a full-time student, the student indicated that he was enrolled in at least 9 semester hours of work.   The responses of part-time students were sorted out.   For the purposes of this study, it was felt by the investigator that part-time student responses would skew the percentage responses to items particularly related to commuting and job for self/spouse and would make the manipulation of data more difficult and the results less clear cut.

After the program was run for the combined total of full-time students, the program was run again for full-time students at each school.   It was conceded during the preparation of the questionnaire that students might have difficulty determining the differences between responses #4, "Did not apply" and #5, "Not a consideration."   Therefore, the investigator was prepared to combine

the responses of #4 and #5 for the purpose of analyzing data.
Since choosing between items #1, "Primary Consideration" and #2,
"Important Consideration" might also be difficult for students,
the investigator, after reporting responses by categories 1
and 2 sometimes combined responses in these categories in order
to provide more meaningful comparisons.

The following chapter reports the findings of the survey.

FINDINGS

Introduction

Enrollment figures given the author by the two schools indicated an enrollment of 335 at the University of Michigan School of Library Science and 172 at the Western Michigan University School of Librarianship. Thus, the estimated total population of the schools surveyed was 507 students. Since students drop from each school throughout the school year, the enrollment figures are only approximate.

A total of 269 full-time students responded to the questionnaire; 186 of the respondents were University of Michigan library students, and 83 were Western Michigan University library students. Based on the approximate enrollment figures provided by the schools, the return represented 70% of the University of Michigan population and 75.5% of the Western Michigan University population.

The responses from full-time University of Michigan students (186) totaled more than twice the number of responses from full-time Western Michigan students (83). However, this difference does not adversely affect the validity of the study's results since the comparative analysis made of the data collected was evaluated on a percentage basis for each school's enrollment. In every case, the report of findings is on a percentage basis

18

for each individual school. The combined totals, arranged in descending order of importance, are included for the reader in Appendix 5.

Educational Factors

Educational factors perceived as most important

The major finding of this study indicates that the students surveyed felt that the accreditation of the school's program by the American Library Association was THE primary consideration in the selection of a graduate library school. This item had been categorized by the researcher as an educational factor. Sixty percent (112) of the University of Michigan full-time students revealed that an accredited program was of "primary consideration" to them; sixty-seven percent (56) of the full-time students at Western Michigan University responded similarly. This indicates that an original assumption was correct: students do consider accreditation as a primary factor in their choice of a graduate school. The validity of the original assumption becomes even more clear when "primary" and "important" consideration responses are added together for each school. The "primary" and "important" responses totaled 82% (152) at the University of Michigan respondents 89% (74) of the Western Michigan University respondents.

Other educational factors of primary concern to students at both library schools were: item #1, "Overall reputation of the

University was excellent;" item #11, "School offered program and degree particularly desired;" and item #2, "Library school had an excellent reputation."

The overall reputation of the entire university was rated as a "primary consideration" by 45% (84) of the University of Michigan students, while only 1% (1) of the Western Michigan students rated it as a "primary consideration." The writer originally assumed that the overall reputation of the university would be important to graduate students. These data show that the reputation of the University of Michigan was important to their students, but that the reputation of Western Michigan University was not a primary consideration for Western's students. Thus, the original assumption concerning the importance of the university holds true for University of Michigan students but not for Western Michigan University students.

The importance of the University of Michigan's reputation becomes even more pronounced when the "Primary" and "Important" responses are combined: 91% (169) of the University of Michigan's students rated the university's reputation as important, while only 30% (25) of Western Michigan University students considered it of primary or important consequence.

Students at both schools indicated by their responses that the offering of a "program and degree particularly desired," which had been assumed to be a primary consideration to students, was indeed, an important factor. Thirty-five percent (65) of the University of Michigan's students rated "program and degree" as

a "primary consideration;" thirty percent (25) of Western Michigan University's graduate library students indicated it as a "primary consideration."

It was assumed that item #2, "Library school had an excellent reputation," would be a "primary consideration" of all students. This item was regarded a "primary consideration" by 41% (76) of University of Michigan students, but only 14% (12) of the Western Michigan University students considered it that important. These data support the assumption concerning the reputation of the library school as related to the University of Michigan's students; but the assumption is not supported by a significant number of Western Michigan students.

As indicated above, educational factors #6, 1, 11, and 2 were considered a "primary consideration" by at least 30% of the students at one or the other of the two University populations surveyed. As Table 1, page 22 indicates, the remaining educational factors, #9, 8, 10, 7, 12, 13, 16, 4, 14, 32, and 5, received no more than an 18% "primary consideration" response from either school. Only when the percentages for both "primary consideration" and "important consideration" responses are added, do these factors assume any importance in relation to items #6, 1, 11, and 2. Therefore, it must be concluded that this study, whose purpose was to pinpoint major important factors, found only items #6, 1, 11, and 2 are considered relatively important educational factors. (Table 1)

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL FACTORS RANKED IN DESCENDING ORDER
ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT RESPONSES

Item #	Item	Primary Consideration		Important Consideration		Minor Consideration		Does Not Apply		Not A Consideration	
		UM	WMU*	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU
6	School had an A.L.A. accredited program	60	67	22	22	05	05	04	00	08	06
1	Overall reputation of the University was excellent	45	01	46	29	05	33	01	13	04	24
2	Library school had an excellent reputation	41	14	42	39	10	23	02	05	08	18
11	School offered program and degree particularly desired	35	30	34	37	13	11	07	06	10	14
9	School offered opportunity to specialize in a field, e.g. law, map, medical librarianship, school media/ information science	16	16	19	27	20	20	15	08	30	29
8	No thesis or major research project was required for graduation	12	17	30	18	31	29	08	04	20	33
10	School offered flexible programming with electives outside the department	09	04	25	10	37	31	08	14	20	36

* UM = University of Michigan
  WMU = Western Michigan University

22

TABLE 1--Continued

Item #	Item	Primary Consideration		Important Consideration		Minor Consideration		Does Not Apply		Not A Consideration	
		UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU
7	School had fewer special requirements, e.g. foreign language, statistics, Graduate Record Exam	06	18	20	20	19	25	19	04	35	33
12	Program could be completed on a part-time basis	06	05	05	13	07	08	31	23	50	51
13	Program could be completed with fewer semester hours	06	04	16	13	19	08	17	19	41	55
16	Physical facilities were excellent, e.g. equipment, classrooms	05	04	11	13	22	17	18	11	45	54
4	Recognized leadership(within the profession) of the faculty, director, or deans	04	08	19	16	25	19	09	10	43	47
5	Admission would be accepted with lower grade point	02	10	02	18	09	19	33	16	54	36
14	Was attracted by effective recruiting techniques, i.e. journal announcements, correspondence, interviews, bulletins	02	01	02	05	13	11	29	18	53	65
32	Believed I would not be admitted to other schools	01	02	01	08	08	13	35	22	54	49
3	Desired to study under a particular individual	01	00	02	02	07	10	16	13	76	73

Educational factors perceived as least important

A second objective of this study is to provide information
that might be instrumental in helping library schools evaluate
their strengths and weaknesses and improve the effectiveness of
their recruiting techniques. In order to accomplish this objec-
tive, it is necessary to examine certain educational factors
"at the other end of the scale"--those factors which elicited a
high number of "not a consideration" responses.

As Table 1 shows, those educational factors mentioned
above (9, 8, 10, 7, 12, 13, 16, 4, 14, 32, and 5) that received
a relatively low "primary consideration" response did elicit a
relatively high response in the "not a consideration" category.
Obviously, certain of these factors, such as #16, "Physical
facilities were excellent, e.g. equipment, classrooms," may be
beyond the control of the library schools' administrations to
change. Other factors, describing existing practices or condi-
tions (such as #8, "No thesis or major research project was
required for graduation"), could not logically be changed so as
to have a positive effect. That is, if, for example, the library
school administration elected to require a thesis, this factor
would become a "primary consideration," but with a detrimental
effect: it would become a "primary consideration" in a student's
choice not to attend a particular school. Four factors, however,
specifically #4 "Recognized leadership (within the profession)
of the faculty, director, or deans," #5 "Admission would be

accepted with a lower grade point," #14 "Was attracted by effec-
tive recruiting techniques, i.e. journal announcements, correspon-
dence, interviews, bulletins, and #3 "Desired to study under a
particular individual," are within the control of the library
school administration and could be changed so as to make them
more influential to students and, therefore, a possible "primary
consideration" in the choice of a graduate library school. Sug-
gestions for changing these factors will be made in the final
chapter of this paper. It should be noted, however, that chang-
ing these factors does not guarantee their role as "influencing"
factors. The effects of implementating changes would still need
to be measured.

Item #3, "Desired to study under a particular individual,"
received the greatest percentage of "not a consideration"
responses of all educational factors. Seventy-six percent (141)
of the University of Michigan students indicated that it was
"not a consideration," while 73% (61) of the Western Michigan
University students regarded item #3 as "not a consideration."

Eliciting almost as high a percentage of "not a considera-
tion" responses was item #14 "Was attracted by effective recruit-
ing techniques, i.e. journal announcements, correspondence,
interviews, bulletins." In response to this item, 53% (99) of
the University of Michigan Students indicated that it was "not
a consideration," while 65% (54) of the Western Michigan Univer-
sity students rated it "not a consideration."

Responding to item #4 "Recognized leadership (within the

profession) of the faculty, director, or deans," 43% (80) of the University of Michigan's library students identified the item as "not a consideration." Forty-seven percent (39) of the Western Michigan University students responded to the item in the same manner.

Finally, item #5 "Admission would be accepted with a lower grade point," was identified as "not a consideration: by 54% (100) of the University of Michigan students and 36% (30) of the Western Michigan University population.

Summary

In the group of educational factors, four items, #6, 11, 1, and 2, emerge as "primary consideration" factors in the student's choice of a particular graduate library school. On the other hand, four other factors in the educational group are clearly "not a consideration" in students' decision-making process. Comparing the findings on educational factors with the following reports of findings on the economic and sociological factors reveals that students responded in higher percentages to educational factors in both the "primary consideration" and the "not a consideration" response categories than they did to either the economic or sociological factors.

Economic Factors

Economic factors perceived as most important

None of the eight economic factors was identified by students

as being as important as the four educational factors described earlier. In fact, only one economic factor, #20 "Had appealing geographical location; cultural and recreational facilities," elicited a relatively higher "primary consideration" response than did any of the other factors in this group. Twenty-three percent (43) of the University of Michigan students and 20% (17) of the Western Michigan University students ranked item #20 as a "primary consideration." Although not a strong support of the original assumption concerning geographical location, the data do identify the item as one of important consideration to students.

Economic factors perceived as least important

The entire group of economic factors is, perhaps, most distinguishable by the fact that all of the factors within the group elicited a relatively uniform response in the "not a consideration" category. The implications of the findings about the economic group are included in the final chapter. A summary of the findings for this group is provided in Table 2, page 28.

Sociological Factors

Sociological factors perceived as most important

Only two sociological factors were selected by students as having relative importance: item #28 "School was highly recommended by a professional librarian;" and item #29 "School was

TABLE 2

ECONOMIC FACTORS RANKED IN DESCENDING ORDER
ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT RESPONSES

Item #	Item	Primary Consider- ation		Important Consider- ation		Minor Consider- ation		Does Not Apply		Not A Consider- ation	
		UM	WMU*	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU
20	Had appealing geographical location; cultural and recreational facilities	23	20	30	16	20	24	09	14	18	25
19	Had opportunity in area for work for self and/or spouse	13	11	08	14	12	06	32	30	35	39
25	Desired to live with or near family and relatives in the area	12	18	05	08	09	10	37	23	37	41
21	Had adequate living facilities near or on campus	12	-7	24	25	28	22	11	13	25	33
17	Assistantships/fellowships or other financial aids were available	11	16	11	06	13	12	35	23	30	43
18	Had job placement opportu- nities vs. those of other schools	09	02	25	08	25	23	13	12	28	52
15	School had relatively low tuition costs vs. those of other schools	08	18	09	12	10	19	43	13	31	36
22	Convenient transportation about campus or community was available	05	04	17	11	22	17	20	19	36	49

* UM = University of Michigan
  WMU = Western Michigan University

28

recommended by friends." Thirty-one percent (58) of the University of Michigan students felt that professional librarians were a primary reference source regarding choice of schools, while only 13% (11) of Western Michigan University students ranked recommendations of professional librarians as a "primary consideration." When the "primary" and "important" responses are added together, the recommendation of a professional librarian emerges as significant; 54% (101) of the University of Michigan students ranked it in one of these two categories, and 46% (30) of the Western Michigan University students rated it thus. This significant finding was not one of the original assumptions made by the author, but these data indicate a basis for drawing some conclusions which are presented in the final chapter.

The figures are somewhat lower for item #29, "School was recommended by friends." Thirteen percent (25) of the University of Michigan students rated this factor of "primary consideration" as compared to only 6% (5) of Western Michigan University students. Combining the "primary" and "important" responses yields 41% (78) of University of Michigan students who regarded peer recommendation as a primary or at least important factor, and 29% (24) of Western Michigan University students who ranked the factor in one or the other of these two categories. Peer recommendations were not considered in the original assumptions, but these data indicate that the influence of peer recommendations could have been a logical assumption.

Sociological factors perceived as least important

Just as no sociological factors are perceived by students
to be as important as certain factors in the educational factor
group, so also, no sociological factors are as unimportant as
some of the factors regarded as "not a consideration" in the
educational group. Nonetheless, four sociological factors, all
of which elicited close to a 50% "not a consideration" response,
emerge as a source of information about those factors which
students consider even less important than the other factors in
the sociological group. The four least important factors in the
sociological group are #23 "School was located away from major
metropolitan areas," #27 "Desired to relocate away from family
or relatives," #24 "Campus was deemed relatively safe for stu-
dents to move about day or night," and #26 "Desired to continue
family tradition of attending the university."

Forty-eight percent (90) of the University of Michigan
students indicated that item #23 "School was located away from
major metropolitan area," was "not a consideration;" 51% (42)
of the Western Michigan University students registered the same
response to the item.

Concerning item #27 "Desired to relocate away from family
or relatives," 47% (87) of the University of Michigan students
rated the factor "not a consideration," while 49% (41) of the
Western Michigan University students indicated that the factor
was "not a consideration."

In response to item #24 "Campus was deemed relatively safe for students to move about day or night," 45% (84) of the University of Michigan students replied that the factor was "not a consideration," while 49% (41) of the Western Michigan University students registered the factor "not a consideration."

Finally, 45% (84) of the University of Michigan students considered item #26 "Desired to continue family tradition of attending the university," as "not a consideration," while the factor elicited a "not a consideration" response from 54% (45) of the Western Michigan University population.

Table 3, page 32, summarizes the findings for the entire sociological group; observations concerning the significance of those findings appear in the final chapter.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

The responses of students from both schools indicate that their primary consideration in the selection of a library school was an educational factor: the accreditation of the schools' programs by the American Library Association. Other important considerations included the educational factors of programs and degrees offered, reputation of the university, reputation of the library school; the economic factor, of appealing geographical location; and the sociological factor of recommendations by professional librarians. This latter factor was especially selected by the University of Michigan respondents.

As indicated by the variety of responses from each school,

TABLE 3

SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS RANKED IN DESCENDING ORDER
ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT RESPONSES

Item #	Item	Primary Consideration		Important Consideration		Minor Consideration		Does Not Apply		Not A Consideration	
		UM	WMU*	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU	UM	WMU
28	School was highly recommended by a professional librarian	31	13	23	23	12	13	16	20	18	30
29	School was recommended by friends	13	06	28	23	17	07	22	25	19	39
30	Completed undergraduate education in university and desired to remain for graduate study	11	12	08	02	02	05	54	46	25	33
31	Completed undergraduate education in one university and desired to make a change	10	05	13	07	12	13	32	27	32	43
23	School was located away from major metropolitan areas	04	06	06	13	20	13	22	16	48	51
27	Desired to relocate away from family or relatives	03	08	08	05	11	12	32	24	47	49
24	Campus was deemed relatively safe for students to move about day or night	03	04	10	11	23	18	18	16	45	49
26	Desired to continue family tradition of attending the university	01	00	03	01	06	06	45	39	45	54

* UM = University of Michigan
  WMU = Western Michigan University

many items were considered to be less important. Among this group were educational factors such as recruiting techniques and the desire to study under a particular individual. All but one of the economic factors and sociological factors such as "School was located away from major metropolitan area," "campus was deemed relatively safe for students to move about day or night," and "Desired to continue family tradition of attending the university," were among the group indicated by the students as "not a consideration."

The following chapter presents conclusions and recommendations based upon these findings.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

> "Criticism is easy compared to suggesting
> solutions. Suggesting solutions is easy
> compared to suggesting workable ones. And
> suggesting workable solutions is easy
> compared to putting them into practice."
>
> --B. Berelson[1]

The purposes of this study were: 1) to identify those factors which were influential in the decision making process by students in two library schools which were related to the selection of a graduate library school; 2) to provide information to library schools which would help them to understand better their students' specific concerns; 3) to help identify a school's strengths; and 4) to furnish information which might conceivably help in developing admissions and graduation requirements, re-evaluation of curriculum, or other modifications of the schools which might be needed to attract students.

A survey questionnaire consisting of thirty-two items representing educational, economical and sociological factors which were believed by the author to be important considerations in the selection of a graduate library school was administered to the graduate library students at the University of Michigan and Western Michigan University.

---

[1]Bernard Berelson, _Graduate Education in the United States_ (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960), p. 233.

34

Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning Education Factors

The results of this study indicate that the primary factor influencing graduate students in their selection of the two school of librarianship in Michigan which were surveyed is the accreditation of programs by the American Library Association. This major concern by students indicates either their respect for accreditation procedures or for status and prestige which a degree from an ALA accredited school affords them. Whatever their reasons, graduate library students desire accreditation of the library education programs in the schools they choose to attend.

Based on these data various graduate library schools which have non-accredited library programs would obviously wish to gain ALA accreditation of their programs as one means of attracting students to their schools.

The outstanding conclusion to be drawn from the comparison of the two library schools surveyed is, of course, what had been anticipated regarding the importance of the reputation of the overall university. The reputation of the University of Michigan (45% "primary consideration") influenced many more students than did the reputation of Western Michigan University (1% "primary consideration"). Thus, the University of Michigan obviously attracts more of its graduate library students because of the national reputation of the university. Also, the reputation of the library school at the University of Michigan received more primary consideration responses than did the reputation of the

library school at Western Michigan University. Based on these data, faculty members of Western Michigan University's School of Librarianship may wish to concern themselves with the promotion of the overall reputation of Western Michigan University through jointly sponsored cross-discipline seminars and other cross campus public relations activities which tend to promote the total reputation of Western Michigan University. By taking an active role in university affairs, the library school faculty may help attract favorable recognition responses from the academic community for themselves and the library school as well. However, it should be noted that little is known about how to modify a university's reputation and unless there is a scarcity of applicants at Western Michigan this may be a non-essential concern.

Another area of concern closely related to the reputation of the university and the library school was the larger percentage of referrals from professional librarians indicated by University of Michigan students (31%) as compared to primary responses (13%) by Western Michigan University students. Presumably, a library school could improve the number of referrals received from professional librarians if the library school administration kept its own alumni apprised of various curricular innovations and changes and if librarians in the field were consulted oftener than by an annual newsletter or other such limited communications. Even distant alumni might be supportive of special programs being considered; might personally attend short courses and workships

if they were kept sufficiently informed; or they could conceive-ably recommend programs and courses to colleagues and beginning students. Secondly, if students have a satisfactory experience while they are attending graduate school, they will be more likely to advise capable students to attend "their" library school.

Although most students (nearly 50%) were conscious of the universities' and schools' reputations, there was no indication that students chose a school in order to study under a particular individual. This is contrary to the results of Brown's study, noted earlier, of Ph.D. candidates in Education. The data indicate that 76% of University of Michigan students and 73% of Western Michigan University students felt that consideration "never entered their mind." When the enrollment "crunch" occurs, in addition to good teaching techniques, library school professors may wish to seek actively greater visability through research activity and publications in their field of specialization as a means of promoting the overall reputation of the university and the library school. By increasing the professors' and the library schools' visibility students might be attracted to the schools as was indicated by Brown's study of Ph.D. candidate noted earlier. Of course, such activities are keys also to faculty growth regard-less of enrollment concerns.

Another recommendation implied from the data relating to the "reputation" factor is that library school professors could become active in recruiting quality visiting professors to their

schools. The visiting professors would bring attention and quality instruction to the schools. This requires that professors keep abreast of the progress being made in their field of specialization so that they know where and whom to seek.

Western Michigan University's greater strengths, as indicated by the responses from the students surveyed, aside from items 6, 1, 2, and 11 which were of primary concern, were its fewer special requirements, no major research paper, and its relatively low tuition costs. Also, when primary and important consideration responses were combined, the total responses indicated that students felt that Western Michigan University offered a slightly greater opportunity to specialize in a field (43%) than did the University of Michigan (35%). Perhaps the smaller enrollment at Western Michigan University, which allows for better counselling practices, accounts for this difference in responses, but it seems to this author that since specialization is a relatively important factor in library education according to student responses, both schools will wish to maintain their flexibility and expand their programs of specialization.

Nearly 50% of the students indicated at least some consideration for flexible programming and electives outside the department. On several occasions, students told this author that they chose their library school, in part, because of the strength of another academic department. Therefore, cross-listing of courses in audio-visual and communication departments, in social work,

management, and geography/earth science would encourage inter-action between professors throughout the university and permit flexibility for the student. Here, then, is another reason for members of the library school to be concerned with the reputation of the total university.

According to responses of the students surveyed, the current recruiting techniques should be reviewed and revised at both schools. Sixty-five percent at Western Michigan University and fifty-three percent at the University of Michigan indicated that journal announcements, interviews and bulletins "never entered their minds," as a basis for school selection. Based on the data accumulated in this study, different procedures should be considered if publicity is to be used. Since students indicated a certain respect for the recommendations of professional librarians, perhaps more money should be budgeted for the alumni organization or other similar public relations groups to promote the library school. Interviews of applicants by selected alumni located strategically throughout the country, periodic news-letters which keep graduates apprised of curricular and course changes and seminar offerings, and a greater involvement of alumni in each school's activities might result in a greater return on the recruitment dollar.

Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning Economic Factors

Those items considered economic factors did not receive responses sufficiently discrete upon which to base sound recom-mendations. However, as explained earlier in this paper, one

might conclude that economic/financial considerations were not primary factors.

Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning Sociological Factors

The response to the factor of recommendation of the school by friends indicates an area of concern. Since nearly 50% of all students surveyed indicated that recommendations by peers are important, library school administrators, as already emphasized should not discount the importance of alumni influence. Faculty members wishing to improve their image may begin by expressing an interest in their students and by being approachable. Also, by implementing a variety in teaching methodologies which allows for individualized instruction and small group activities which brings the professor into closer contact with students. Again, the University of Michigan's reputation holds a slight edge; however, through careful, energetic planning with student associations, both schools' faculties should receive valuable imput from students concerning their aspirations and more effective recruiting techniques. Student groups could be involved in providing important feed back on teaching methodology and course content, and in identifying for the library administration, recruiting techniques which they found attractive and effective. If these suggestions are currently being practiced in the library schools, the data suggest that the practices be continued with a greater emphasis on the students' reactions.

Recommendations for Further Study

Other studies which should be undertaken include the analysis of part-time student responses to a similar questionnaire or an investigation of resident versus non-resident students or men versus women responses to determine primary concerns of those students. Are they the same concerns? Are financial considerations greater among one group than another, or would it be sociological or educational factors which would receive the greatest number of primary responses from these groups? Would the responses from a student body which has a preponderance of part-time students indicate, for instance, that recruitment procedures never entered their minds? In other words, an analysis of students' individual and collective characteristics as related to the selection process would add to a better understanding of situations.

A study of recruitment procedures to ascertain whether one method, such as interviewing candidates in their home locality, is more effective than brochures or departmental catalogs mailed to the candidates should be conducted.

How does a university go about developing a national reputation? What are the factors which are important to this process? These are some of the questions that might be answered by further study.

Reasons why people act or react as they do are not easily assessed objectively even by skilled psychiatrists. However, when sufficient studies of this nature have been carried out in various states and library schools, there will be a body of knowledge which can be valuable to library educators.

APPENDIX 1

THE IDENTIFICATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING MASTER'S DEGREE
STUDENTS IN LIBRARIANSHIP IN THE CHOICE OF A GRADUATE SCHOOL

1. School Identification_____ 1.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

2. Full Time_____ Part Time_____ 2.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

3. Area of Specialization_____ 3.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

4. Sex M._____ F._____ 4.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

5. Place of birth_____ 5.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

6. Age: 20-30__, 30-35__, 35-40__, Over 6.
   ```
   O 1 2 3 4  5 6 7 8 9
   ```

   40__

1. Primary Consideration, 2. Important Consideration,
3. Minor Consideration, 4. Did not Apply, 5. Not a
   Consideration

1. Overall reputation of the   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   University was excellent

2. Library school had an excel-   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   lent reputation

3. Desired to study under a   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   particular individual

4. Recognized leadership (within the 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   profession) of the faculty,
   director, or deans

5. Admission would be accepted with   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   a lower grade point

6. School had an A.L.A. accredited   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   program

7. School had fewer special requirements, e.g.
   foreign language, statistics,   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   Graduate Record Exam

8. No thesis or major research project 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   was required for graduation

APPENDIX 1--<u>Continued</u>

9. School offered opportunity to   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
   specialize in a field, e.g. law,
   map, medical librarianship, school
   media/information science

10. School offered flexible program-   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    ming with electives outside the
    department

11. School offered program and degree 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    particularly desired

12. Program could be completed on a   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    part-time basis

13. Program could be completed with   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    fewer semester hours

14. Was attracted by effective recruiting
    techniques, i.e. journal announce- 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    ments, correspondence, interviews,
    bulletins

15. School had relatively low tuition   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    costs vs. those of other schools

16. Physical facilities were excel-   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    lent, e.g. equipment, classrooms

17. Assistantships/fellowships or   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    other financial aids were
    available

18. Had job placement opportunities   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    vs. those of other schools

19. Had opportunity in area for work   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    for self and/or spouse

20. Had appealing geographical   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    location; cultural and
    recreational facilities

21. Had adequate living facilities   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    near or on campus

22. Convenient transportation about   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    campus or community was available

23. School was located away from major 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    metropolitan areas

24. Campus was deemed relatively safe for
    students to move about day or night 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )

25. Desired to live with or near   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    family and relatives in the area

APPENDIX 1--Continued

26. Desired to continue family   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    tradition of attending the
    university

27. Desired to relocate away from   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    family or relatives

28. School was highly recommended by a   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    professional librarian

29. School was recommended by friends   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )

30. Completed undergraduate education
    in university and desired to   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    remain for graduate study

31. Completed undergraduate education
    in one university and desired   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    to make a change

32. Believed I would not be admitted   1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )
    to other schools

33. Other. Please specify: 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( )

One column Research   K. Shaw, 1973

APPENDIX 2

Dear Fellow Student:

Re: THE IDENTIFICATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING
MASTER'S DEGREE STUDENTS IN LIBRARIANSHIP
IN THE CHOICE OF A GRADUATE SCHOOL

This form is designed to identify factors relating to an applicant's selection of a graduate school of librarianship. We are NOT interested in why you chose librarianship as a profession, but rather why you chose a particular graduate school.

It is possible that you may have considered all of these items in making applications, but ultimately, certain factors determined your final choice.

Please read ALL of the items before you begin scoring; then fill in the appropriate square according to your present perception of its influence. Please use a No. 2 lead pencil.

Rating scale:

1. Primary consideration: Those few items which were "musts" without which you could not or would not attend a given school.

2. Important consideration: Those items which were significant but not essential.

3. Minor considerations: You would be pleased if these were present, but they did not affect your final decision.

4. Did not apply in your situation.

5. Not a consideration; never entered your mind!

Although questionnaires have been identified for follow-up purposes, no individual will be associated with any responses in the analysis of data. Questionnaires must be completed by March 1, 1973.

Thank you for cooperating with me.

Sincerely yours,
(Mrs.) Katherine Shaw
Teaching Fellow
Educational Specialist Program
School Media Administration
School of Librarianship
Western Michigan University

APPENDIX 3

INSTRUCTIONS

You will be allowed 10 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

Please read the directions quickly; score the questionnaire
with the pencils I've handed out.

Finally, when you have completed scoring the items, turn the
questionnaire over and in the upper right hand corner

> Write: your name and
>   number of hours in which you are enrolled
>
>   return letter, questionnaire and pencils.

I do not wish to answer any questions concerning the items on
the questionnaire because part of the survey will be administered
by others helping me, which precludes special instructions.

Thank you for your assistance.

                                                    Kay Shaw

APPENDIX 4

ALL FULL TIME STUDENTS SURVEYED - separated by school

University of Michigan

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6	School had ALA accredition	112/60	40/22	10/5	8/4	15/8
11	Program and degree offered	65/35	63/34	25/13	13/7	19/10
2	Reputation of Library School	76/41	79/42	19/10	3/2	4/8
1	Reputation of the University	84/45	85/46	9/5	1/1	7/4
20	Geographical Location	43/23	55/30	38/20	16/9	34/18
28	Recommendation of Professional Librarian	58/31	43/23	23/12	29/16	33/18
25	Could live with family	23/12	9/5	16/9	69/37	68/37
19	Job for self/spouse	25/13	15/8	22/12	59/32	65/35
12	Program could be completed part time	12/6	10/5	13/7	58/31	93/50
9	Special fields of study, i.e. map lib	29/16	36/19	37/20	27/15	56/30
17	Available assistantships or fellowships	20/11	21/11	24/13	65/35	56/30
8	No thesis	22/12	55/30	57/31	15/8	37/20
30	Undergraduate and wished to stay	20/11	15/8	4/2	100/54	46/25
29	Peer recommendations	25/13	53/28	31/17	41/22	36/19
21	Adequate living facilities	22/12	44/24	53/28	20/11	47/25
15	Lower tuition	14/8	16/9	18/10	80/43	57/31
7	Fewer special requirements	12/6	38/20	36/19	35/19	65/35
4	Faculty leadership in the field	8/4	35/19	46/25	16/9	80/43
18	Placement opportunities	17/9	46/25	46/25	24/13	53/28
22	Convenient campus transportation	10/5	32/17	40/22	37/20	67/36
31	Undergraduate and desired to leave	18/10	24/13	23/12	60/32	59/32
13	Program required fewer semester hours	12/6	29/16	35/19	32/17	77/41
16	Physical facilities	9/5	21/11	40/22	33/18	83/45
24	Safety on campus	6/3	19/10	43/23	33/18	84/45
23	Campus located away from metro area	7/4	11/6	37/20	41/22	90/48
5	Would be admitted with lower g.p.a.	4/2	4/2	17/9	61/33	100/54

APPENDIX 4--Continued

University of Michigan

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
27	Desired to move away from family	6/3	14/8	20/11	59/32	87/47
14	Recruitment brochures etc.	4/2	4/2	25/13	54/29	99/53
26	Carry on a family tradition	2/1	5/3	12/6	83/45	84/45
32	Believed would not be admitted other schools	1/1	2/1	14/8	65/35	101/54
3	Wished to study with a special individual	1/1	1/2	13/7	29/16	141/76
10	Flexible programming and outside electives	16/9	46/25	69/37	15/8	38/20

Western Michigan University

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6	School had ALA accredition	56/67	18/22	4/5	0/0	5/6
11	Program and degree offered	25/30	31/37	9/11	5/6	12/14
2	Reputation of Library School	12/14	32/39	19/23	4/5	15/18
1	Reputation of the University	1/1	24/29	27/33	11/13	20/24
20	Geographical Location	17/20	13/16	20/24	12/14	21/25
28	Recommendation of Professional Librarian	11/13	19/23	11/13	17/20	25/30
25	Could live with family	15/18	7/8	8/10	19/23	34/41
19	Job for self/spouse	9/11	12/14	5/6	25/30	32/39
12	Program could be completed part time	4/5	11/13	7/8	19/23	42/51
9	Special fields of study, i.e. map lib	13/16	22/27	17/20	7/8	24/29
17	Available assistantships or fellowships	13/16	5/6	10/12	19/23	36/43
8	No thesis	14/17	15/18	24/29	3/4	27/33
30	Undergraduate and wished to stay	10/12	2/2	4/5	38/46	27/33
29	Peer recommendations	5/6	19/23	6/7	21/25	32/39
21	Adequate living facilities	6/7	21/25	18/22	11/13	27/33
15	Lower tuition	15/18	10/12	16/19	11/13	30/36
7	Fewer special requirements	15/18	17/20	21/25	3/4	27/33
4	Faculty leadership in the field	7/8	13/16	16/19	8/10	39/47
18	Placement opportunities	2/2	7/8	19/23	10/12	43/52

APPENDIX 4--Continued

Western Michigan University

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22	Convenient campus transportation	3/4	9/11	14/17	16/19	41/49
31	Undergraduate and desired to leave	4/5	6/7	11/13	22/27	36/43
13	Program required fewer semester hours	3/4	11/13	7/8	16/19	46/55
16	Physical facilities	3/4	11/13	14/17	9/11	45/54
24	Safety on campus	3/4	9/11	15/18	13/16	41/49
23	Campus located away from metro area	5/6	11/13	11/13	13/16	42/51
5	Would be admitted with lower g.p.a.	8/10	15/18	16/19	13/16	30/36
27	Desired to move away from family	7/8	4/5	10/12	20/24	41/49
14	Recruitment brochures etc.	1/1	4/5	9/11	15/18	54/65
26	Carry on a family tradition	0/0	1/1	5/6	32/39	45/54
32	Believed would not be admitted other schools	2/2	7/8	11/13	18/22	41/49
3	Wished to study with a special individual	0/0	2/2	8/10	11/13	61/73
10	Flexible programming and outside electives	3/4	8/10	26/31	12/14	30/36

APPENDIX 5

ALL STUDENTS SURVEYED-BOTH SCHOOLS
366 Students - Full Time and Part Time

Item #		Primary Consideration	Important Consideration	Minor Consideration	Did not Apply	Not A Consideration
6	School had ALA accredition	217/59%	83/23%	24/7%	1/3%	31/8%
11	Program and degree offered	130/36	121/22	46/13	23/6	42/11
2	Reputation of Library School	109/30	155/42	58/16	14/4	28/8
1	Reputation of the University	105/28	148/40	58/16	21/6	35/10
20	Geographical location	88/24	90/25	69/19	41/11	78/21
28	Recommendation of Professional Librarian	83/23	71/21	54/15	66/18	86/23
25	Could live with family	86/23	23/6	31/8	100/27	124/34
19	Job for self/spouse	75/20	39/11	32/9	99/27	120/33
12	Program could be completed part-time	69/19	50/14	24/7	80/22	143/39
9	Special Fields of study, i.e. map lib.	62/17	69/19	69/19	53/14	110/30
17	Available assistantship or fellowships	46/13	37/10	41/11	11/30	131/36
8	No Thesis	39/11	82/22	104/28	31/8	109/30
30	Undergraduate and wished to stay	39/11	24/7	14/4	175/48	109/30
29	Peer Recommendation	38/10	92/25	58/16	8/22	96/26
21	Adequate living facilities	38/10	77/21	84/23	54/15	112/31
15	Lower tuition	35/10	37/10	46/13	11/30	135/37
7	Fewer Special requirements	31/8	64/17	74/20	58/16	139/38
4	Faculty leadership in the field	24/7	73/20	83/23	41/11	144/39
18	Placement opportunities	25/7	63/17	84/23	49/13	141/39

APPENDIX 5--Continued

Item #		Primary Consider-ation	Important Consider-ation	Minor Consider-ation	Did not Apply	Not A Consider-ation
22	Convenient campus transpor-tation	25/7%	5/14%	65/18%	72/20%	153/42%
31	Undergraduate and desired to leave	25/7	39/11	40/11	116/32	138/38
13	Program required fewer semester hours	17/5	43/12	56/15	76/21	173/47
16	Physical facilities	14/4	43/12	69/19	72/20	153/42
24	Safety on campus	14/4	32/9	70/19	65/18	180/49
23	Campus located away from metropolitan	16/4	25/7	58/16	79/22	187/51
5	Would be admitted with lower g.p.a.	15/4	24/7	40/11	89/24	196/54
27	Desired to move away from family	16/4	23/6	35/10	110/30	181/49
14	Recruitment, brochures	8/2	8/2	39/11	96/26	215/59
26	Carry on Family Tradition	3/1	7/2	19/5	147/40	190/52
32	Believed would not be admitted other school	3/1	12/3	27/7	113/31	203/55
3	Wished to study with special individual	2/1	8/2	25/7	58/16	270/74

WORKS CITED

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

Brown, Laurence D., and Slater, William. Doctoral Graduates in Education. Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1966.

Embs, Ardith. Unpublished Administrative Survey. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Fall, 1972.

Goldhor, Herbert, ed. Education for Librarianship: The Design of the Curriculum. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1971.

Forum of Library Education. "Library Education -- What is Missing?" Journal of Education in Librarianship, 5:87-92, Fall, 1964.

Gropper, George L., and Fitzpatrick, Robert. Who Goes to Graduate School? Pittsburgh: American Institute for Research. 1959

Harvey, James. Graduate School Admissions. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971

Wallace, Sarah Leslie. So You Want To Be A Librarian. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Walters, Everett, ed. Graduate Education Today. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Tucker, Allan and Sloan, Lee. "Graduate School Talent Sold to Highest Bidder." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXV No. 1, January, 1964, pp. 12-16.

Calvert, Robert, Jr., Et. Al. "College Student Migration: A Review of 1968 Data and Implications," College and University, Vol. 47, No. 1, Fall, 1971, pp. 36-47.

SOURCES CONSULTED--Continued

Gossman, Charles S. et. al. Migration of College and University Students in the United States. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Graduate and Professional Education, 1980: A Survey of Institutional Plans. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.

Thistlethwaite, D. L. "Fields of Study and Development of Motivation to Seek Advanced Training." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 53, No. 2, Apr., 1962.