In the professional school librarian community, collaboration between teachers and librarians is emphasized as a key to a successful school library program that has a positive impact on student learning. A content analysis was performed on journal articles and convention sessions of two teachers’ professional organizations, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), to determine if teachers are likewise encouraged to engage in this collaborative work. Little mention of the school library or teacher – librarian collaborative relationship was found; even less was found concerning its impact on student learning. Suggestions to better utilize the communication channels of professional teachers’ organizations are offered for school librarians, both individually and collectively through the American Association for School Librarians (AASL) and affiliate organizations.
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I recently took an education course concerning the importance of teaching reading comprehension skills across the curriculum. Our textbook (Vacca & Vacca, 2008) included a chapter on using trade books to supplement classroom textbook reading to provide additional interest, coverage, and depth, as well as to provide material for a variety of reading levels and learning styles. While the authors advised teachers to build classroom libraries to meet these needs, no mention was made of working with the school’s librarian to select materials from the school library. How could this be? Was it not obvious that a school library program aligned to the school’s curriculum and learning needs of its students would be an ideal source of resource materials to extend and enrich the classroom? Was it not even worth mentioning as an option?

A school library program built around the curriculum and learning needs of its students would certainly contain relevant trade books, along with other potential resources such as videos, web sites, maps, or database articles. Such a model program is described in the national guideline for school library media specialists, Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning (AASL & AECT, 1998). Information Power defines elements, roles, and goals that intertwine to create a school library program vision that fosters active, authentic learning. Three themes are identified that underlie the successful implementation of the vision: collaboration, leadership, and technology.
The school library program as outlined by *Information Power* (AASL et al., 1998) is supported by a large body of research (Haycock, 1992; Kuhlthau, 1999; Lance, 1994, 2002; Todd & Kuhlthau, 2005a) that connects improved student learning to an effective school library program. Across studies, librarian collaboration with school community members, especially teachers, is consistently highlighted as an important factor contributing to the success of a school library program.

With collaboration firmly entrenched in professional guidelines and backed by significant research, school librarians are highly aware of its importance. While school librarians are expected to collaborate with everyone in the learning community – students, teachers, administrators, staff, and parents – the collaboration with teachers receives special attention for its impact on student learning. Its importance, and difficulty, is reflected in the large amount of conversation that goes on within the school library profession concerning its implementation. Conventional wisdom says that many school librarians have difficulty engaging teachers in collaborative efforts.

It is this apparent disconnect between school librarians and teachers on the importance of collaboration that inspired this research project. How do teachers in the field learn of this model? Do their professional organizations address the role of the school librarian or the school library program? Do their professional organizations provide a complementary mandate to collaborate with school librarians to improve students’ learning? If not, what can be done to pursue this channel of communication? These are the questions that initiated my investigation into the role of the school library program as portrayed by teachers’ professional organizations. I suspect that, although the AASL (American Association of School Librarians) promotes the collaboration between
librarians and teachers as a key component of improved student learning, the professional organizations of teachers pay scant attention to this successful model.
Literature Review

*Note Concerning Professional Titles*

In the literature and in this paper the professional title “school library media specialist” is used interchangeably with “school librarian”, “teacher-librarian”, “library media specialist”, “media specialist”, and simply “librarian”.

*The Progression of School Librarian Standards and Guidelines*

The media center program outlined in the 1998 *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL et al.) is not a revolutionary vision. Although the collaborative and leadership roles of the school librarian have become more prominent and explicit over time, their natures have been included in AASL standards and guidelines for over fifty years.

The 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs* (AASL), an update to the previous 1945 standards, was developed with the cooperation of 19 other educational and community organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators, NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies), NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English), National Citizens Council for Better Schools, and the Public Library Association. Chapter 1 states: “The most important part of the library program is the work with students and teachers, those activities and services that make the library an educational force in the school” (p. 7). Objectives of the school library program, which were carried over from the 1945 standards, include the idea of
working collegially within the school community: the school library program was to “participate effectively in the school program as it strives to meet the needs of pupils, teachers, parents and other community members”; “work with teachers in the selection and use of all types of library materials which contribute to the teaching program”; and “participate with teachers and administrators in programs for continuing professional and cultural growth of the school staff” (p. 8). The idea of the library program being entwined with the school’s educational program is more explicitly stated in the following general principle: “The true concept of a school library program means instruction, service and activity throughout the school rather than merely within the four walls of the library quarters...” (p. 14). Instruction in the use of materials, one area of the 1960 school library program, is described as a “cooperative endeavor” between the principal, classroom teacher, and librarian; the program should be developed “so that it is fully integrated with classroom work, evolving naturally, not artificially or arbitrarily, from the purposes and requirements of classroom instruction” (p. 18). The continued discussion of this point sounds close to today’s description of critical thinking and life-long learning skills:

Using a library and its resources is an important means... to some ultimate goal – the synthesis of information, the extension of knowledge, the analysis and solution of problems, thinking, reflection, the satisfaction of curiosity, the development of taste, or the derivation of pleasure. (p. 18)

In a 1986 literature survey, Craver traces the changing instructional role of the high school librarian as reflected in library literature and research from 1950 to 1984. Her review includes the evolving instructional role as outlined in the AASL standards published in 1960, 1969, and 1975. Craver’s analysis of the 1969 standards (AASL & DAVI) reflects more direction for the collegial work with teachers including: “acting as a
resource person in the classroom…”, “serving on teaching teams”, “working with teachers to design instructional experiences”, and “working with teachers in curriculum planning” (p. 187). Craver explains that the 1975 standards (AASL & AECT) were updated, at least in part, to better define the instructional role of the school library specialist, and described two functions in this area: design and consultation. Design included the participation in curriculum development; and consultation encompassed the recommendation of media “to accomplish specific instructional purposes” (p. 189). These roles also imply significant collaborative work with teachers and administrators. While admiring the progressive changes in the instructional role of media specialists in the standards and literature from 1950 to 1984, Craver tempers the observation with the conclusion that research studies during the same time frame indicate a lag time for these roles in practice.

1988 brought the first Information Power, Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs (AASL & AECT). The introduction states that “INFORMATION POWER is based on the premise that teachers, principals, and library media specialists must form a partnership and plan together to design and implement the program that best matches the instructional needs of the school” (p. x). The next paragraph continues “The document also emphasizes the building-level school library media specialist’s responsibility to exercise leadership in establishing the partnerships and initiating the planning process” (p. x). The current mission statement made its appearance in the 1988 guidelines, and states “The mission of the library media program is to ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information” (p. 1).
The three “separate but overlapping roles” (p. 26) of the school library media specialist were defined as: (1) information specialist, (2) teacher, and (3) instructional consultant.

The current set of AASL guidelines, *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning* (AASL et al., 1998), continues to describe a school library program that is centered on student learning. The three elements of the program are: (1) learning and teaching, (2) information access and delivery, and (3) program administration. The defined roles of the media specialist increased from three to four: (1) teacher, (2) instructional partner, (3) information specialist, and (4) program administrator. Packer (1997), commenting on a draft version of the 1998 guidelines, notes that the addition of the program administrator role acknowledges the “responsibility for administering the LMP [library media program]” (p. 32). The change from instructional consultant to instructional partner is important because it signals an equal partnership for the teacher and librarian, which is a necessary ingredient for collaboration (Muronaga & Harada, 1999). The program elements and roles are supported by the underlying themes of collaboration, leadership and technology. These themes are considered the keys to the successful implementation of the school library program vision.

It has been ten years since the release of *Information Power* (AASL et al., 1998), and an update is expected in the near future. Surely the expressed roles of the school librarian will continue to evolve. Todd and Kuhlthau (2005a, 2005b), investigating how the library helps students, have described a primary role of the school librarian as an “information-learning specialist’. In 2007, AASL released *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner*, which is a significant revision to the “Information Literacy Standards for Student Learning,” published as Chapter 2 in *Information Power. Standards for the 21st-*
Century Learner begins with a listing of nine common beliefs: one of the common beliefs is that “inquiry provides a framework for learning” (p. 1). In writing about the school librarian’s role in inquiry-based teaching and learning, Stripling (2008) identifies the importance of “…collaboration, teaching, and collection development, as well as leadership and professional development” (p. 52).

In his keynote speech at the 2008 North Carolina School Library Media Association Annual Conference, Mike Eisenberg suggested that school librarians need to focus more on the outputs than the processes. With that in mind, he proposed three main roles for teacher-librarians: (1) teacher, (2) reading advocate, and (3) chief information officer. In the role of teacher, the teacher-librarian is responsible for teaching essential information and technology skills, integrated with the school’s curriculum. As reading advocate, the teacher-librarian is responsible for reading guidance and promotion. Providing information and technology services, systems, resources, and facilities, are the responsibilities associated with the chief information officer role.

School Library Media Programs and Student Learning

In the 1992 What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning through the School’s Library Resource Center, Haycock synthesizes the findings of nearly 200 doctoral dissertations related to the instructional effectiveness of the media specialist and the media center program into twenty-eight key findings across five general categories: program (including cooperative program planning between teachers and media specialists), staffing, resources, administration, and school and district leadership and support. Haycock’s first-listed finding that “Students in schools with well-equipped
resource centers and professional teacher-librarians will perform better on achievement tests for reading comprehension and basic research skills” (p. 13) is echoed in a study, widely referred to as the “Colorado Study” (Lance, 1994), that also links reading achievement scores to school library characteristics. Summarizing the findings of subsequent similar studies performed across six states, including a second Colorado study, Lance (2002) refines three groupings of school library characteristics that positively affect student learning: (1) school library development, which includes the proper funding and staffing of the library; (2) leadership and collaboration activities of the school librarian; and (3) the use of technology to extend the library program beyond the physical library.

The National Library Power Program, funded by the DeWitt-Wallace Reader’s Digest Fund in the 1990’s, collaborated with participating schools to create model school libraries with improved collections and facilities, proper staffing, flexible scheduling, and training in cooperative planning for teachers and school librarians. In her investigation of the effects the program had on student learning, Kuhlthau (1999) found that while each school received equivalent Library Power contributions, there was variation in the learning opportunities described by the school librarians. Using a comparative case study, Kuhlthau concluded that an important contributing factor was the commitment to an inquiry approach to learning shared by the administration, teachers, and school librarian. She states: “In schools where the library was considered essential rather than just good, a clear commitment to inquiry learning was in place on which to build a collaborative library program integrated with the curriculum. In these schools, Library
Power was making a significant impact on student learning opportunities” (Kuhlthau, 1999).

More recently, Todd and Kuhlthau (2005a) investigated thirty-nine effective school libraries to see how they helped students learn. Referred to as the “Ohio Studies”, the researchers surveyed the 13,000+ students in grades 3 – 12 to learn their perceptions of their school library, using both quantitative and qualitative questioning. Almost all (99.44%) of the surveyed students reported being helped in some way by their school library. This help came in many ways and across grade levels, including getting the information needed, using the computers in the library, school, and at home, and using the information to complete school work. The qualitative statements reveal that students perceive that the school library saves them time in doing their assignments and helps them get their assignments done on time. Todd et al. state:

Central to this work is the role of the school librarian as an information-learning specialist, working with classroom teachers to foster opportunities for students to learn well. This shared dimension of pedagogy clearly plays a key role in maximizing learning outcomes in terms of intellectual quality... (p. 86)

Teacher-Librarian Collaboration

What does teacher and school librarian collaboration look like? Loertscher (2000), describes collaboration as a continuum between support and intervention: collaboration happens at the point when the question changes from “What can I get you?” to “What is our best strategy?” (p. 70). To gauge the level of collaboration, Loertscher provides a classification of actions that progress from no collaboration to full collaboration in curriculum planning: these are the Loertscher taxonomies (1982, 1988,
Loertscher (2000) provides separate taxonomies for the school librarian (levels 1 – 10) and the teacher (levels 1 – 8) to accommodate their different perspectives.

In 2005, Montiel-Overall defined teacher and school librarian collaboration as “a trusting, working relationship between two or more equal participants involved in shared thinking, shared planning, and shared creation of integrated instruction” (Section A: Defining Collaboration, para. 7). She proposed four models, which evolved from the Loertscher taxonomies (1982, 1988, 2000), to describe the working relationships between teachers and school librarians: (Model A) Coordination, (Model B) Cooperation/Partnerships, (Model C) Integrated instruction, and (Model D) Integrated curriculum. “The primary distinctions among the models are: “(1) intent of the working relationship… (2) intensity or degree of involvement…and (3) … extent to which the effort focuses on improving student outcomes” (Montiel-Overall, 2005, Section B: Models—Multiple Perspectives, para. 3). Models A and B, coordination and cooperation, describe lower levels of teacher and librarian interaction that do not embody the idea of true collaboration; Models C and D, integrated instruction and integrated curriculum, describe the more desired, higher levels of collaboration. She believes that significant impact on student learning may occur only at the higher levels (Model C and D). The difference between the latter two models is the extent of the collaboration across the school.

By Montiel-Overall’s 2008 study of highly collaborative teachers and librarians, the framework of the four “models” of coordination, cooperation, integrated instruction, and integrated curriculum had evolved into the four “facets” of the Teacher-Librarian Collaboration (TLC) model. The 2008 study resulted in further refinements to the TLC
model to illustrate the context and paths various collaborative efforts may take. The modifications clarify that the facets “may occur independently or work together to improve the teaching and learning environment…. For example, coordination of schedules (Facet A) is an integral part of arranging collaboratively planned lessons” (p. 152). The 2008 study also identified key elements in successful high-end collaboration: a school culture of collaboration; participants who acted as catalysts for the collaborative process; communication; motivation between the professions; and committed principals. School culture was considered so integral, that it is believed that integrated curriculum (Facet D) is not possible without it.

**Teacher Perceptions of the Role of the School Library**

In 2004, O’Neal investigated the perceptions of administrators, teachers, and media specialists concerning the four roles of the media specialist as outlined in *Information Power* (AASL et al., 1998): teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator. Administrators, teachers and media specialists from randomly selected schools in Metro-Atlanta school districts responded to survey statements depicting facets of the media specialist roles. Participants responded to each statement twice: first, as they reflected the current role of the media specialist in their school; and second, as they reflected the ideal role of the media specialist in their school. O’Neal found that there were differences “within and among administrators, teachers, and media specialists in their perceptions regarding the current and ideal roles of the media specialist in instructional programs” (p. 299). Perceptions vary within the professions by age and experience of the respondent, whether the school is urban or
suburban, and whether the library operates on a fixed or flexible schedule. In comparing perceptions between administrators, teachers, and media specialists, O’Neal notes that it is the teachers’ perceptions that vary significantly from the others. To address the variance of perceptions, O’Neal suggests that the role of a strong library media program be taught in administrator, teacher, and library science education programs. In addition, she notes that perceptions of administrators, teachers and media specialists in the field need to be changed, otherwise, “the struggle becomes perpetual as each new generation enters the profession” (p. 300). Although she identifies the problem for those in the field, she offers no suggestion to address this aspect of the problem.

As part of their “Ohio Studies” addressing student learning in effective school libraries, Todd et al. (2005b) investigated the faculty’s perceptions of how the school library helps its students. In their introduction, they state:

> Contemporary school librarianship literature is based on the assumption that there should be a strong and positive collaborative relationship with classroom teachers, with mutual planning, design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional interventions to ensure that students develop the appropriate cognitive, behavioral, and affective scaffolds for finding and using information in their learning tasks. Whether this role is actually endorsed by classroom teachers has never been determined. (p. 90)

The researchers distributed a survey instrument to the faculty that was similar to the survey instrument completed by the students (2005a). Both surveys were focused on the “helps” the library gives to the students. Both surveys were getting at the same concepts from two points of view: the student survey asked the students directly how the library helped them; the faculty survey asked how the library helped their students. The faculty survey also contained an open-ended question asking how they knew that the library had
helped their students. School inclusion in the “Ohio Studies” was purposeful: only schools with effective library programs were selected.

The survey of Todd et al. (2005b) revealed that the most important ways that the faculty saw the library helping the students were: (1) “…improvement in the quality of research assignments, projects, reports, and presentations…” (p. 100); (2) “…students becoming more skilled at research through their use of the library” (p. 102); and (3) “…increased confidence in using technology, increased competence in using technology as part of the search process and in creating the actual products, and ethical and appropriate use of information technology” (p. 103). The researchers conclude: “School faculty do value the school library and do see it playing an important role in student learning in tangible ways” (p.108). Todd et al. draw further insight from their quantitative and qualitative data. They assert that faculty see “…a strong informational infrastructure, centering on diverse sources in multiple formats targeted to learning levels, learning styles, and interest levels, and a backbone of state-of-the-art information technology… as critical to effective learning in an Information Age school…” (p. 109). Upon this strong foundation, they value the school librarian taking on the role of “information-learning specialist…[to enable] students to engage purposefully and meaningfully with information in order to learn successfully” (p. 109).

Teacher Collaboration

Mention teacher collaboration, and the Professional Learning Community (PLC) movement immediately comes to mind. Arising from the change and reform processes focusing on accountability and teacher efficacy that started roughly in the 1980s, PLCs
have been touted by many as the school reform that must be put into practice to improve student achievement. Broadly speaking, in a PLC, teachers and administrators continually strive to improve their effectiveness for the benefit of the students. They do this through research study, sharing of knowledge and experiences, discussion, evaluation, and reflection of their teaching practices in the context of their school. In 2004, DuFour asserted three core principles upon which an effective PLC must be based: (1) Ensuring students learn by shifting the focus of the school from teaching to learning; (2) A culture of collaboration among the teachers who work together to analyze and improve classroom practice with the goal of improving student learning; and (3) A focus on results, specifically, the achievement of each individual student. Summarizing, DuFour emphasizes:

...initiating and sustaining the concept [of a PLC] requires hard work...
The community concept depends not on the merits of the concept itself, but on the most important element in the improvement of any school—the commitment and persistence of the educators within it. (p. 11)

In a case-based study drawing from three research projects of Jewish studies teachers from sixteen, diverse, Canadian Jewish elementary day schools, Pomson (2005), “…explores the messy complexities of teacher cooperation and collaboration” (p. 783).

Pomson uses the definitions of Kruse, Louis, and Bryk (1995) to distinguish cooperation, collegiality, and collaboration:

…cooperation “represents a very basic level of social interaction among teachers. . . . It entails mutual aid in order to get work done more efficiently” (pp. 32–33). Collegiality, in contrast, is “characterized by mutual learning and discussion of classroom practice and student performance” (p. 33). Collaboration is “an expression of collegiality at its most advanced.” It is not contingent on tangible products but “entails a shared value base about teaching practice, students, and learning” (pp. 33–34). (p. 787)
In the private schools of the studied teachers, sharing students with at least one other teacher is the norm; sharing classroom space is also common. From journal entries and interviews, the researchers unexpectedly found that few teachers “talk about the rewards and satisfactions of cross-curricular partnerships in ways that indicate that these relationships are valuable in and of themselves, that they are *collegial* or *collaborative*, in Kruse’s terms…” (p. 796). They found that teachers were “willing to cooperate with one another … to get through the day or to do their job more efficiently [for example], but few are ready to commit to a relationship grounded in a shared vision of teaching and learning” (p. 797). The researchers cite two different causes of this apparent ambivalence: (1) lack of learning how to cooperate or collaborate with other teachers either in pre-service education programs or through mentoring or coaching, and (2) “resistance to entering close professional relationships with colleagues chosen for them by ‘third parties’” (p. 798). Pomson concludes that the study reveals “the hesitations and complications that impede the construction of teacher community. …school reform is not only about changing organizational structures, but also about establishing ongoing processes that nurture teacher community” (p. 799).

In “Who (Else) is the Teacher? Cautionary Notes on Teacher Accountability Systems”, Valli, Croninger, and Walters (2007) researched teaching combination patterns in grades 4 and 5 in 18 moderate and high poverty schools via observation, teachers’ logs, surveys, student achievement records, and interviews. In contextualizing their work, the researches note that the research concerning professional learning communities “is fairly consistent about the relative benefits of collaborative versus privatized organizational structures” (p. 639). From their data, Valli et al. found a wide variety of
ways students are exposed to multiple teachers, including instructional assistants, resource teachers, student teachers, team teaching, pull-out classes, tutorials, temporary regrouping of students, and reassignments (both within the school and between schools). These formed three broad patterns of instruction that involved more than one teacher: simultaneous, sequential, and supplemental. Overall, one or more types of shared instruction was experienced by 67% of the students in reading and by 55% of the students in mathematics. The researchers raise two major issues of concern related to these findings. The first questions the “feasibility and desirability of teacher accountability systems… [Is] it possible to isolate teacher effects from school effects? …researchers would need to account for variations in frequency, quality, intensity, and duration of influence” (p. 653). The second issue questions the undesired effects on collaborative work if individual teacher accountability were to be put into place. “…they would have little incentive to work together as teams, develop shared goals, share resources, collaboratively plan, or serve as mentors and peer coaches” (p. 654). They conclude that individual accountability models “can too easily derail other efforts to support high-quality teaching and learning, including the promotion of professional learning communities and the flexible, coordinated use of trained teacher resources” (p. 654).

Specifically addressing team teaching, Shapiro and Dempsey (2008), write of their experience in creating an inter-disciplinary course at their university drawing from their respective fields of communications studies and theology. They experienced many of the challenges that they found in team-teaching literature including: finding a common base from which to work; assimilating each others’ identities as teacher, researcher, and area expert; finding time in their schedules to properly plan and integrate; loss of teaching
autonomy; learning of each other’s disciplines and determining the most appropriate
connections between the disciplines; pedagogical differences; determining the day-to-day
format of the class; and student assessment. The writers stress, repeatedly, how time-
consuming the effort is and how their limited shared time exacerbates all the other
challenges of team-teaching. Despite the challenges, the instructors noted benefits to
their own development, including: increased knowledge and appreciation of another field
of study, exchange of teaching and assessment ideas, and friendship. Benefits to the
students included: making better connections between disciplines; exposure to instructors
modeling collaboration techniques; and a wider range of teacher personalities, instruction
design, and assessment methods.

Diffusion of the School Library Role

As early as 1960, it was recognized in the AASL community that, to be effective,
the role of the school media center had to have support within the educational and local
communities. The Committee for the Implementation of Standards of the AASL
developed a Discussion Guide (AASL, 1960) to accompany the 1960 Standards for
School Library Programs (AASL). The discussion guide was “designed to serve as an
aid in planning and conducting meetings on some of the fundamental aspects of effective
school library programs and services…” (p. 2). The purpose of the meetings, to be held
with various groups including school administrators, teachers, and school board
members, was to “develop… an understanding of the standards and of the ways in which
they can be implemented” (p. 2). Five major topics were identified for these discussions,
including: how the library can contribute to the objectives of education, what constitutes
a good school library program, and what plan of action would be required. Each of the major topics had suggested discussion questions and targeted messages. For example, in answer to “What plan of action will bring about good school library programs,” the discussion guide states: “It must be emphasized that the development of good school libraries comes about gradually as the result of careful planning. It is a co-operative endeavor [emphasis added] that may result in minor achievements at first; it is not intended to be a ‘crash’ program…” (p. 16).

In writing “The Invisible School Librarian”, Hartzell (1997) points out that teachers and administrators rarely learn about the role of the school media center in their education programs. Once employed, they get caught up in their own imperatives, and may not be exposed to the idea that the school media center can be a positive force in student learning. Often, school media specialists are busy with students during teachers’ “free time” such as lunch, which allows for little social contact between librarians and teachers upon which to share information and build relationships. Hartzell also opines that the school media specialists’ culture generally does not embrace program advocacy. Recognizing that school library specialists need to be concerned both with teachers and administrators in the field as well as those in pre-service programs, Hartzell offers three primary actions on the part of school media specialists: (1) consciously build influence where you work by building relationships with administrators and teacher leaders; (2) write articles and make presentations for administrators and teachers, especially in their journals and conferences, focusing on their professional priorities; and (3) become active in your state and national school library associations and push for their assistance in national, state and local advocacy issues.
With the release of the 1998 *Information Power* (AASL et al.), the AASL realized that the success of the guidelines depended on their acceptance by a number of constituents in addition to the school librarians. In a paper presented at the 28th Annual International Association of School Librarianship, Haycock and Cavill (1999) outlined a plan combining public relations, marketing, and advocacy for seventy target groups, including principals and teachers. A distinction was drawn between the terms public relations, marketing, and advocacy:

**Public relations** consists of getting the library’s message across: “this is who we are and what we do, this is when and where we do it and for whom...” **Marketing**... is finding out what the customer needs: “who are you, and what do you need, how, where and when can we best deliver it to you...” **Advocacy** involves building support and awareness incrementally over time and connecting agendas and priorities: “your agenda will be assisted by what we have to offer” [emphasis added]. (p. 29)

While one-on-one advocacy was recommended as being the most effective method, other avenues to reach the target audience included the dissemination of tailored information through national, regional and state professional organizations. A sample plan was included that targeted the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).

**Teachers’ Professional Organizations**

In their study of high school teachers’ professional reading, Littman and Stodolsky (1998) note that belonging to a professional organization and reading professional journals are two among a number of activities in which teachers can engage to “(a) discover new curricula and pedagogical methods, (b) learn about important issues that affect teaching and learning, and (c) demonstrate their commitment to their profession.” In setting the context for their study, Littman et al. found that reading professional journals (51.7%) ranked second behind workshop attendance (75.1%) for the
professional development activity of their subjects. The vast majority of the high school teachers who read journals read subject matter journals; only 7.6% reported reading only general education journals. The researchers’ results included the following: the reading of professional journals correlates with belonging to a professional organization; readers of professional journals are more likely to be aware of subject matter reforms; and journal readers are more likely to have adopted classroom modifications to better align with general educational and subject area reforms.

In a 2003 peer-reviewed essay, Moseley, a university assistant professor, and Boulden, a sixth grade teacher, examine the advantages to attending professional organizations’ national conventions. They quote the U.S. Department of Education (1995):

> Professional development plays an essential role in successful education reform. Professional development serves as the bridge between where prospective and experienced educators are now and where they will need to be to meet the new challenges of guiding all students in achieving to higher standards of learning and development.

When she attends professional conferences, Moseley cites learning about current research and issues in her field of education and networking with others by sharing ideas and seeking input and advice. Boulden shares that she experiences opportunities to expand her knowledge, her teaching, and her ideas. She further opines that “teachers should experience excellence in classrooms across the nation to support their own practices and guide them through change” (p. 61). Boulden also mentions the exhibit hall as a major component: while overwhelmed with the collection of companies and organizations, she was amazed “to realize the support and materials that [are] available for teachers of all levels if they know it’s there, how to access it and what to do with it” (p. 61).
Crews (2007) surveyed a random sample of middle school business and technology educators who belong to the National Business Education Association to learn how professional organizations could better meet their professional development needs. Survey participants indicated that the most important item for professional organizations to provide is lesson ideas/plans and instructional strategies (58.1%). The next four most important items, in order, were standards and curricula (31.8%), conferences and sessions at conferences (24.3%), publications (10.8%), and lobbying for funding (9.3%).

**Portrayal of the School Library Program in Education Communication Channels**

In her 1997 master’s paper, Agness looked at the role of school librarians as depicted in five educational journals across the ten-year time span since the 1988 *Information Power* (AASL et al.). The reviewed journals were *Teaching Children Mathematics, Science Teacher, Social Education, Reading Teacher*, and *Instructor*. Agness used the table of contents to identify relevant articles, and then coded the inclusion of the school librarian, with particular attention paid to the role of instructional consultant. At the issue level, she noted: titles of promising articles; relevant departments or regular features; articles specifically about children’s literature, team teaching, curriculum integration, student research, or other topics in the library realm; anything authored by a librarian and any photos of a library. At the article level, she noted: the type of article (research, editorial, lesson plan, descriptive, persuasive, and other); the mention of literature books or materials that would be found in a media center; and mention of the school library, school librarian or photos of the library. If the school
library or librarian was mentioned, she coded the portrayal using Loertscher’s 1988 taxonomy for media specialists. Summarizing her findings, Agness concludes: “School librarians are often overlooked, occasionally mentioned briefly, and rarely featured prominently in education journals. They are almost never referred to in the role of instructional consultant” (p. 29). Agness suggests that including articles about school librarians in educational journals would “serve to plant the idea in teachers’ minds and give validity to media specialists’ efforts at promoting collaboration” (p. 31).

Packer’s 1997 master’s paper investigated principal’s exposure to the role of the school librarian through content analysis of core course syllabi and readings for the Master of School Administration program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, three professional journals for principals spanning one year, and the presentation titles of the 1997 annual conference for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). Packer classified mentions of the school librarian by role as described in the August 1996 draft AASL/AECT National Guidelines, which are no longer available online, but are consistent with the 1998 *Information Power* (AASL et al.) roles: information specialist, teacher, instructional partner, and program administrator. A category of “incidental mention” was included only if enough information was not given to classify the mention. Attention was paid to readings that addressed resource-based teaching, instructional design, leadership, consultation, and curriculum development or design. Any mention of the school library or program was also noted. Packer finds that “most references to the [school librarian or program] that were found are brief and circumstantial, showing little insight beyond traditional roles and services” (p. 31).
Two studies have looked at the diffusion of the role of librarians in student information literacy at the university level (Still, 1998; Stevens, 2007). Still’s investigation was in two parts: (1) a search across 29 discipline-specific journals in the ERIC database for the stem “library$” in the title, subject heading, or abstract; and (2) a more detailed, page-by-page examination across seven years of journals for 13 randomly selected journals. From the ERIC search (part 1), less than 0.5% of the articles contained some form of the word library in their citation; Still classified each of these into four categories: library research, specific assignments, libraries in general, and libraries in passing. When Still examined selected journals more closely (part 2), she only included articles that could be classified in the first two categories – library research and specific assignments. Still concludes:

References to bibliographic instruction and the impact librarians can have on student research are scattered and sketchy. If the library and library instruction have been integrated into the academic curriculum, there is little evidence of it in the discipline specific teaching journals studied.

(Conclusion, para. 1)

Stevens (2007), refers to Still’s 1998 study and the 2000 adoption of the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (ACRL) to investigate whether librarians are using non-library journals that publish articles on pedagogy to reach out to faculty to promote the integration of information literacy in the curriculum. Of the 54 journals searched, 26 were also used in Still’s research. Stevens searched using four ProQuest databases, which provided a consistent interface and coverage of the selected journals. She performed two searches across the journals, targeting the citation and abstract for years 2000 - 2005: (1) librar* and (2) information literacy. Articles were divided into five categories: specific assignments/projects, electronic resources, information literacy and library instruction, libraries in general or in passing, and false
hits. Those articles focusing on information literacy and/or library instruction were selected for further analysis: out of thousands of records searched, only 25 articles were found. Of the 25 articles, 12 were collaboratively written by a librarian and faculty member, 6 were written solely a librarian, 1 was written collaboratively by more than one librarian, and the remaining 6 were written by faculty members, either individually or collaboratively. 11 of the articles were published across 5 general higher education journals; the remaining 14 were distributed across 11 discipline-specific journals.

While replicating Still’s (1998) finding of little mention of the library and even less of the library’s role in developing information literacy in journals likely to be read by faculty members, Stevens (2007) finds hope in an example from the nursing field. Stevens argues that the nursing field has a small, nursing-specific body of information literacy literature that started early with collaborative working and publishing relationships between nursing faculty and librarians, and now serves as a base for additional research and publishing. Stevens observes that articles published in a faculty’s field carry more interest and authority; once a line of research starts, it can be perpetuated. As evidence, Stevens points to one of the nursing articles, which referenced other nursing information literacy articles, not information literacy articles from the library field. Stevens further speculates: “Faculty who read about [information literacy] in their disciplinary publications are also more likely to be receptive to the collaborative initiatives advanced by librarians at their home-institutions” (p. 262). She concludes that librarians should pursue publishing articles about information literacy and library instruction in disciplinary journals as one form of outreach to the faculty.
Conclusion

Collaboration within the school community is an essential component of important educational reform movements focused on improving student learning, such as professional learning communities and interdisciplinary teaching (DuFour, 2004; Pomson, 2005; Shapiro et al., 2008; Valli et al., 2007). While collaboration is recognized as time consuming and fraught with difficulties, proponents assert that the results are worth the considerable effort (DuFour, 2004; Shapiro et al., 2008; Valli et al., 2007). However, there is evidence that teachers may lack the educational foundation or professional development to work in a collaborative manner and, in fact, resist collaborative relationships prescribed by others (Pomson, 2005). Recent political trends to hold teachers individually accountable for student achievement may also undermine efforts toward more collaboration in the schools (Valli et al., 2007).

Collaboration between school librarians and teachers has been an integral part of standards and guidelines published by the AASL for many years, and its emphasis and focus has only increased (AASL 1960; AASL et al., 1969, 1975, 1988, 1998, Craver, 1986); however, practice in the field is seen to lag behind the standards and guidelines (Craver, 1986). The current guidelines (AASL et al., 1998) define collaboration as an omnipresent theme that influences the impact of the four roles of the school librarian: teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator. Collaboration, with teachers in particular, is seen as an important factor for student success and achievement (Haycock, 1992; Kuhlthau, 1999; Lance, 1994, 2002). For many years, the school librarian has been able to assess the collaborative nature of the library program using the Loertscher taxonomies (1982, 1988, 2000). More recent work
by Montiel-Overall (2005, 2008) has led to a greater understanding of the context of
 collaboration, including the importance of the overall collaborative culture of the school.

Despite the long-standing understanding of the importance of teacher – librarian
collaboration in the school library community and the importance of collaboration
recognized within the context of the educational community as a whole, there is a wide
range of perceptions among teachers in the field concerning the role of the school
librarian (O’Neal, 2004). While new educators can be informed about the importance of
an effective library program in their education programs, dispersing information about
this successful model among those already in the field is a challenge (Hartzell, 1997;
O’Neal, 2004). With its 1998 release of Information Power, the AASL strategy to
diffuse its vision to teachers included a combination of one-on-one advocacy and tailored
messaging to targeted groups, such as teachers’ professional organizations (Haycock et
al., 1999). Indeed, teachers look to their professional organizations to learn of new lesson
plans in addition to new pedagogy and educational trends (Crews, 2007; Littman et al.,
1998; Moseley et al., 2003;). Professional journals and conventions are communication
channels that have been analyzed in the past, resulting in little evidence of portrayal of
school library programs and the importance of teacher – librarian collaboration (Agness,
1997; Packer, 1997; Stevens, 2007; Still, 1998). In light of AASL’s plan circa 1998 to
diffuse the vision of Information Power (1998) among teachers’ professional
organizations, this study will investigate professional journals and convention programs
of two teachers’ professional organizations to determine if effective library programs and
the importance of teacher – librarian collaboration have received more attention in recent
years.
Methodology

Teachers’ professional organizations serve as an important source of professional development to its members through a variety of offerings including standards and guidelines, books, journals, workshops, and conferences. The purpose of this study is to investigate the portrayal of the role of the school librarian within these organizations: the portrayal will be investigated via content analysis of articles in their journals and conference sessions as described in their 2007 national conference program. The role of the school librarian will be broadly classified by specific or general library use; those with specific use will be further classified according to the school librarian’s role and teacher – librarian collaboration.

Two professional organizations of teachers are to be investigated: the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the National Council of Social Studies (NCSS). According to its website, the NCTE, in operation since 1911, is “devoted to improving the teaching and learning of English and the language arts at all levels of education” (NCTE, n.d., para. 1). Their membership consists of over 60,000 subscribers from the United States and other countries, and is described as follows:

*Individual members are teachers and supervisors of English programs in elementary, middle, and secondary schools, faculty in college and university English departments, teacher educators, local and state agency English specialists, and professionals in related fields. Anyone interested in advancing English language arts education is welcome to join the NCTE membership community.* (para. 3)
The NCSS, founded in 1921, claims to be the “largest association in the country devoted solely to social studies education” (NCSS, n.d., para. 2). Similar to the NCTE, membership is “open to any person or institution interested in the social studies” (para. 6), and includes the range of K-12 and university educators. “NCSS defines social studies as ‘the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence’” (para. 3), which includes a wide range of disciplines, including civics, economics, geography, history, psychology and sociology.

For the journal analysis, two journals from each of the professional organizations targeting K-12 educators will be used. The NCTE journals are: *Language Arts*, which is written for educators teaching pre-K through eighth grade, and *English Journal*, which is written for educators teaching grades 6 – 12. According to *Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory* (2008), *Language Arts* has a circulation of 11,500 and *English Journal* has a circulation of 51,000. Both are refereed and published bimonthly. The NCSS journals are: *Social Education*, their “flagship journal” for all grades, and *Social Studies and the Young Learner (SSYL)*, which is specific to the elementary school educators. *Ulrich’s* lists the circulation for *Social Education* as 29,000; *Ulrich* does not provide a circulation number for *SSYL*. *Social Education* is published seven times a year and *SSYL* is published quarterly: both receive *Middle Level Learning* as a supplement, which is published three times a year.

Similar to the methodology of Still (1998) and Stevens (2007), the journals will be searched via the H. W. Wilson Education Full Text database, which indexes all four journals: the unit of study will be the feature article. In anticipation of a small number of retrievals, ten years will be searched, January 1998 through December 2007; this time
frame coincides with the implementation of the 1998 *Information Power* (AASL et al.)
guidelines, which strongly encourages school librarian and teacher collaboration. The
titles, subjects, and abstracts will be searched for the concepts of the school library or
librarian (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept: School Library</th>
<th>Concept: School Librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td>librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media center</td>
<td>media specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning resource center</td>
<td>media coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional resource center</td>
<td>teacher-librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>library specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Phase 1 Search Concepts*

For the convention analysis, PDF files containing the 2007 convention programs
from the NCTE and NCSS will be analyzed. The unit of analysis will be the “session”
presented during the regular part of the convention. Pre- and post-convention sessions,
clinics, and workshops are excluded, as well as special events and luncheons. The 2007
NCTE Annual Convention, *Mapping Diverse Literacies for the Twenty-first Century:*
*Opportunities, Challenges, Promising New Directions*, was held in New York City
November 15-20, 2007. The regular convention sessions occurred over a three-day
period, Friday – Sunday. The 2007 NCSS Annual Convention was in held in San Diego,
California, November 30 – December 20, 2007: the convention title was *Crossing
Boarders, Building Bridges*. All NCSS regular sessions were held on the officially-stated
convention dates: pre-conference events were not included within the stated dates.
Searches for the concepts of school library and school librarian (see Table 1) will be
performed on the convention programs using the basic PDF search function.
Using the information in the title, subject headings, and abstract, the “found” journal articles and convention sessions will first be classified into the following broad categories:

1. Specific Use – requires a specific school library use or librarian role;
2. In Passing – refers to libraries / librarians in general or school libraries /librarians in passing; and,
3. False Hit – includes specific reference to non-school libraries, such as presidential libraries or the Library of Congress.

Articles and sessions classified as specific use will be further classified according to the school librarian’s role as defined by Information Power (AASL et al., 1998) and according to collaboration as defined by the TLC model (Montiel-Overall, 2005). In the case of journal articles, the full-text article will be consulted for this classification. See Appendix A for the theoretical data collection template; data will actually be collected in a Microsoft® Excel spreadsheet.

The Information Power (AASL et al., 1998) roles are outlined as: teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator. Partial descriptions of these roles from Information Power (pp. 4-5) that will be used in the article and session categorizations follow [emphasis added]:

As teacher, the library media specialist collaborates with students and other members of the learning community to analyze learning and information needs, to locate and use resources that will meet those needs, and to understand and communicate the information the resources provide...

As instructional partner, the library media specialist joins with teachers and others to identify links across student information needs, curricular content, learning outcomes, and a wide variety of print, nonprint, and electronic information resources...

As information specialist, the library media specialist provides leadership and expertise in acquiring and evaluating information resources in al
formats; in bringing an awareness of information issues into collaborative relationships with teachers, administrators, students, and others; and in modeling for students and others strategies for locating, accessing, and evaluating information within and beyond the library media center...

As **program administrator**, the library media specialist works collaboratively with members of the learning community to define the policies of the library media program and to guide and direct all the activities related to it... Proficient in the management of staff, budgets, equipment, and facilities, the library media specialist plans, executes, and evaluates the program to ensure its quality both at a general level and on a day-to-day basis.

The classification of the teacher – librarian collaboration will use the four facets of the TLC Model (Montiel-Overall, 2008): coordination, cooperation, integrated instruction, and integrated curriculum. These facets are described by Montiel-Overall (2008, p. 146) as follows [emphasis added]:

- **Facet A—Coordination**: Working together to arrange schedules, manage time efficiently, and avoid overlap.
- **Facet B—Cooperation**: Responsibilities are divided among participants to create a whole project.
- **Facet C—Integrated Instruction**: Jointly planned, implemented, and evaluated instruction integrates library curriculum and content curriculum in a lesson or unit.
- **Facet D—Integrated Curriculum**: Integrated instruction found in Facet C occurs across a school or school district.

A phase 2 search of the titles, subjects, and abstracts across the same 10-year time frame will be searched for the concept of collaboration, using the following search strings: collaborat*, cooperat*, team teach*, and partner*. This will help illustrate the broader context of collaboration as portrayed in the teachers’ professional journals. These articles will be quantified without categorization.
Findings

Phase 1: School Library and School Librarian Concepts

Journals. The initial search for the concepts of school library or school librarian across 10 years of feature articles produced 5 articles in Language Arts, 19 articles in English Journal, 5 articles in Social Studies and the Young Learner (SSYL), and 14 articles in Social Education. One of the English Journal articles was a poem miscategorized as a feature article and was removed from the study, resulting in 18 English Journal articles. Table 2 summarizes the initial categorization of the articles by specific use, in passing, or false hits. A total of 12 articles, representing an overall percentage of 0.4%, were classified as specific use: 1 from Language Arts, 7 from English Journal, 2 from SSYL, and 1 from Social Education. The relatively high number of false hits was expected because the generic string “librar*” was used in the search, which produced results referring to the Library of Congress or the American Library Association, for example. Appendix B contains the search statement used; Appendices C and D list the resulting articles and their initial categorization for the NCTE and NCSS articles, respectively.
### Table 2. Journal Articles: Phase 1 Initial Categorizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Category</th>
<th>NCTE Language Arts Articles</th>
<th>NCTE English Journal Articles</th>
<th>NCSS SSYL Articles</th>
<th>NCSS Social Education Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of feature articles from 1998 to 2007</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of feature articles found with search</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Hits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of article classed as “Specific Use”</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 11 articles categorized at the initial level of *specific use*, 3 articles are classified at the *integrated instruction* level of teacher and librarian collaboration, 3 are classified at the *cooperative* level and the remaining 5 are classified at the *coordinated* level. All articles classified as *specific use* portray the *program administration* role of the school librarian. It is inferred that the library cannot be used or the librarian worked with unless there are facilities, resources, and/or programs being managed.

Two of the three articles classified as portraying an *integrated instruction* level of teacher and librarian collaboration were published in NCTE’s *English Journal*. In “Guiding Research: A Collaborative Approach”, Derrico (2006), an English teacher, describes how the English department at her high school has “an extensive and ongoing collaboration” (p. 11) with the school librarian. A great deal of pre-planning is described, as well as post-unit evaluation, involving both the teachers and the school librarian. The relationship is described as a “…mutually supportive and productive partnership… the
teachers focus on content, while the library media specialist focuses on information processes” (p. 11). In addition to the benefits to the teachers and school librarian, benefits to the students are highlighted, which include better utilization of resources and a nurtured spirit of inquiry. Derrico also cites an NCTE position statement On Electronic Online Services (1995) that states “Teachers and school library media specialists have a professional responsibility to work together to help students develop the intellectual skills needed to identify, evaluate, and use information sources to meet students’ educational goals (para. 2)” (p. 11). The librarian roles of teacher, instructional partner, and information specialist are all evident in this article. Although the entire department is said to be involved, the teacher – librarian collaboration designation of integrated instruction was chosen for this article instead of the higher integrated curriculum because the entire school or district was not addressed in the article.

The second English Journal article to be classified at the collaboration level of integrated instruction is Johnston’s “A Librarians’ Perspective on Research” (1999). Johnston, a university reference librarian, outlines the advantages of faculty and instructors collaborating with librarians in creating their assignments; the argument is generalized to include K-12 educators. She states that librarians can help instructors devise assignments that are based on resources available in the school or university library. They can also inform instructors and students about text and electronic resources, teach students to find and evaluate resource, and provide feedback to instructors about the difficulties students have with their research assignments. This eight-page article is written prescriptively and the tone is somewhat preachy: this is what
English professors/teachers need to do. However, her “prescription” does cover the librarian roles of teacher, instructional partner, and information specialist.

The third article portraying the integrated instruction level of collaboration is the 2007 SSYL article by Codispoti and Hickney, “Teachers and Librarians Collaborate! Teaching about Hispanic Culture.” Codispoti, a university librarian, and Hickney, a professor of education, write of their collaboration to create an annotated bibliography of trade books about Spanish culture as a model for K-12 school librarians and classroom teachers. They mention that collaboration is supported by research and explain the extensive planning and mutual vision of the project that is necessary. Although Codispoti had no direct contact with students, the teacher role is fulfilled by her collaboration with Hickney to analyze the learning needs and locate resources to meet the needs. The instructional partner and information specialist roles are easier to see in their description of regularly-scheduled meetings and Codispoti’s role of selecting and evaluating appropriate literature books. Their project does not fit neatly into the teacher–librarian collaboration categories because it did not result in direct instruction to students; however, their annotated bibliography could be viewed as the instructional product. It is clear that they had joint planning, implementation, and evaluation of their product, so the article was classified at the integrated instruction level.

All three articles that were classified at the cooperation level of teacher-librarian collaboration were published in English Journal. Two articles, Elliott’s (2000) “Helping Students Weave their Way through the World Wide Web” and Wilson’s and Castner’s (1999) “From Mickey Mouse to Marilyn Manson: A Search Experience,” both include the school librarian’s teacher and information specialist roles by mentioning that the
librarian instructs the students about resources and searching; however the projects are completely developed and controlled by the teacher. *Cooperation* is evident in that the library instruction happens at the time of the project, although the Wilson et al. article refers to it as “library orientation”. The third article, Claxton’s and Cooper’s (2000) “Teaching Tools: American Literature and the World Wide Web” just barely made the *cooperative* categorization. They include a statement to “Ask the librarians to present a program for your students on research materials and the Internet” (p. 101), which also resulted in the librarian roles of *teacher* and *information specialist* to be included. In their summary they suggest that teachers should look outside their own disciplines for help – librarians make the list along with technology experts and teachers in other disciplines.

The final five *specific use* articles were classified at the *coordination* level of teacher – librarian coordination. Three were published in NCTE journals and two were published in NCSS journals. However, the two NCSS journal articles actually refer to one article that was published in NCSS’s *Middle Level Learning*, which is issued as a supplement to both *Social Education* and *SSYL*.

Of the three NCTE articles classified as *coordination*, one was published in *Language Arts*. In “The Explorers Club: The Sky is No Limit for Learning” (Mansukhani, 2002), ESL students get books for their personal research project from the library. No collaboration on the part of the teacher is implied: the teacher “informed” (p. 34) the school librarian what they were doing and arranged a time in the library. The teacher was impressed that the librarian took special time with the students during their
arranged time to help them find appropriate books, performing the role of teacher; perhaps this will lead to a more cooperative—or better—effort in the future.

The remaining two NCTE articles classified at the coordination level were published in *English Journal*. Brown (2001) starts negatively in “Silverstein and Seuss to Shakespeare: What is In Between?” by stating that a review of the school’s media center found that the “collection of poetry is woefully lacking…” (p. 151). She concludes by proposing that teachers “work with their media specialists to purchase [poetry books the teacher finds] for the library” (p. 152). This reflects the program administration role of purchasing for the library; however, no collaboration with the school librarian concerning selection is implied. Conner and Mouton (2002), describe a student project of compiling an anthology of love poems in “Motivating Middle School Students to Revise and Edit.” The school library receives a copy of the anthology; however there is no stated involvement of the librarian in this project. The inclusion of the anthology in the library collection implies the school librarian’s program administration role.

The NCSS article appearing in *Middle Level Learning*, which is included as a supplement to both *Social Education* and *SSYL*, was classified at the coordination level of collaboration. In “Working to Improve our Community: Students as Citizens and Town Partners,” Mitchell (2006), describes an authentic and involved community planning project through which students research key community issues and suggest potential solutions. The school library is only mentioned as the venue for the final student presentations to the town council and planning commission members. Inexplicably, the list of suggested resources for the students to use includes the public library, but not the school library. The school librarian’s role is that of program
administrator and the level of collaboration is coordination, assuming that there had to be agreement on when the library could be used for the presentations.

Table 3 shows the summary of the teacher – librarian collaboration and librarian role relationships in NCTE and NCSS journal articles. Appendix E contains a listing of the individually classified articles from both the NCTE and NCSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Integrated Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Integrated Instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X 0 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Cooperation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Journal Articles: Relationships between Collaboration Levels and Roles

LA=Language Arts; EJ=English Journal
SSYL= Social Studies and the Young Learner; SE=Social Education

Convention Programs. The two convention programs handled poster and roundtable sessions differently. In the NCTE program, a poster or roundtable session consisted of multiple posters or roundtables. In contrast, the NCSS program listed each poster as a separate session, although multiple poster sessions were hosted in the same physical space. The NCSS program did not list their “community” roundtable
discussions as sessions. The two conventions had a similar number of session time-blocks: the NCTE had fifteen time-blocks, resulting in an average of forty-four sessions per block; the NCSS had fourteen time-blocks, resulting in an average of thirty-seven sessions per block.

The initial search for the concepts of school library or school librarian in session descriptions published in 2007 NCTE and NCSS convention programs found 15 NCTE sessions and 9 NCSS Sessions. Due to the minimal amount of abstract information available about the sessions, categorization was more difficult than the journal article categorization. Table 4 summarizes the initial categorization of the sessions by specific use, in passing, or false hits: 3 NCTE and 0 NCSS sessions were classified as specific use. As with the journal searches, the relatively high number of false hits was expected because the generic string “librar*” was used in the search, which produced results referring to the Library of Congress, various presidential or public libraries, or the American Library Association, for example. Appendix B contains the search statements applied on the convention PDF files; Appendices F and G list the resulting sessions and their initial categorization for the NCTE and NCSS sessions, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Category</th>
<th>NCTE Sessions</th>
<th>NCSS Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sessions included in search</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sessions found in search</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Hits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of sessions classed as “Specific Use”</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Convention Sessions: Phase 1 Initial Categorizations
Three sessions classified as specific use were presented at the NCTE convention; no sessions from the NCSS were classified as specific use. Of the three NCTE sessions portraying a specific school library use or librarian role, one is categorized at the integrated instruction level of collaboration, one is categorized at the cooperation level of collaboration, and the third had no indication of collaboration. Like the journal articles, if a specific use was indicated, the librarian role of program administrator was inferred: one cannot use the school library or interact with the librarian unless facilities, resources, and / or programs are being managed.

Session A.36, “Extending Information Literacy Skills through Lesson Study” was the only session that clearly fell into the specific use category (NCTE, 1997). The session abstract states:

A mutually supportive and productive relationship with a library media specialist can be effective in helping teachers and students to develop information literacy skills. Focusing on an information literacy lesson study, these presenters will engage participants in a conversation that addresses ways in which to align standards, classroom practice, student work, and assessment. (p. 76)

Since a “mutually supportive and productive relationship” was described in the same paragraph as library media specialists, teachers, students, information literacy skills, standards, classroom practice and assessment, this session was categorized as representing the teacher, information specialist, and instructional partner roles as well as the collaboration level of integrated instruction. This designation was strengthened when it was noticed that one of the presenters was Regina Derrico, the author of the “Guiding Research: A Collaborative Approach” (2006), which was categorized similarly among the journal articles. All the presenters were from her high school; the school’s web site
confirmed that Susan Grossman, one of the co-presenters, is the school’s media specialist (Williamsville Central School District, n.d.).

The remaining two sessions categorized as *specific use* were more of a stretch. Session I.27, “Understanding Self in Connecting with Others” (NCTE, 2007) includes the following in its abstract:

> This demonstration will show how one school takes advantage of the visual and social online learning environments to move their students from being consumers to being producers of information. Presenters will engage participants with classroom activities for connecting students with texts, ideas, and issues important to our global community. (p. 199)

All the presenters are from Tifflin Columbian High School, Ohio. One co-presenter, Ann Reddy, has her session portion titled “Where the Library is Never Closed: Expanding Traditional Media Centers through Online Environments” (p. 199). Tifflin Columbian High School’s web page (n.d.) confirms that Reddy is the school’s librarian. From these tidbits, the school librarian’s roles of *teacher, information specialist,* and *program administrator* were assumed. One can imagine that there could be some instructional partnership going on, but that would be an even further stretch. Likewise, *integrated instruction* cannot be assumed; it even appears that the presenters are presenting disparate projects. Teacher and librarian collaboration level is not referenced; the safer categorization is *cooperation.*

Session L.35, “Computer-mediated Learning: Online Role-play, Videogames, and Electronic Search Engines” is the third session to receive the *specific use* designation. Although all the presenters are from universities, the session is rated for both secondary and college convention participants. The abstract includes:
This panel will describe several computer-mediated approaches to teaching and learning important literate behaviors for today’s changing student population. (p. 253)

Based on the description and two of the individual presenters’ sub-topics, “From Google Searches to Researchers: Teaching Library Research Skills to College Freshmen” and “Literacy Learning through Videogames: Changing Understandings, Changing Practices”, it can be assumed that the library is involved with providing computer-assisted instruction, fulfilling the teacher and information specialist roles, albeit via the computer. However, from this brief description and sub-topics, there is no indication of collaboration or even coordination with instructors: no collaboration category was classified.

One NCTE session, M15 “9/11 Ground Zero School Recovers”, was categorized as in passing instead of specific use. The abstract includes:

This panel will describe an extensive case study of how Public School P. S. 234, the New York City elementary school closest to the World Trade Center, survived and regenerated itself through exemplary teaching, after the devastating attack of September 11, 2001. (p. 262)

One of the presenters, Annie Luce, is described as “school volunteer and librarian” (p. 262). The school’s web site confirms that Luce is the current school librarian (PS 234, The Independence School, n.d.). However, the fact that she was listed as a volunteer first and librarian second gives the impression that she will be speaking mainly from the point of view of volunteer. It also cannot be assumed that she was the librarian in 2001.

A summary of the classification of teacher – librarian collaboration levels and librarian roles for the convention sessions is depicted in Table 5. The details for each of the sessions are listed Appendix H.
Table 5. Convention Sessions: Relationships between Collaboration Levels and Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role: Teacher</th>
<th>Role: Instruct. Partner</th>
<th>Role: Info. Special</th>
<th>Role: Program Admin.</th>
<th>NCTE Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Integrated Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Integrated Instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Cooperation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC: Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TLC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 2: Collaboration Concept

Searches were performed on the same NCTE and NCSS journals and convention programs for the broader concept of collaboration. Appendix B includes the search statements used.

Collaboration, from the point of view of teachers, often refers to student collaboration in learning. There is some mention of student – teacher collaboration, teacher – teacher collaboration, and teacher – university collaboration. Pre-service teachers collaborate too: they collaborate with their mentor teacher, the students, or pre-service peers. Partnerships with community persons and agencies as well as international partnerships facilitated by technology are also mentioned. Collaboration, as a broader topic, gets much more attention in journal articles and convention sessions by the NCTE and NCSS. Articles about collaboration appear in *Language Arts, SSYL, and Social Education*, on average, in approximately half the issues; in *English Journal*, collaboration
articles appear, on average, a little more than once per issue. Table 6 summarizes the
articles and sessions with the “collaboration” concept; the articles and sessions were not
evaluated for further classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCTE</th>
<th>NCSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>English Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Articles/Sessions</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Collaboration Articles/Sessions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Articles w/ Concept</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Collaboration Articles / Year</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Issues / Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Phase 2 Collaboration Concept Found in Journal Articles and Convention Sessions
Discussion

The number of NCTE and NCSS journal articles including a specific library use or librarian role in their abstracts is low – 11 feature articles across four journals over a span of 10 years, representing less that 0.5% of all the feature articles – which is similar to previous findings, both at the collegiate and K-12 levels (Agness, 1997; Stevens (2007); Still (1998)). The number of sessions at the NCTE and NCSS 2007 conventions that included specific mention of the school library or librarian was likewise low: 3 out of 1,100+ sessions. Even fewer articles and sessions portray a truly collaborative relationship between the teacher and librarian, that is, a relationship classified as integrated instruction. How do these results compare to the number of articles that school librarians receive from their professional organization, the AASL, about teacher–librarian collaboration?

As a rough comparison, an additional investigation was performed on Knowledge Quest, the journal of the AASL. Knowledge Quest is published five times a year and has a circulation of 91,000 (Ulrich’s, 2008). Unfortunately, it has been indexed by H. W. Wilson’s Educational Full Text database only since September 2001, so the same 10-year time frame could not be used. A search was performed looking for feature articles from 2001 to 2007 that had “teacher” and (collaborat* or cooperat* or coordinat*) as keywords. 63 out of 521 feature articles were found, representing approximately 12% of the feature articles. Assuming the covered time period had 32 issues (September 2001
December 2007), that averages almost 2 articles per issue. An AASL conference program was not readily available in PDF format, but the 2005 conference, held in Pittsburgh, PA, had a webpage with some of conference handouts (ALA, 2008). Out of the 64 sessions with handouts listed on the web page, 8 of them had “collaborat*” in the session title, representing 12.5% of the listed sessions. It is not known whether the session with handouts is a random sample of all the sessions, but it is interesting that the 12.5% figure is similar to the percentage of Knowledge Quest articles. Regardless, the 12% figure representing mentions of collaboration with teachers in Knowledge Quest is orders of magnitude greater than any specifically mentioned library use or librarian role in professional literature or conferences of English or Social Studies teachers.

Three additional observations were made concerning the NCTE and NCSS journal articles. First, none of the 11 articles reviewed at the specific use level specifically mentioned any of the research concerning the effect of the school library media program on student achievement, for example, Haycock (1992), Lance (1994, 2002), Kuhlthau (1999) or Todd et al. (2005a). The closest mention is an article by Codispoti et al. (2007), who generically state “Recent research supports collaborative relations between teachers and librarians” (p. 21). Derrico (2006) describes some of the learning benefits seen in her students, but she does not specifically mention student achievement, nor tie her observations to research. Johnston (1999), states “librarians have proselytized to make information literacy and research a central component of education” (p. 100) and refers to professional guidelines, but not to research.

Secondly, a qualitative difference was noted between three articles written at the collaboration level of integrated instruction (Codispoti et al., 2007; Johnston, 1999;
Derrico, 2007). It is my opinion that K-12 teachers may be more receptive to the content, length, and tone of the two-page Derrico article, which is written by a teacher and presents a real-life example of how the English department works with the school librarian and the benefits for all involved, including the students. While the Codispoti et al. article has a catchy title, readers may decide that the collaboration example of creating an annotated bibliography of trade books about Spanish culture, presented by a university librarian and professor of education, is not pertinent to their K-12 work. (However, they may skip to the end and use the bibliography!) The Johnston (1999) article, written by a university reference librarian, is eight pages long and is written prescriptively with a somewhat preachy tone. While it touches on a number of important points about teacher-librarian collaboration, it starts negatively with an anecdote of the repercussions experienced by the librarian helping a student with a poorly conceived assignment, which may put teachers off and cause them to not complete the article.

Lastly, no journal articles were classified at the integrated curriculum level of teacher–librarian collaboration. This may be because the predominant target audience is K-12 educators and therefore the articles focus on the actions within a classroom.

Why is there such a lack of attention on the part of professional teacher organizations to the potential student benefits to working collaboratively with the school librarian? Many teachers read professional journals and attend conventions to learn about lesson plans and instructional strategies (Crews, 2007; Littman et al., 1998; Moseley et al., 2003); although this aspect was not enumerated, my impression is that many of the articles and sessions read for this study contained these desired lesson plans and instructional strategies. It is possible that journal authors and convention presenters try to
focus on what teachers can do in their classroom without many assumptions about what resources are available in teachers’ individual schools. Some schools do not have school libraries, and some school libraries are not staffed by librarians or are not staffed or scheduled in a manner conducive to teacher-librarian collaboration; therefore, to appeal to wider audience, it may seem more desirable to present plans and methods that do not rely on them. Another related possibility is that in focusing so strongly on the teacher’s role, authors and presenters gloss over details that can be implemented in a variety of ways. In describing a particular activity or unit, they may simply say “students perform research” as part of the process. The details of whether that would happen in the classroom, in the school library, at a public library, or at home are left for the audience to determine.

A third theory about the lack of attention to the teacher – librarian relationship is the fact that classroom teachers have many different types of relationships to manage. As the Phase 2 search indicated, collaboration as a general topic is included more frequently in teachers’ professional journal articles and convention sessions. A good number of these articles address student collaboration. The remaining articles reveal that teachers are concerned with many types of collaboration, including: co-teachers, departmental members, team members, PLC members, special needs teachers, ESL teachers, guidance counselors, or reading specialists. It is easy to see how articles or sessions concerning the teacher – librarian collaborative relationship can get diluted in a sea of collaboration.

In thinking within the larger context of collaboration, a question arises: “When does the teacher have time to collaborate with all these different people?” Shapiro et al. (2008) were particularly pointed about the amount of time it took to plan and implement
their interdisciplinary course. Perhaps this implies a chicken and the egg situation.

Teachers, not knowing of the benefits of teacher–librarian collaboration, pay little attention to the relationship in the context of their scarce amount of time. Because little attention is paid to the relationship, teachers do not write journal articles or present convention sessions about them. This then continues the cycle: because so few journal articles and convention sessions are written about the benefits of teacher–librarian collaboration, teachers in the field do not learn about this relationship.

To become more visible, Hartzell (1997) recommends a multi-pronged approach that includes working to win over the perceptions of current teachers and administrators currently in the field and then working to ensure new teachers and administrators learn about the role of effective school libraries in their educational programs. Haycock et al. (1999) assert that personal, one-on-one advocacy is the most effective method to diffuse information in the field; however they also recommended the use of tailored messages utilizing broader avenues, such as professional organizations. Littman et al. (1998) confirm that teachers are members of professional organizations to keep up with pedagogical and instructional trends. So, despite the findings in this study, the idea of using teacher professional organizations as a means to diffuse the benefits of the teacher–librarian collaboration seems a promising strategy to pursue. But how can this communication channel be opened?

A teacher who belongs to a professional organization and reads their journals or attends their national conventions would seem to be a candidate to be open to new ideas to improve student learning. As librarians encounter such teachers and experience positive outcomes while working with them, librarians should encourage these teachers to
publish their successes within their professional journals as well as present at their conferences. Regina Derrico, who wrote an article in *English Teacher* and presented at the 2007 NCTE conference provides a shining example. Stevens (2006) observes that articles written within one’s field carry more authority than articles from other fields. She promotes the idea of collaboratively writing articles with those from other fields so the framework of the library science field gets propagated into other fields.

To help with diffusion at the national level, the AASL could take actions to have a broader impact than an individual’s efforts. The 1960 and 1969 standards were written in cooperation with many other educational professional organizations, including the American Association of School Administrators, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Association of Childhood Education International, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Association of Classroom Teachers, various departments of the National Education Association, National Association of Secondary-School Principals, National Council for the Social Studies, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Science Teachers Association. Conversely, the 1988 and 1998 standards appear to have been written in relative isolation. Only the AECT is credited as co-author; there is no mention of cooperation from other organizations. It would seem that inclusion of some of the more influential educational organizations would provide important input and build support in these organizations as well as help the diffusion of the vision into the teachers’ and administrators’ organizations.

Beyond the focus of AASL’s guidelines, the AASL could work with teachers’ professional organizations to identify points of common interest. According to Haycock et al. (1999), this connection of agendas and priorities is the definition of advocacy. For
example, it appears that the AASL, NCTE, and NCSS all have relationships with the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Clearly the NCTE’s 1995 position statement *On Electronic Online Services*, referenced in Derrico’s (2006) article stating, “Teachers and school library media specialists have a professional responsibility to work together…” is a point of common interest.

Perhaps more immediately, the AASL could adopt a strategy used by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) at the 2007 NCTE convention. The ISTE sponsored nine special sessions concerning the integration of technology in the classroom over 1½ days of the main convention. The NCTE program explains:

*NCTE thanks its partner, the International Society for Technology Education, for a 40-computer lab that enables exciting hands-on sessions…At these NCTE and ISTE sessions you will participate in innovative uses of technology to support student learning.* (p. 162; 245)

Examples of sessions offered are: *Digital Arts Storytelling; Integrating Emerging Technologies into Your Curriculum: 101; and Engaging 21st Century Writers: Blogging and Social Networking Tools for the English (or any) Classroom.* The AASL could similarly partner with teachers’ professional organizations and offer a special slate of sessions that would feature exemplary interactions with the school library program to improve student learning.

Boulden, a sixth grade teacher writing of her experience at a national convention, mentioned the impact of the exhibit hall and how much she learned from the various vendors in attendance (Moseley et al., 2003). What if AASL were to set up a public relations booth in the exhibit hall to explain the role of effective school libraries? To borrow an idea from Mike Eisenberg (2008) and merge it with the American Library
Association’s latest marketing slogan, the banner over the booth could read: “Ensure that students are effective users of ideas and information—at your school library.”

Limitations of the Study

This study looked at only two professional teacher organizations, the NCTE and the NCSS. While these are two large organizations representing the language arts and social studies, respectively, there are many other teacher organizations to which a teacher can belong. In addition, only two types of offerings from these organizations were investigated: journal articles and convention sessions. NCTE and NCSS, as well as other teacher’s professional organizations provide a variety of professional development venues including books, newsletters, workshops, webinars, and list-serves. In addition, teachers’ professional organizations have regional and state affiliates who also provide professional development opportunities.

The brevity of the session abstracts made categorization of convention sessions more a matter of faith than certainty. It is possible that convention sessions may have included information about teacher–librarian collaboration when it was not included in either the session title or description.

By searching journal article abstracts, confidence is high that articles about school librarians and libraries were found. However, there are many topics that could include a mention of the school librarian or library that would not necessarily be reflected in an abstract and therefore not found in the search.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Specific use of the school library is mentioned very little in the journal articles and convention sessions of two national teachers’ professional organizations, the NCTE and the NCSS. Portrayals of the roles of the school librarian, and in particular, the collaborative relationship between teachers and the school librarian, are mentioned even less. In addition, in the journal articles and convention sessions selected for review, no mention was made of the research reflecting the positive effects that an effective school library program can have on student achievement. The results confirm the hypothesis of teachers’ professional organizations paying scant attention to the role that teacher–librarian collaboration can play in improved student learning and helps explain the disconnect between teachers and librarians concerning the importance of this model.

Despite the findings in this study, the idea of using teachers’ professional organizations as a means to disseminate information about the benefits of teacher–librarian collaboration seems an appropriate and effective way to reach greater numbers of teachers in the field. By introducing beneficial ways the teacher and librarian can work together through the context of the teachers’ professional associations, the individual advocacy efforts of building-level librarians may become more productive.

Five recommendations result from this study to increase the amount of information about the role of the school library program into the communication channels of teachers’ professional organizations:
1. School librarians can encourage teachers to submit articles to their professional journals about successful collaborative lessons or units. If appropriate, school librarians can offer to co-write the articles.

2. School librarians can encourage teachers to present sessions at their state, regional, or national professional conventions about successful collaborative lessons or units. If appropriate, school librarian can offer to co-present at the session.

3. State or regional AASL affiliates can provide a presence at state or regional teachers’ associations’ affiliates by sponsoring special sessions highlighting school libraries and disseminating information at an exhibition booth.

4. AASL can provide a presence at national teachers’ associations’ conventions by sponsoring special sessions highlighting school libraries and disseminating information at an exhibition booth.

5. AASL can collaborate with other national teachers’ professional organizations, such as the NCTE and NCSS, in areas of common interest. This can include input on each other’s guidelines or standards, position statements, or work on interdisciplinary efforts such as the Partnership for 21st Century Skills.

These and any other measures that can be taken to open and sustain additional channels of communication to teachers in the field about the benefits of teacher and librarian collaboration would facilitate the efforts of the building-level librarian participating in one-on-one advocacy, and ultimately benefit the learning of students. As the entire educational community becomes more familiar with the benefits of working
with the school librarians, there will be no question that the librarian can help plan, 
instruct, and evaluate an inquiry project. Teachers, when considering the addition of 
alternative and supplemental trade books to enhance student learning, will think first of 
working with their school librarian. It will be obvious that their school library program 
is, indeed, an ideal source of ideas and resources to support, extend, and enrich the 
classroom.
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Appendix A:

Theoretical Data Collection Form

Search Phase (circle one):        1      or        2

Article or Session Citation:

How this Article or Session was “hit” on the Search:

Initial Broad Classification:
   1. False Hit (how) ____________________________
   2. In Passing (how) __________________________
   3. Specific Use (how) __________________________

For those broadly classified as (3) Specific Use above:

Portrayal of School Librarian Role (circle all that apply; describe how)
   a. Teacher
   b. Instructional Partner
   c. Information Specialist
   d. Program Administrator

Portrayal of collaboration between Teacher and School Librarian (circle all that apply; describe how)
   a. Coordination
   b. Cooperation
   c. Integrated Instruction
   d. Integrated Curriculum

Additional Notes:
Appendix B:

Search Statements

Phase 1 Search Statements

Search Statement on H.W. Wilson Education Full Text Database:

("journal name") <in> Journal Name
AND ((<any>(librar*, media center*, resource center*, media special*, media coordinat*, teacher librarian, teacher-librarian, information special*, library special*)) <in> Keyword
AND Feature article <in> ARTICLE_TYPE
AND Date: between 1998 and 2007

Convention Program Search using PDF Basic Search:

- librar
- media center
- resource center
- media coord
- specialist

Note: “Hits” for “specialist” were reviewed for instances of “media specialist” or “information specialist”

Phase 2 Search Statements

Search Statements on H.W. Wilson Education Full Text Database:

Note: ISSN numbers were used instead of journal names in this search.

(Journal ISSN number) <in> ISSN
AND ((<any>( collaborat*, cooperat*, team teach*, partner*)) <in> Keyword
AND Feature article <in> ARTICLE_TYPE
AND Date: between 1998 and 2007

Convention Program Search using PDF Basic Search

- collaborat
- cooperat
- team teach
- partner
# Appendix C:

Initial Classification of NCTE Journal Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Citation</th>
<th>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</th>
<th>Specific Use</th>
<th>In Passing</th>
<th>False Hit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, C. B. (2000). Helping students weave their way through the World Wide Web. <em>English Journal</em>, 90(2), 87-92.</td>
<td>“…encourage students to use online sources that are available in the media center…” (abstract). Full text reveals that the librarian can provide instruction on Internet research.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansukhani, P. (2002). The explorers club: The sky is no limit for learning. <em>Language Arts</em>, 80(1), 31-39.</td>
<td>The students go to the library to get books for research. Full text review reveals that the teacher “informed” (p. 34) the media specialist of their project.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franek, M., &amp; NiiLampti, N. (2005). Shoot the author, not the reader. <em>English Journal</em>, 94(6), 20-22.</td>
<td>Huckleberry Finn should be “available in every library” (abstract), but not necessarily assigned in English classrooms. Full text review revealed that the focus is on non classroom use.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomez, S. (1998). Belonging. <em>English Journal</em>, 87(4), 62-63.</td>
<td>One of several recommended excursions to broaden students’ horizons. Since the rest of the list is external to the school, I think this reference is for the public library; regardless, it is “in passing”.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caswell, L. J., &amp; Duke, N. K. (1998). Non-narrative as a catalyst for literacy development. <em>Language Arts</em>, 75, 108-117.</td>
<td>“Spend more time in local libraries” (abstract) was mentioned as one of a number of outcomes in this literacy study. Full text review indicated that the emphasis of this article was on the literacy study.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesesne, T. S. (2004). Bold books: How to find them. <em>English Journal</em>, 93(4), 97-100.</td>
<td>Author is identified as a professor of library science; how to select books for library or classroom collection. Sadly, since school librarians are part of audience, they are not included as a reference source.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elster, C. A. (2000). Entering and opening the world of a poem. <em>Language Arts</em>, 78(1), 71-77.</td>
<td>Librarians were included in participant pool in a research study.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth, C. (2003). How I become a public library. <em>English Journal</em>, 92(3), 120.</td>
<td>Miscategorized as a feature article. This is a poem; <strong>excluded from findings &amp; discussion.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D:
Initial Classification of NCSS Journal Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Citation</th>
<th>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</th>
<th>Specific Use</th>
<th>In Passing</th>
<th>False Hit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Codispoti, M., &amp; Hickey, M. G. (2007). Teachers and librarians collaborate! Teaching about Hispanic culture. <em>Social Studies and the Young Learner</em>, 19(4), 21-24.</td>
<td>University librarian and educator write of their collaboration to create an annotated bibliography of trade books about Spanish culture for social studies use to model the importance of collaboration for K-12. Lots of planning and sharing of ideas: mutual vision of project.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, T. (2006). Working to improve our community: Students as citizens and town planners. <em>Social Education</em>, (25), 8-13.</td>
<td>Only use of school library was that the final presentations were held there. Not even mentioned as a resource, although the public library was…</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, T. (2006). Working to improve our community: Students as citizens and town planners. <em>Social Studies and the Young Learner</em>, (25), 8-13.</td>
<td>Duplicate of above. This was published in <em>Middle Level Learning</em>, which is included as a supplement to both <em>Social Education</em> and <em>SSYL</em>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallenstein, N. L. (2000). Group investigation: An introduction to cooperative research. <em>Social Studies and the Young Learner</em>, 13(1), 17-18.</td>
<td>School and public libraries listed in list of options for research resources. Distinction for classification as “in general/in passing” is that the author did not say that the school library was used; it was stated that it could be used (in theory vs. actual).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasta, S. (2006). The American Revolution, three lesson plans for critical thinking. <em>Social Education</em>, (25), 2-7.</td>
<td>School and public libraries are mentioned as potential places the teacher can find the described resource books. Focus is totally on the classroom activities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasta, S. (2006). The American Revolution: Three lesson plans for critical thinking. <em>Social Studies and the Young Learner</em>, (25), 2-7.</td>
<td>Duplicate of above. This was published in <em>Middle Level Learning</em>, which is included as a supplement to both <em>Social Education</em> and <em>SSYL</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stix, A. (2000). Mixing it up: A multilevel book room and flexible literature circles. <em>Social Education</em>, 64(4), 218-220.</td>
<td>The creation of a trade book room seems to circumvent the library, although a “specially designated corner of the school library” is mentioned as a potential space. The teachers take on many functions of the library. The librarian is not mentioned AT ALL.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranning, A., &amp; Ehman, L. (1999). Help! I'm lost in cyberspace! <em>Social Education</em>, 63(3), 152-156.</td>
<td>Library is one of several resources mentioned for students in an email project between pre-service teachers and elementary students. Term “library” in general was used; no mention of school librarian.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E:

Role and Collaboration Classification of NCTE and NCSS Journal Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansukhani, P. (2002). The explorers club: The sky is no limit for learning.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>English Journal</em>, 90(5), 150-152.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F:

**Initial Classification of NCTE Convention Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Citation</th>
<th>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</th>
<th>Specific Use</th>
<th>In Passing</th>
<th>False Hit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.36</td>
<td>“Mutually supportive and productive relationship with a library media specialist can be effective in helping teachers and students develop info literacy skills” (p. 76). Regina Derrico (from NCTE Journal search) is presenter, along w/ her media specialist and two others from her school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.27</td>
<td>“…how one school takes advantage of the visual and social online learning environments to move their students from being consumers to being producers of information” (p. 199). All presenters are from Tiffin Columbian High School, Ohio. One is the school librarian.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.35</td>
<td>“…computer-mediated approaches to teaching and learning important literate behaviors” (p. 253). Based on presenters (all from universities) and individual talk titles, can infer that library is involved with providing computer assisted instruction. No indication that the project(s) are coord. w/ instructors. Target audience includes secondary as well as college.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.15 9/11 Ground Zero School Recovers (E–M)</strong></td>
<td>Extensive case study of one school near ground zero survived and regenerated itself. One presenter is described as a school volunteer (first) and librarian (second). According to the school web site, she is the school’s (current) librarian.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.02 Off the Map: Motivating Summer Reading (G)</strong></td>
<td>Includes presenter from a public library.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.13 The Cream of the Crop: Finding the Best Books and Albums for Your Young Children (E)</strong></td>
<td>Presenters are children’s librarians from the NY Public Library’s Central Children’s Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.12 Welcome to the Kidlitosphere: Reading, Reviewing, and Blogging about Children’s Literature (E)</strong></td>
<td>One speaker is a librarian blogger from a public library</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J.04 The More Things Change . . . . Using the Socratic Dialogue in the 21st Century (G)</strong></td>
<td>One of the presenters is from the Terrebonne Parish Library System, Houma, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JK.01 Poetry Blast (G)</strong></td>
<td>Poets read their own work; a co-host is from the Brooklyn Central Public Library, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O.06 What’s New in Fantasy and Science Fiction for Grades 5 and Up (E–M–S)</strong></td>
<td>One presenter is from Woodbridge Public Library, NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.57 Teaching Shakespeare with 21st Century Technologies (M–S)</strong></td>
<td>Chair is from Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Citation</td>
<td>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</td>
<td>Specific Use</td>
<td>In Passing</td>
<td>False Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.23 YouTube, Wikis, Podcasts and Webquests: Teaching Literature with Today’s and Tomorrow’s Technology (M–S–C)</td>
<td>Chair is from Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC; remaining presenters are from Stony Brook University, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.34 Technology in the Language Arts Classroom—What Works and What Doesn’t: Advice from a Laptop School and a Large Suburban High School (S)</td>
<td>Description focuses on classroom use, although one presenter has a title “One Computer per Class and the Media Center” (p. 106).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.06 Defending Intellectual Freedom (G)</td>
<td>Presenter is from the ALA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.19 Why are all the Educators Still Using One Mode of Literacy? (E)</td>
<td>Books for classroom and professional libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G:

Initial Classification of NCSS Convention Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Citation</th>
<th>Brief Notes Explaining Classification</th>
<th>False Hit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Archival Adventures, Essays, Performances, and Stories*  
U.S. History SD Convention Center 29B (p. 77) | Presidential libraries | X |
| *Engaging Archival Experiences for Students*  
U.S. History SD Convention Center 31C (p. 104) | Presidential libraries | X |
| *Lessons from The Cold War*  
U.S. History SD Convention Center 29B (p. 52) | Presidential libraries | X |
| *Teaching Conflict and Compromise with Documents from the National Archives*  
U.S. History SD Convention Center 24B (p. 71) | Presenter from presidential library | X |
| *Videoconferencing with the National Archives*  
Civics/Government SD Convention Center 29B (p. 80) | One presenter from presidential library | X |
| *Digital Content in Social Studies Curriculum*  
Civics/Government SD Convention Center 28B (p. 81) | One presenter from Library of Congress | X |
| *Transforming Public Opinion for Legislative Action: Teaching Civil Rights with Documents*  
U.S. History SD Convention Center 22 (p. 109) | Presenters from presidential libraries | X |
| *The Brave New Citizen*  
Friday, 2:30–3:30pm Convention Center Ballroom (p. 6) | Speaker, Jamie McKenzie, has director of libraries, media and technology on resume | X |
| *Mapping History with Primary Sources and Google Earth*  
U.S. History SD Convention Ctr., South Foyer (p. 83) | Poster  
One presenter is from Library of Congress. | X |
## Appendix H:

Role and Collaboration Categorization of NCTE Convention Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.36 Extending Information Literacy Skills through Lesson Study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.27 Understanding Self in Connecting with Others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.35 Computer Mediated Learning: Online Role-play, Videogames and Electronic Search Engines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>