

**IFLA Section of School Libraries – International Research on the Role of School Principals:  
Principals and School Librarians Working Within an Information Literate School Community  
Amsterdam, August 1998**

**Liisa Niinikangas  
Lighthouse Consulting Ltd  
Tampere, Finland**

**Principals and school librarians working within an information literate school community – case Finland**

**Abstract**

IASL and IFLA have provided funding for an international study of the principal's role in developing and supporting information literacy. In this paper, the researcher describes and reports on the progress of the study in one of the participating countries, Finland. Some preliminary findings are presented related to the situation in Finland, where school libraries are highly controversial.

**1. Background of the research**

**1.1. School library background in Finland**

School library issues are controversial in Finland. In the words of the Chief Executive of the **Finnish Library Association, Tuula Haavisto**: *“There are no school libraries in Finland. This will not be changed in the new (library) act. It is considered that the network of public libraries is sufficient for the needs of school children. Our experience supports the view that common libraries for children and adults make better use of library resources than do separate institutions. People continue to use the same library after leaving school because they do not have to cross new thresholds.”* The fact is, however, that we still have school libraries, even if the latest statistics date back to the 1980s. The economic recession of the early 1990s cut many school libraries, but it seems clear that most schools have them. They are run 1-5 hours per week mostly by teachers without a library qualification. There are also qualified school librarians working in school libraries, but their number is unknown.

There is, especially in vocational schools and new polytechnics, a growing number of very modern libraries called learning support centers or information centers. These schools have undergone a major educational change. In order to gain their goals they had to renew their whole pedagogical environment with school libraries.

In the library legislation of 1990, responsibility for activities within school libraries was given to public libraries. The problem, of course, is money: how to fund fairly public and school libraries. In the new library legislation, which is due this autumn, school libraries are not mentioned.

Unfortunately, there is no clear school library policy in Finland. In **the Ministry of Education** no one is responsible for the strategic planning of school libraries, although public libraries and schools are central actors in the national Information Society Strategies (Information Superhighway). There is also substantial financing for this. Due to the unclear position of school libraries, the money inside schools has been allocated to computer classrooms.

The tactical level of educational policy in Finland is the **National Board of Education**. It set the goals of schooling, establishes curriculum guidelines and requirements and evaluates student learning. One of the many tasks of the chief inspector for the teaching of the Finnish language is to develop school libraries.

The whole education system has undergone a profound change: a new educational legislation will take effect in 1999. From a rigid and highly centralized system of top-down administration, Finland has moved towards a more flexible system of decentralized decision-making. This means much greater autonomy for educational institutions themselves and for their owners.

In the new education law school libraries are mentioned for the first time ever: **“In a school there can be a school library for achieving the pedagogical goals of the school. The school library will be financed by the budget of the school.”** It is still to be seen how this challenge can best be used for the benefit of school libraries. The supporting role of local deciding bodies and principals will be emphasized.

Programs in librarianship at Finnish universities (**Tampere, Oulu, Åbo Akademi**) do not offer possibilities to specialize in school librarianship. There is no education for teacher-librarianship, either. The basic ideas of libraries supporting learning have become familiar in the in-service workshops or continuing education courses offered mainly by the **Continuing Education Center for Vocational Schools (AK-KK)** in Tampere. Some recent research and strategies (Niinikangas 1995, Niinikangas 1996) have also been done, and the idea has been advocated also in Finnish library journals.

The **School Library Association of Finland** has proclaimed its goals for the development of Finnish school libraries. There is also a growing number of politicians, teachers, principals and parents who think that a real innovation of the school is impossible without a school library resource center.

## **1.2. Finnish educational system**

The Finnish education system comprises of comprehensive schools (1-9), post compulsory general and vocational education (10-12), higher education and adult education (supplement 1). The language of teaching is Finnish or

Swedish: official bilingualism guarantees the Swedish-speaking minority (about 6 per cent of the population) equal opportunities at all levels. Ministry of Education is a central coordinating body for Finnish education. Comprehensive and post compulsory general and vocational education belong to the municipal authorities.

Compulsory comprehensive school education starts at the age of seven and continues for 9 years. Comprehensive education is free of charge for all pupils. 581.000 pupils were attending approximately 4400 schools in 1995. Just over one per cent of the schools is private; they are also supervised by the Ministry of Education.

### **1.3. Target of the international school library research in Finland: Upper secondary schools**

Since the early 1980s, educational planning in Finland has been based on the principle of offering either vocational or higher education to the entire age group. On entering the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the policy will be to provide upper secondary education, either general or vocational, to the entire age group, and further higher education to 60-65 per cent of the age group.

After leaving comprehensive school, a young person may apply for a place at a general upper secondary school or at a vocational school. There is also an experiment under way in upper secondary education which aims at providing a wider range of opportunities than before to obtain vocational diplomas and to complete the upper secondary school syllabus. This is being carried out through collaboration among vocational institutions and upper secondary schools: their students can choose courses from both institutions.

Upper secondary schools normally provide general education to prepare the pupils for further studies. At the end of schooling, the pupil takes the national matriculation examination, which is a general eligibility criterion for university or polytechnic admission. Schools follow a fairly homogeneous curriculum. They can also specialize in languages, science, sports, music or the arts. The curriculum reform of 1994 increased the range of choices in the curriculum. All instruction is given in the form of courses. Pupils are allowed to take their courses at their own pace, so the upper secondary level can last two to four years.

In 1995, 54 per cent of comprehensive school pupils went straight on to study at an upper secondary school and 31 per cent at a vocational school. Education is free of charge in both schools. There were about 440 upper secondary schools with over 109.000 pupils in 1995.

## 2. How the school library research in Finland was carried out

### 2.1. Research sample

The study was conducted in upper secondary schools of the southern Finland. The target area was the only metropolitan area in Finland, the **Helsinki** region, with the population of one million (incl. towns **Helsinki, Espoo, Vantaa, Kauniainen**), and two towns to the north of Helsinki, **Tampere** (pop. 180 000) and **Lahti** (pop. 70 000, a well known school library town with experimental mixed upper secondary and vocational schools). Helsinki is the capital of Finland and the biggest town in Finland.

The sample of the Finnish research was all upper secondary schools and those vocational schools taking part in the 'mixed' educational experiment in chosen areas. Swedish schools were not included. The number of the participating schools was **86**. They were identified using educational directories, statistical yearbooks and telephone catalogues of each town.

#### Why this area and why these schools?

*For library and school library policy reasons:* In the Helsinki region these are the largest schools. There the variety of upper secondary schools is the highest, there are both private and municipal schools. There has been a tendency to establish school libraries in upper secondary schools. This is the area where the population is a challenge in the Finnish scale, because Finland is a sparsely inhabited country.

We wanted to receive new data about the true school library situation in Finland. What kind of school libraries do really exist in Finland? Most of the qualified Finnish school librarians work in the Helsinki area. What is their current situation?

### 2.2. The practicality of the Finnish research

Three research instruments of the principal and school librarian were translated into Finnish by BA **Eeva-Maria Suojarvi**, a librarian familiar with school library terminology. The Finnish version of the questionnaire was pilot tested in the printed form by the library assistant students of Tampere College of Business. The comments given by them and their teacher MA **Leena Aaltonen** made us clarify the typographical format, Finnish terminology and the following letter of intent. The piloting phase showed clearly that it was essential to explain the underlying school library philosophy and the purpose of the questionnaire, because they seemed unfamiliar and difficult.

No new Finnish terms were to invent, because all the basic theory is known. However, the following questions were added/ changed in Finland to get national information:

Are you a member of the Finnish School Library Association?

Do you follow any library listservs? (There is not a special listserv for school librarians in Finland)

Questions about the Internet were translated using the relevant Finnish terms but the questions were mostly misunderstood. In Finland we have a national plan to connect all schools to the Internet by the year 2000, and the program is at different levels among various schools. The answers reflect the situation at the end of 1997, since the situation has quickly changed. Reasons for the misunderstanding could be:

1. Most practising school librarians are mother tongue teachers who have little knowledge about computers or the Internet. They might be confused the questions concerning access points and connections.
2. Internet access is arranged differently in different towns and also in different private schools. There are town wide strategic plans for schools to access the Internet and there are single school solutions. It is easy for the principals, too, to be confused with the number of connections and access points.
3. In Finnish schools, computers and Internet usually are in hands of computer teachers.

The National Board of Education was contacted at the beginning of the research for moral support and financial assistance. On November 14<sup>th</sup>, 1997, permission was given to send the supportive letter as an attachment (supplement 2), but no funding was allocated to the research. The Finnish School Library Association also promised to support the research. We had two complementary mainstays to be used to gain research permission from the local authorities and later, hopefully, more answers from the schools.

Letters asking for study permission (supplement 3) were sent to the educational authorities of each chosen town after this. Every town gave its consent before December 4<sup>th</sup>, 1997. **Mauno Rissanen**, the leading principal of Tampere upper secondary schools, wrote in his letter of consent: **“These questions seem to reflect a reality totally different from Finland with working possibilities totally different from ours, yet it may be that just the things worth developing became visible in this questionnaire.”**

Both the principal's and school librarian's research instruments were sent out in the same envelope to each school library by the sixth of December, 1997. The questionnaire was in paper form with my letter telling about the research and with another letter by the National Board of Education. - Why in paper form? It was known that not all schools had the Internet access. Many participants were also supposed to be inexperienced Internet users, so the online survey format could diminish the amount of answers. Most responses arrived by 20.12.1997, before Christmas leave. The last ones arrived when principals and teachers returned to work at the beginning of January, 1998. No reminder letters were sent in Finland.

The overall response percentage in Finland was 49 per cent. Principals and school librarians in pairs answered 38%, principals alone 5%, school librarians alone 3%. The principal and school librarian was the same person in two cases. Research instrument 3 was left unanswered by eight principals and three school

librarians, and it was answered partially by ten principals and seven school librarians. Many research instruments were answered partially. There were empty spaces and question marks in the answers. Reasons for the low response per centage might be: Research instruments were complicated to complete. The whole survey was very long and detailed. It was very busy time at schools before Christmas leave. Still, however, it seemed to be very accurate to some respondents, who even attached detailed letters with their answers.

In January 1998 the research data was translated into English by a Finnish student. The researcher loaded the data into the Finnish Web-site during one week in early February 1998.

**Virhe. Linkki ei kelpaa.**

Table 1: Numbers and percentages of the Finnish responses

### **3. Survey findings**

#### **3.1. Demographics of the schools**

All schools in the research were located in urban area. Most schools were quite small, 75% of schools had max. 599 students. More than half of schools (65%) have max. 39 teachers. Usually the school was a community school (67%). Private schools were 25% and governmental schools 8% of the research sample. Most schools were ordinary upper secondary schools, 37% of schools were reform schools, combined usually of an upper secondary school and either a vocational school or a business college. 18% of ordinary upper secondary schools were specialized in arts, 9% in business, 36% in languages, 9% in media, 9% in sciences and 18% in sports.

Most schools (65%) have not a full time school librarian, but 35% of schools have a qualified school librarian. The questions about the Internet have been misunderstood: School librarians replied that 96% had 0-4 Internet connections in the school library, but 14% told that they had more than 5 Internet access point in the school library. Principals replied that 30% of the schools had more than 100 Internet connections and 17% had more than 100 Internet access points at their schools. It can be seen from the answers that schools usually have Internet connections and access in the computer classrooms but not in the school library.

#### **3. 2. Analysis of the data**

The quantitative data analysis was done in Australia for the whole international research. The following results are based on the analysis and quality interpretations of the data.

##### **3. 2. 1. School librarians**

The Finnish school librarian is mainly a female MA, over 40 years of age. She is usually appointed through an unadvertised position. School librarianship belongs to her as the duty of mother tongue teacher. As teacher librarian she

takes care of the school library less than nine hours per week, most common 2 – 3 hours per week. She has been a school librarian for either less than four years or more than five years (50%- 50%). She has been a teacher prior to appointment as school librarian more than four years. She has no library qualifications. She is a member of the teachers' union and the Association of the Mother Tongue Teachers. If she is a qualified librarian, she does not belong to the teaching staff. Being a teacher she does not follow Finnish library listservs or Finnish library journals, instead, she reads journals of her own subject area and of the Teachers union.

The majority of the school librarians believe that the following statements are accurate (appendices 1,3):

- That Internet access should be available through the school library.
- That students should have individual access to the school library during class time.
- That it is the school librarian's responsibility to educate the principal about the role of the school librarian.
- That the school librarian should inform the principal about issues affecting the potential of the school library.

They felt that the following statements are not so accurate (appendix 4):

- That the school librarian should be a key player in the school information literacy programs.
- That the school librarian should be identified as an IT leader in the school.
- That the school librarian ought to have a qualification in education and librarianship.
- That the principal should supervise the school librarian.
- That the school librarian should provide appropriate servicing to the teaching staff.
- That the school librarianship is good preparation for the position of principal.

The quantitative analysis (appendix 5) demonstrated that school librarians believe their principals should be spending more time in future on the following tasks than they feel they currently do:

- Advocating and facilitating the development of an information literate school community.
- Ensuring that the attainment of information literacy is part of the school plan.
- Understanding and advocating the role of the school librarian in the school's instructional plan.
- Demonstrating support for collaboration among the school librarian and teaching staff.
- Ensuring that the school library objectives reflect school goals.
- Encouraging the teaching staff to invest time in cooperatively planning and teaching with the school librarian.
- Informing new staff about the importance of collaborating with the school librarian.

- Supporting the development of the resource collection that is current and relevant to the curriculum needs of the school.
- Encouraging staff about information policy.
- Ensuring that significant funding is allocated to the school library budget.
- Visiting the school library to observe the work of the school librarian.
- Encouraging the teachers to incorporate learning of a range of skills into their teaching programs and to assess process skills as well as content.
- Seeking feedback from staff about their impressions of the quality of the school library.

Overall school librarians view their in service training as being more important than the principals do.

### **3. 2.2. Principals**

The Finnish principal is usually male (57%) in his late fifties He has been in his current position less than 10 years (70%) and in an executive position more than ten years (57%). He has worked with one school librarian (56%). He belongs to the Union of the Finnish Principals and also to at least one professional association. His academic qualification is MA, and he has been a teacher prior to appointment at least 10 years.

Principals differed to school librarians in that they felt the following statements to be accurate (appendix 4):

- The school librarian should be a key player in the schools' information literacy programs.
- The school librarian should have a qualification in education and librarianship.
- School librarians should be appointed according to a merit selection process.
- It is important that principals act as role models and mentors to staff which is reticent about the appropriate instructional use of IT.
- Principals are not well placed to judge the school librarians' professional competence.

Analysis (appendix 6) demonstrated that principals believe they should be spending more time in the future on the following tasks than they feel they currently do:

- Encouraging the teaching staff to invest time in co-operatively planning and teaching with the school librarian.
- Informing the new staff about the importance of collaborating with the school librarian.
- Actively seeking outside school funding possibilities that can be used to supplement the school library budget.
- Working with the school librarian to develop her professional development plan.
- Providing time release and funding to the school librarian to undertake ongoing professional development.

Overall principals view themselves as spending more time on school library tasks than the school librarians perceive them spending. Principals also perceive themselves as generally needing to spend a little less time than the school librarians perceived in the future.

#### **4. 2.3. Sample findings from the research instrument 3 and open questions**

Research instrument 3 and open questions were analyzed as follows: After the responses to individual questions have been analyzed, the responses to instrument 3 provided by teacher-librarians and principals in the same school were examined for possible patterns.

##### **Question 1 – From my perspective the strengths of the library resource center are:**

Principals (11) emphasized that the strengths are resources and equipment. A school library is close to users. It has open access and connections to other libraries, it has a qualified and/or cooperative staff and its focus is on learning or curriculum. School librarians (12) emphasized the library's open access, closeness of the users, resources and equipment, qualified and/or cooperative staff and its focus on learning or curriculum. Overall both principals and school librarians agreed that the existence of a school library was important. (total 28 principals and 24 school librarians)

##### **Question 2 – From my perspective the challenges that face the library resource center are:**

Principals (10) saw IT and acquisition of both printed and electronic material as the biggest challenges in the school library. More room, professional staff and cooperation between teachers, students and the library were also important. School librarians considered adequate library space and the acquisition of modern basic materials as the most important. The importance of following of general library development was self evident even to teachers. After these followed IT and IT user education, teaching information skills and weeding out old material. The low salary compared to teachers' wages and low status of qualified school librarians were also mentioned: *"To get the appointment, status and salary of a real school librarian. The other challenges, e.g. integration into curriculum etc., follow long behind."* Overall principals emphasized more than school librarians the importance of IT. School librarians saw sometimes IT as an enemy to reading. (Total 30 principals and 31 school librarians)

##### **Question 3 – The following things that the school librarian does are critical to the quality of teaching and learning**

Principals (12) saw most importantly the school librarian's task to teach information skills/user education and inspire and encourage students and staff. Traditional library tasks like cataloguing or converting the card catalogue to the database, selecting and acquiring material and organizing the school library were next. School librarians saw their most important tasks of the acquisition of material, the guidance of students to the right sources of information and the

quality of library collection. Three school librarians did not consider their work critically valuable. Two instead thought that their enthusiasm to promote reading and the use of the library was critical. There were also mentions about keeping the library tidy, integrating the library into the curriculum and taking care that the IT machines are worked. - School librarians saw as their most important task the acquisition of the materials, whilst according to principals' opinion it was the teaching of information skills. (Total 25 principals and 29 school librarians)

**Question 4 – If the library resource center were closed for more than two weeks the form and quality of teaching would be affected in the following ways:**

The majority of the principals (14) considered that the students' independent work would become more difficult, but three thought that it would not affect school work at all. There were also opinions that students would have to go elsewhere and the teaching strategies could not vary during the closure. Six school librarians also thought that the closure would be ineffective or they could not comment. Eight emphasized that students could not work independently at school or they could not complete their assignments /essays. Some teachers have access to the school library, so it could be used, but in three cases students would not have space to work. Some mentioned: *“Behavioristic teaching methods would come back, and very strongly. Project works would be in danger. The reading habits would diminish, only the most eager would go the city library.”* Or *“The dialogue would diminish from the library side. Teachers and students lose a good, familiar working space. Many students would lose the ability to study independently. It means going back to teacher-centered teaching.”* Overall principals saw the affects less important than school librarians. (Total 26 principals and 25 school librarians)

**Question 5: If the school librarian were absent from school more than two weeks the form and quality of teaching and learning would be affected in the following ways:**

Seven principals reported that the school library was always open in their school. Seven others thought that the absence of the school librarian would cause some harm, but would not upset the whole school. In four cases there was a stand-in. In three schools this situation would threaten the independent search for information. One principal considered the absence of the school librarian as a catastrophe!

Eight school librarians on the other hand mentioned the practical side of the school librarian's absence: The library will be messy and the material is returned to the wrong places. The majority, 13 respondents, thought that absence had no or hardly any effect. Five would not comment. In four cases the teachers had keys or they could use the library independently. There were also those school librarians who remembered the learners: Guidance will become to an end and the same happens to the co-operation and integration, or: *“Chaos! Material will be lost. Students will have no help in using the machines, or in seeking for information. Lessons cannot be taught cooperatively by the teacher and school librarian.”* School librarians and principals agreed that affects

would not be essential, but on the other hand some regarded it as a very serious matter. (Total 26 principals and 28 school librarians)

**Question 6: When the school librarian is absent, the following arrangements ensure access to the library resource center:**

Eight principals told that other teachers had keys, five that the library was always open or they had substitute arrangements. In three cases the guardian opened the door.

Nine school librarians told that teachers had keys, seven that the door was always open. In six cases someone of the school staff opened the door. In some papers it was pointed out that students knew the rules of the library and self-service was arranged to the school library. It seems clear that inside school there are arrangements to ensure that the school library can be used during school terms. (Total 27 principals and 29 school librarians)

**Question 7: I see information literacy as:**

Most principals saw information literacy as a critical skill to be able to look for information, two principals to find essential information, two principals to use information for the right purpose. It was also mentioned that information literacy is the skill to distinguish between truth and false or the skill to ‘understand the whole picture’.

The majority (10) of the school librarians saw information literacy as an ability to find information from various sources, three as traditional and media literacy. It was also mentioned that it is knowing how to acquire, understand, analyze, criticize and apply information, to distinguish the important from the unimportant, to see the cause and result. One school librarian also stated: “*You must know how to use the library catalogue and search for appropriate information.*” Both principals and school librarians had quite a similar idea about information literacy. (Total 22 principals and 26 school librarians)

**Question 8: I see the following as the major barriers to the integration of information skills across the curriculum:**

A small majority of the principals (6) saw the limited subject areas or the rigid areas of compulsory courses and their fixed contents as the major barriers. Four principals lacked resources. Lack of time, space and training were also mentioned as barriers.

The school librarians had a slightly different picture: Four told about the lack of time, three about the rigid borders between subject areas and tight timetables. Qualified school librarians also told of negative attitudes of the teachers, low status of the school librarian and of ignorance about the work of the school librarian. (Total 22 principals, 19 school librarians) Principals and school librarians differ significantly from each other in this question.

**Question 10** - In conclusion I would like to make the following points about my role as school librarian:

Two extremes are seen:

*“Your questionnaire is idealistic but really very far from the real situation. In your questionnaire you totally ignore the importance of the school*

*librarianship from the point of a view of teachers' employment. I have got the responsibility of the school library because it gave me my minimum of teaching hours."* (teacher)

*"The questions asked in this questionnaire and the comparison to the real situation in our school library are much apart from each other: Our school library is in the cellar (or in the bomb shelter or in the attic or in the rear of the assembly hall), because of lack of space. We do not have a qualified school librarian but a mother tongue teacher, who takes care of the school library for three hours per week. The responsibility of the development of IT is upon our principal and IT-teacher."* (teacher)

*"I feel I am an important member of the school community. My duties don't include tasks like coffee making or other people's tasks. Teachers are not yet ready to develop the library, they say: "You can decide about the library matters." Still there are exceptions: Many teachers are in the long run interested in the acquisition of material of their subject area and also in classification. Teachers also bring me their schedules and time tables and we talk about the contents of the courses."* (librarian)

*"I feel I have a key position in our information centre. In addition we try within the quality criteria to maintain the quality of collection and service, level of the knowledge of the personnel and the coziness and functionality of the space, we also aim at the ongoing grass-root-level collaboration with teachers to integrate information skills to all teaching. Tomorrow it is that we work together with students in an inspiring information atmosphere, where we all have windows open to the world. We will have possibilities in the process of creating "new information" or "new knowledge". The contents of my work are always changing and growing."* (teacher-librarian)

#### **4. Conclusion**

Following results are preliminary: Principals and school librarians in Finland differ significantly in gender, and age. Whilst school librarians are primarily female, principals are primarily male. Whilst school librarians are likely to be between 40-49 years of age, principals are likely to be between 50-59 years of age. Their co-operation varies, too. The analysis of all the answers shows three probable types of co-operation between principals and school librarians in Finnish upper secondary schools:

1. A school library is divided into subject classes. The school librarian is a mother tongue teacher with help from a team of subject teachers. The library's emphasis is on supporting subject areas and their teaching. Librarian's main task is to order books. The principal's support and co-operation with the school librarian is minimal.
2. A traditional school library is like a warehouse of old books in most schools. No IT. The school librarian is a mother tongue teacher with max. five hour/ week in the school library. School library is always open. Rules

for using it independently are in practice. The main focus of the school library is in supporting reading and students' independent information seeking. The principal's support and co-operation with the school librarian is small. Both teachers taking care of the school library and qualified school librarians feel that they need more principal's support. There are pressures to have a better school library, but limits to the development are tight.

3. A modern learning resource center with IT, with good collection and with computers and networking also with other libraries. The school librarian is a qualified professional librarian, even a teacher-librarian. The emphasis of the learning resource center is on supporting students' independent learning and teachers' teaching. The principal supports the development of the learning resource center. The school librarian and principal communicate on an open and honest basis. They share the same school vision.

The research showed the weaknesses of Finnish school libraries: Lack of school library vision and competence at all levels. Small resources inside the school, lack of space, lack of materials, no IT. The traditional vision of the school library is linked only with books and to promoting reading. The school librarian is struggling without support. Inside the school there are rigid subject areas. Teachers teach traditionally from the textbooks. No need for a learning resource center. This all reflects the difficulties to define the school library as an organic part of learning and teaching within schools.

This survey also aims at showing the challenges of the Finnish school libraries:

1. The enthusiastic spirit and will to develop the school library is strong in some schools where student-centered learning is not only a possibility but a living fact. The changing curriculum is a main promotor.
2. There are existing Finnish examples of modern learning support centers with all possible IT supporting reading, students' independent learning and teachers' work. They are most common in schools where the change in pedagogy has taken place.

In both cases principals and school librarians are working together for the information literate school community.

## **5. What next in Finland?**

Principals and school librarians should be equal partners in the same process. The earlier studies (Hafsteinsdottir (1997), Hay, Henri & Oberg (1998), Oberg (1997), have shown that principal's support is vital to the well-being and development of the school library. The school librarian should also bear her part of the challenge of the educational reform. Above all, the educational policy and the socio-economic factors within each country establish possibilities for school libraries.

This research gave some hints for developing Finnish school libraries, whether in collaboration with public libraries or inside schools as the school's learning resource centers. The results of the research may not be valid for a small

amount of the participating schools, but they can and need to be used for the benefit of Finnish school libraries.

**Sources:**

**Haavisto, Tuula:** Country focus – Finland. In: Information Europe, spring 1998, s.28-29.

**Hafsteinsdottir, Hafdis Dögg:** The attitude of Icelandic principals towards school libraries. Paper presented at IFLA council and general conference, Sect. School libraries and resource centres, Copenhagen, 1997.

**Hay, Lyn, Henri, James & Oberg, Dianne:** The principal's role in developing information literacy: Findings from Australia and Canada. Paper presented at IASL conference, Jerusalem, 1998.

**Niinikangas, Liisa:** An Open learning environment – new challenges for the Finnish school library. Scandinavian Public Library Quarterly 28(1995):4, 4-10

**Niinikangas, Liisa:** Uudesta kirjastosta ammattikorkeakoulun ylpeys.

Ammattikorkeakoulukirjastojen nykytila ja ehdotuksia kehittämismuutoksiksi ja mahdollisuuksiksi. Ammattikasvatustieteiden tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 2/1996. Tampere, 1996.

**Oberg, Dianne:** Principal support: a research from Canada. Paper presented at IFLA council and general conference, Sect. School libraries and resource centers, Copenhagen, 1997.

<http://www.edu.fi>

**Appendix 1: Descriptive Statistics from frequency analysis for Teacher Librarians perception of time spent on tasks/ or in support of tasks by the Principal**

Question	Present		Future	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	3.25	1.05	3.81	.40
2	2.89	1.26	3.64	.76
3	3.39	.96	3.64	.76
4	2.61	1.10	3.42	.81
5	2.56	1.21	3.17	1.03
6	2.47	1.38	3.31	.89
7	1.64	1.38	2.22	1.59
8	2.69	1.55	3.11	1.37
9	2.17	1.13	2.97	1.18
10	1.81	1.26	2.67	1.29
11	3.03	1.28	3.14	1.27
12	1.69	1.31	2.58	1.48
13	3.11	1.14	3.06	1.24
14	2.44	1.46	3.67	.76
15	2.56	1.32	3.39	1.15
16	1.39	1.34	2.31	1.45
17	2.64	.99	2.94	1.01
18	1.44	1.05	2.06	1.26
19	2.03	1.32	2.44	1.34
20	1.72	1.03	1.78	1.33
21	2.61	1.50	3.0	1.20
22	1.39	.90	1.56	1.32
23	1.06	1.04	1.19	1.26
24	2.56	1.54	3.19	1.09
25	1.22	.99	1.61	1.42

26	1.17	.88	1.92	1.32
27	1.56	1.13	1.83	1.36
28	2.33	1.55	2.94	1.37
29	1.83	1.18	3.03	1.08
30	1.61	1.50	3.11	1.14
31	1.14	1.13	2.50	1.32

**Appendix 2: Descriptive Statistics from frequency analysis for Principals perception of time spent on tasks/ or in support of tasks by themselves**

Question	Present	Present	Future	Future
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	3.40	.78	3.5	1.09
2	3.25	.49	3.47	.78
3	3.68	.73	3.67	.92
4	2.78	.95	3.10	1.08
5	2.83	1.13	3.22	1.05
6	3.05	.75	3.32	.76
7	1.70	1.34	2.05	1.30
8	2.15	1.35	2.45	1.38
9	2.70	1.04	3.15	.95
10	2.62	1.03	3.07	1.10
11	3.67	.47	3.70	.72
12	2.42	.96	2.95	.99
13	3.28	.60	3.40	.81
14	3.18	.81	3.38	.77
15	2.85	1.17	2.88	1.26
16	1.75	.87	2.15	1.05
17	2.80	1.14	2.90	1.24

18	2.05	1.11	2.32	1.12
19	2.30	1.09	2.53	1.22
20	1.90	.98	2.07	1.14
21	3.00	1.34	3.15	1.21
22	1.62	.87	1.80	1.24
23	1.63	1.10	1.63	1.10
24	3.4	.63	3.48	.78
25	1.65	1.12	2.05	1.36
26	1.28	.85	1.80	.07
27	2.02	1.21	2.20	1.32
28	2.90	.98	3.07	1.12
29	2.10	1.08	2.53	1.20
30	2.08	1.25	2.37	1.41
31	1.85	.98	2.17	1.22

**Appendix 3: Descriptive Statistics from frequency analysis for Teacher Librarians Beliefs**

Mean of 2.10 or under is considered disagreement. Mean of 2.90 or over is considered agreement.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
32	2.67	1.12
33	2.67	1.33
34	2.72	1.34
35	2.22	1.59
36	2.17	1.21
37	2.67	1.43
38	1.94	1.55
39	1.61	.96
40	1.81	1.60
41	3.56	.97

42	3.44	.97
43	1.83	1.32
44	1.89	1.35
45	2.56	1.40
46	2.19	1.64
47	1.78	1.40
48	1.50	1.46
49	2.08	1.18
50	2.97	1.06
51	3.53	.77
52	1.19	1.14
53	2.42	1.34

**Appendix 4: Descriptive Statistics from frequency analysis for Principals Beliefs**

Question	Mean	SD
32	2.72	1.18
33	3.08	.80
34	3.35	.58
35	2.50	1.40
36	1.80	1.16
37	2.88	1.21
38	2.33	1.33
39	1.65	1.10
40	1.85	1.39
41	3.55	.93
42	3.63	.74
43	1.75	1.21
44	2.55	1.15
45	3.07	1.05

46	<b>2.77</b>	<b>1.37</b>
47	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.28</b>
48	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.44</b>
49	<b>2.25</b>	<b>1.35</b>
50	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.37</b>

**Appendix 5: T –Tests – Present vs. Future Analysis – School librarians**

Question value	Present Mean	Present SD	Future Mean	Future SD	P
1	<b>3.25</b>	<b>1.052</b>	<b>3.806</b>	<b>.401</b>	<b>.002</b>
2	<b>2.89</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>.762</b>	<b>.000</b>
4	<b>2.61</b>	<b>1.103</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>.81</b>	<b>.000</b>
5	<b>2.56</b>	<b>1.206</b>	<b>3.167</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>.004</b>
6	<b>2.47</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>.89</b>	<b>.000</b>
9	<b>2.17</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>.000</b>
10	<b>1.806</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>.000</b>
12	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>.000</b>
13	<b>3.11</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>.76</b>	<b>.002</b>
14	<b>2.44</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>.003</b>
15	<b>2.56</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>.000</b>
16	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>.000</b>
18	<b>1.44</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>.000</b>
26	<b>1.17</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>.000</b>
28	<b>2.33</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>.004</b>
29	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>.000</b>
30	<b>1.61</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>.000</b>
31	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>.000</b>

Due to limited space only the questions that yielded significant differences between time currently spent and time perceived to be required in the future are presented. To be considered significant a difference had to be significant at  $p \leq .005$ .

#### **Appendix 6: T –Tests – Present vs Future Analysis - Principals**

Question value	Present	Present	Future	Future	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
10	2.625	1.03	3.075	1.092	.002
12	2.425	.958	2.95	.986	.003
16	1.75	.870	2.15	1.051	.000
26	1.275	.847	1.8	1.067	.000
29	2.1	1.081	2.53	1.198	.004

#### **Appendix 7: Present and Future Overall**

	Present	Future	Beliefs
Teacher Librarian - Mean	66	85.19	41.31
Teacher Librarian - SD	20.79	20.99	11.32
Principal – Mean	77.88	85.48	44.83
Principal – SD	17.24	23.10	10.76
Levenes F-value	.785	.212	.116
Levenes p-value	.378	.646	.741
t-value	-2.72	-.06	-1.39
Df	74	74	74
p-value	.008	.956	.169

#### **Appendix 8: Other Variables**

	<u>Age</u>	<u>Gender</u>
TL - Mean	<u>3.22</u>	<u>1.08</u>
TL - SD	<u>1.045</u>	<u>.28</u>

Principal - Mean		<u>3.95</u>
<b>1.58</b>		
Principal- SD	<u>.552</u>	<u>.501</u>
Levenes F-value		<u>23.004</u>
<b>74.315</b>		
Levenes p-value		<u>.000</u>
<b>.000</b>		
t-value	<u>-3.74</u>	<u>-5.35</u>
df	<u>51.87</u>	<u>62.46</u>
p-value	<u>.000</u>	<u>.000</u>