

**EDUCATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR INDONESIAN ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS: A SURVEY**

Imas Maesaroh

School of Media, Culture and Creative Arts
Curtin University of Technology
GPO Box U1987
Perth, 6845
imasmae@yahoo.com

Paul Genoni

School of Media, Culture and Creative Arts
Curtin University of Technology
GPO Box U1987
Perth, 6845
p.genoni@curtin.edu.au
(08)9266-7256

EDUCATION AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR INDONESIAN ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS: A SURVEY

Purpose

This paper reports base-line data on the current levels of education, skills, and knowledge of Indonesian academic librarians, and provides an insight into their continuing professional development. The paper reports:

- The current level of qualifications of librarians working in Indonesian academic libraries;
- The current level and type of continuing professional development and work place training in Indonesian academic libraries.

Design/methodology/approach

This paper includes the results of a questionnaire delivered to all librarians working in Indonesian public universities. The survey instrument was based on that used in the NEXUS survey distributed to Australian ILS professionals in 2006. The paper includes a comparison of survey results on key indicators for Indonesian and Australian library and information staff.

Findings

The research reports comparative shortcomings in the level and standard of education available to Indonesian academic librarians. The issue of continuing professional development is more complex, with quite high levels of participation in some types of training reported by the Indonesian respondents, but generally lower levels of satisfaction with that training than reported by their Australian counterparts.

Research limitations/implications

Some of the conclusions made comparing the situations in Indonesia and Australia are tentative due to the different understandings of key terms and concepts in the two countries. The data

reported in the paper is quantitative and comprehensive findings require further qualitative research.

Practical implications

The results have implications for the future development of library education in Indonesia, and workplace training for Indonesian academic librarians.

Originality/value

The research reported is the first to collect large-scale data relating to ILS workforce education and continuing professional development from a developing country.

Introduction

Academic libraries play a critical role in supporting universities in achieving their teaching and research goals. It has been legitimately suggested that academic libraries have been at ‘the heart of the university’ since the 19th century (Lynch *et al.* 2007). Many scholars rely heavily on their university library’s collections and services to enable them to develop new knowledge (Hayward, 2006), and in fully developed higher education environments libraries are supported as an essential component of the scholarly community in which researchers and teachers create and transmit knowledge.

At the centre of the academic library is the staff. Academic librarians have an essential role in managing collections and delivering services to their users. It is the library staff who are required to build library content; organize collections to optimise retrievability; ensure reliable and equitable access to information sources; and implement reference and information services to meet the needs of a library’s various users. In recent years these roles have become increasingly

complex due to the impact of rapidly changing information technologies. These technologies, based on the digital creation, storage and transfer of library content, have transformed the nature of library collections and services, while substantially raising user expectations.

The quality of staff is influenced by numerous factors. Some of these include personal attributes such as aptitude, intelligence and commitment. There is also a range of environmental factors that are important, including the availability and standard of education, continuing professional development (CPD) and workplace learning.

This paper reports on an ongoing research project examining the present and desired state of academic library staff education and professional development in Indonesia. The goal of the research is to determine ways in which the quality of Indonesian academic library staff can be improved in order to assist the higher education sector produce high quality research, teaching, and learning outcomes. While there has been a considerable amount of attention given recently to the state of library education and CPD in developed countries there is substantially less information available regarding the circumstances in developing countries. The paper reports on a survey conducted of Indonesian academic librarians. The survey instrument (a questionnaire) was based on the NEXUS survey distributed to Australian LIS professionals in 2006. By comparing key responses to the surveys conducted in Indonesia and Australia it is possible to compare the different education and CPD standards and practices in the two countries, and thereby benchmark some of the improvements that might be required in the Indonesian academic library environment.

Literature Review

Higher education and academic libraries in Indonesia

As a developing country with a population of over 230 million, Indonesia is confronted by many intransigent problems. These include; a disadvantaged level of economic development; a chronically high unemployment rate; widespread poverty, and severe environmental challenges. A contributing cause to many of these problems is the low educational level of much of the population. Education that provides much needed knowledge and skills is a critical factor in developing human resources and should be made the first priority in economic and social development (Azahari, 2000). The Indonesian education system, however, is currently below the level needed to optimise its role in addressing the nation's problems.

There are two ministries responsible for the management of Indonesian higher education; the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), and the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA). MoNE oversees 2,428 higher educational institutions of which 81 are public and 2,347 are private; while MoRA administers 454 Islamic higher educational institutions, of which 52 are public and 402 are private. Due to inadequate financial support from government many universities rely upon student tuition fees for survival, and as a result they offer courses to as many as students as possible. In the drive to minimise costs they frequently disregard important elements required to produce quality education outcomes, including library services (Naibahi, 2007). Indeed many Indonesian universities do not provide a library service. According to Rachmananta (2002) there are some 500 academic libraries in Indonesia, which represents approximately 17% of the total number of institutions of higher education.

Those universities that do have a library typically fail to support it with adequate funding. A study undertaken by The Indonesian University Libraries Forum (FPPTI) reported that “5 of 125 universities have allocated 5% of their budgets [for their library] while 40% of them allocated less than 2%” (Fahmi, 2005). The budgets allocated to develop and manage the university library collections and services are well below those provided in developed countries, and in many cases below the amount required to provide even a modest information service.

Academic librarians in Indonesia

Despite chronic underfunding, the success of Indonesian academic library services in supporting the objectives of higher education is also dependent on the quality of library staff. According to a registry maintained by the National Library of Indonesia—and used to identify participants in this research—there were 1,282 academic librarians working in 133 public universities as at December 2008. This number does not include those librarians working in private universities. Pedit notes that in order to work as a librarian in government employment in Indonesia requires accreditation (Pedit, 2001). However, the system of accreditation has met resistance by the private institutions, and as a result it is difficult to identify the total number of librarians working in private universities, or to assess their levels of qualifications and competency. This resistance to the accreditation system in itself indicates weakness in the standards used to regulate the credentials of ‘professional’ librarians in Indonesia.

Several studies have been undertaken in order to investigate the quality of Indonesian librarians. Hasugian (2003) concluded that academic librarians in Indonesia lack the requisite knowledge and skills regarding information technology, which in turn hampers the implementation of ICTs in academic libraries. Hernandono (2005) notes that there are four areas of weaknesses in Indonesian librarians: low self esteem; inadequate skills in English language and ICT; inadequate

skills in conducting research and writing journal articles, and poor skills in developing cooperation between libraries or institutions. These conclusions were supported in a study conducted by Nasution (2006), which found that students' skills in using the Internet are not acquired from their librarians. Furthermore, Kamil (2005, p. 19-22) states that Indonesian librarians have not achieved strategic or influential positions in their institution as they:

1. do not have adequate business knowledge,
2. lack the ability to unite the role of information within an organisation with that organisation's mission,
3. lack the ability to provide leadership,
4. lack managerial ability.

Low performance standards by staff are another problem inhibiting the development of Indonesian academic libraries. Ernawati (2004) concludes that many users receive inadequate service as a result of the low level of commitment by librarians to their job, and this is often accompanied by an inadequate level of competency. Muttaqien (2006) states that librarians sometimes express hostility to their users in a way which inevitably results in a negative perception of the library and thereby acts as a disincentive to further use.

Education for librarianship in Indonesia

LIS education was first established in Indonesia in 1952 with a 'Course for library technicians', and in 1982 Indonesian University commenced offering LIS programs (Sulistyo-Basuki, 2006). Currently, there are 22 universities offering Diploma programs, 15 universities offering undergraduate (Bachelor) programs, and three universities offering Masters program. These schools of librarianship face many problems. Kamil (2005) criticized their curriculum, noting

that while they stressed technical ability, bibliographic management processes, and information resources, they lacked sufficient coverage of business, management and leadership. Farida and Purnomo (2006, p.353-357) note the many problems faced by Indonesian LIS schools, including the lack of facilities such as “library resources and internet access”; lack of funds to attract suitably qualified academic staff or to provide for their professional development, and a lack of government support due to the perception that “librarian is not (an) important profession”.

Other common problems in Indonesian LIS education include shortage of library texts in both print and electronic formats (Damayani, 2005); insufficient teaching staff who have graduated from overseas and “had no practical experience in local libraries” (Ocholla, 2008); and the offering of graduate programs with no requirement that academic staff have a PhD (Sulistyo-Basuki, 2006).

Many of the most critical problems faced by LIS education in Indonesia, however, relate to the lack of access to current information technologies and sufficiently computer literate teachers. As Ocholla states, contemporary LIS education relies on “modern computer hardware and software, efficient internet access and connectivity, computer literate and highly skilled IT staff and well equipped computer laboratories” (Ocholla, 2008). Pendit (2001) and Damayani (2005) argue that the lack of computer laboratories and library software mean that Indonesian staff and students cannot become sufficiently skilled in the use of information technologies. Ardoni (2005) has identified a related weakness in the curriculum of Indonesian LIS schools, whereby there is inadequate coverage of information technologies and associated developments.

While the existing literature on Indonesian LIS education is not extensive it points to the many problems including the lack of access to critical technology and the inadequate qualifications and

training of teaching staff. It can be hypothesised that these factors will negatively influence the skills, knowledge and performance of staff working in academic libraries.

Continuing Professional Development

According to Majid (2004, cited in Woolls, 2005) CPD is “the systematic method of learning that leads to growth and improvement in professional abilities, enabling individual to function successfully in a changing work environment ... the purpose of continuing professional development activities is to fill-in the knowledge gaps between formal education and the needs of the professional practice”. This definition indicates that CPD is critically important to standards of professionalism, particularly when the ‘knowledge gaps’ are exacerbated by inadequate formal education. CPD can potentially remedy or minimise the problems with the standard of first professional qualifications in Indonesian librarianship. This might be achieved by various means including post-qualification education or library-based workplace training.

There is a conspicuous lack of existing literature which discusses or investigates the issue of CPD in Indonesian librarianship. However, investigations of CPD in other developing countries can be found, such as Adanu’s (2007) report on the working environment and CPD activities in university libraries in Ghana.

Methodology

Data collection for this study was undertaken using a questionnaire based on that used in the NEXUS survey distributed to Australian LIS professionals in 2006. NEXUS is in turn part of an ongoing collection of data relating to the education, professional development, and career

aspirations of LIS professionals from other countries including the United Kingdom and Canada. The NEXUS questionnaire was modified as necessary in order to reflect the Indonesian environment, while retaining as many elements as possible in order to optimise the possibility of comparison between the Australian and Indonesia results. The questionnaire was developed in English before translation into Indonesian. The results reported below represent a selection of the core data related to education and CPD.

The institutional sample for the distribution of the questionnaire research was Indonesian public universities. Staff from 133 public universities, consisting of 81 public universities under the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and 52 Islamic public universities under the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA) were included in the survey, and the questionnaire was distributed to all librarians working in these universities. The data regarding these librarians was derived from a National Library of Indonesia database that recorded the details of 1,282 academic librarians attached to the relevant universities.

Of these 1,282 distributed questionnaires, 812 (63.3%) of analyzable quality were returned. These 812 responses came from all of the 133 libraries located in 27 provinces. Of the responses, 651 were received from MoNE universities, 82 from MoNE institutes; 31 from MORA universities; and 30 from MoRA institutes. 18 respondents did not indicate their institutional affiliation. The Australian NEXUS survey received a similar number of responses (800) from academic librarians, consisting of 576 from universities and 124 from TAFE college libraries.

One difficult element in comparing the data generated by this survey with the results from the NEXUS survey is the means by which ‘librarians’ are classified in the two countries. Indonesia has no equivalent to the Australian library technicians, or ‘paraprofessionals’ as they are referred to in the NEXUS survey. The Indonesian questionnaire was sent to individuals who are identified by the National Library of Indonesia database as *pustakawan* (librarian), and are therefore considered to be professional librarians irrespective of their formal qualifications. The Australian NEXUS data for academic librarians as reproduced below includes responses from ‘professional’ librarians only, and disregards the category of ‘paraprofessional’. It is hoped in this way to produce the most meaningful comparison between the two countries.

Results of the questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 60 questions. The results of a selection of those questions relevant to the issues of education and continuing professional development are reported below. Comparisons with the results obtained by the NEXUS survey are included where possible. It should be noted that as results from the Indonesian survey encompassed library staff working in universities and institutes of advanced learning, the results for the NEXUS survey report only those responses received from librarians working for universities and TAFE (Technical and Further Education) colleges.

Demography

The questionnaire included a number of demographic questions. Responses to several of these questions are useful in establishing some distinctions between the workforces in Indonesian and Australian academic libraries.

Table I. Gender

	Indonesia %	Australia %
Male	48.9	15.0
Female	51.1	85.0

The study found that 413 (51.1%) of respondents were female and 395 (48.9%) were male (four respondents did not report their gender). These results differ considerably from those obtained in the Australian survey whereby only 15% of respondents were male.

Table II. Age

	Indonesia %	Australia %
21-25	0.4	2.9
26-35	20.6	18.4
36-45	26.3	29.4
46-55	44.5	33.6
56-65	8.6	14.3
66+	0	1.6

Table II indicates that there is a close similarity in the age distribution of academic librarians in the two countries. Particularly notable is the high proportion of the workforce over 45 years of age: 53.1% in Indonesia and 49.5% in Australia. Both countries therefore show evidence of the 'greying' workforce that has been identified as an international problem for the LIS profession. It can be hypothesised that age and the number of years until retirement will influence respondents' attitudes towards career planning and CPD.

Education

Respondents were asked to indicate the current status of their LIS qualifications.

Table III Status of LIS qualification

	Indonesia %	Australia %
Already qualified	81.6	87.6
Currently studying	1.8	6.2
No qualifications	16.6	6.1

For both countries it was found that the majority of respondents already possessed an LIS qualification, although the number of Australian respondents with a completed qualification or currently studying (93.8%) was greater than that in Indonesia (83.4%).

The discrepancy between the current levels of educational attainment in the two countries becomes more obvious, however, when the highest level of completed education is considered. The figures in Table IV refer only to those respondents who are reported in Table III as having completed a formal LIS qualification.

Table IV. Highest level of completed education

LIS Qualification	Indonesia %	Australia %
Diploma	47.5	N/A
Bachelor	42.5	27.0
Graduate Diploma	0.2	52.1
Masters	9.7	18.2
PhD	0.2	0

For nearly half (47.5%) of the Indonesian respondents their highest completed qualification is a Diploma. Diplomas are offered at three levels (I, II and III), with the level indicating the number of years study required for completion. Of the 265 respondents indicating a Diploma as their highest qualification, 10 hold a Diploma I; 144 a Diploma II, and 111 a Diploma III.

The other significant discrepancy is with the Graduate Diploma qualification. LIS programs in Indonesia do not offer Graduate Diplomas, which are the preferred pathway to a first professional qualification for Australian academic libraries. Given the duration of the Indonesian Diploma courses and Bachelors courses, and the duration of the Australian courses where a Graduate Diploma is completed with one year of full time study, it is apparent that for respondents with a qualification, that the Indonesian librarians have spent a longer average time completing their LIS qualification than their Australian counterparts.

As described in the opening discussion there is some evidence of dissatisfaction with the current state of LIS education in Indonesian. Those Indonesian respondents who had completed a qualification were therefore asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with “the quality of education you received in your program of study”. No comparable results were reported from the Australian survey.

Table V. Level of satisfaction with LIS Education (Indonesia only)

	<i>n</i>	%
Very dissatisfied	13	2.1
Dissatisfied	52	8.3
Neutral	136	21.8
Satisfied	329	52.8

Very satisfied	93	14.9
Total	623	100.0

Despite the evidence to the contrary responses were generally positive, with 422 (67.7%) declaring they were ‘Satisfied’ or ‘Very satisfied’ with the quality of their education. It is the case, however, that most of these respondents have little or no exposure to other courses or educational standards that apply in other countries, and may therefore have low expectations in terms of what constitutes best practice in terms of LIS education.

Indonesian participants were also asked, in an open-ended question, to indicate, “What if anything, do you think could be done to improve the quality of education offered in the librarianship course you completed?” The responses (236 from 204 respondents) were grouped and coded.

Table VI. Areas for improvement in LIS course (Indonesia only)

	% (of respondents)
IT content (insufficient)	49.0
Financial support/ scholarships needed	15.2
Practicum (insufficient)	12.3
Tutorial time (insufficient)	8.3
Quality of lecturers	7.8
Foreign language instruction (insufficient)	6.9
Management content (insufficient)	5.9
Coursework materials (inadequate)	4.4
Library visits (insufficient)	3.4
Curriculum problems of a general nature	2.0

Involvement in professional association	0.5
---	-----

Nearly half of all participants who responded to this question nominated IT content as being in need of improvement. Other curriculum related matters that were mentioned (the practicum component and management content) received significantly lower responses.

Continuing Professional Development

Respondents to both the Indonesian and Australian questionnaires were asked to indicate how frequently they performed a range of work related functions and activities. Only those functions related to CPD are reported in Table VII, and only the responses indicating that an activity was undertaken ‘Often’ or ‘Very often’ are included. (In Table VII it was not possible for the Australian results to separate academic library respondents from those in other sectors. The figures presented represent professional, non-management respondents from all sectors, and are included here for the purpose of a general comparison only).

Table VII. Function/ activity performed

Function/ Activity	Indonesia		Australia	
	Often	Very often	Often	Very often
Participation in professional organisations	23.0	8.2	17.2	13.8
Attending formal conferences, workshops and training events	30.1	7.7	21.1	9.1
Participating in informal workplace learning	34.4	10.6	29.7	14.1
Research and publishing in the field of librarianship	11.8	4.3	4.0	1.8
Managing training and staff development	12.7	4.6	18.0	18.1

These results are perhaps surprising in that they indicate a degree of participation in CPD by Indonesian librarians that is generally higher than might be anticipated, and in several cases

higher than that reported by the Australian respondents. For whereas the Australians indicated they participate 'Very often' at a higher frequency (for four of the five functions) than the Indonesians, the Indonesian respondents conversely reported that they participate in these functions 'Often' at a higher rate (four of the five functions) than do the Australians.

It is worth noting in particular that Indonesian respondents indicated a considerably higher level of participation in "Research and publishing" than did the Australians. This may be explained by the practice of using small research projects as a promotional test in Indonesia, although they rarely result in formal publication. The one function for which the Australians did report a notably higher participation rate was that of "Managing training and staff development", despite the Australian respondents being drawn from the non-management staff.

In order to gather additional information about CPD activity the Indonesian respondents were asked to indicate if they have "attended the following professional development activities in the past 5 years". Of the 812 questionnaire respondents 778 (95.8%) indicated that they had undertaken some form of CPD in this period.

Table VIII. Professional development activities (Indonesia only)

Activity	<i>n</i>	%
Seminar	594	73.2
Workplace training	364	44.8
Workshops	349	43.0
Mentoring	276	34.0
External training	211	26.0
Courses provided by tertiary institutions	132	16.3
Professional reading	107	13.2
Publication or presentation of a paper	103	12.7
Conference attendance	79	9.7
Self-paced learning through audio, video, CD	54	6.7

A personal study project	42	5.2
--------------------------	----	-----

There appears to be an emphasis on workplace training and related activities in these responses and opposed to externally sourced CPD. Whereas the most common response “Seminars”, might be provided within or from outside the workplace, many of the other highly ranked responses (Workplace training; Workshops, and Mentoring) seem to refer to employer provided CPD. Only 26% of respondents specifically nominated that they has received “External training”. It is also notable that only 9.7% of respondents reported attending a conference in the previous five years—although intriguingly a higher number (12.7%) indicated that they had published or presented a paper during this period. Evidence of self-directed learning was low, with only 13.2% having undertaken ‘professional reading’.

Questionnaire participants who had reported undertaking training were also asked to report the particular “knowledge and skills” in which they had been trained, and if this training had “improved your ability to perform your job”. (In Table IX it was not possible for the Australian results to separate academic library respondents from those in other sectors. The Australian figures presented represent respondents from all sectors, and are included here for the purpose of a general comparison only).

Table IX. Participation in training and impact on work performance

Knowledge and skills	Indonesia		Australia	
	Participating	Positive %	Participating	Positive %
Job-oriented skills	83.4	34.6	79.8	66.9
Technology skills	81.4	30.7	83.9	67.8
Customer-service	80.1	29.2	59.1	58.0
Management	75.1	23.2	60.5	44.7
Other professional development (eg subject skills)	77.3	27.2	59.1	62.0

For all but one of these areas of ‘knowledge and skills’ the Indonesian respondents indicated a higher level of participation. The exception is ‘Technology skill’, but even in this category there is little difference in participation rate. It is noticeable, however, that the Australian respondents indicated a substantially more positive response to their training than did their Indonesian counterparts. For each of the five nominated areas of CPD the Australians reported a beneficial impact at approximately twice the rate as that reported by the Indonesians.

Participants were also presented with a series of statements to test their attitudes and opinions regarding various aspects of “training, career development and organisational commitment”. They were asked to respond using a five point Likert Scale. The results presented in Table X aggregate the ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly agree’ responses only.

Table X. Views about training, career development and organizational commitment

	Indonesia %	Australia %
I currently have sufficient education, training and experience to allow me to perform my job	60.4	80.6
Given my education, training and experience, I am overqualified for my current position	41.7	60.2
Given my education, training and development, I am qualified to move to a higher position	45.7	28.5
My career would benefit from technology skills training	65.2	53.5
My career would benefit from management skills training	64.2	52.0
My organisation provides me with sufficient opportunities to participate in training	59.6	68.7
I believe I spend too much time on training	8.6	54.1
I am committed to the goals of the organisation I work for	67.3	42.3

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with the organisation I work for	69.1	80.5
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in my current position	46.4	23.5

Although there are a number of interesting differences between the Indonesian and Australian responses, two deserve particular note. Firstly, the discrepancy in response to the proposition that respondents “currently have sufficient education, training and experience to allow me to perform my job”. Over 80% of Australian respondents indicated some level of agreement with this statement as compared to 60.4% of Indonesians. Secondly, the *very* marked difference in response to the statement that “I believe I spend too much time on training”, with only 8.6% of Indonesian respondents indicating some level of agreement with this statement as compared to 54.1% of the Australians. These two results are compatible and would seem to indicate that despite the high levels of training reported elsewhere by Indonesian respondents that there remains a substantial desire and need for additional CPD.

It is also noteworthy that although a higher percentage of Indonesian respondents report being committed to the goals of their employing organisation (67.3% as opposed to 42.3%), that the Australian respondents are generally more satisfied with the prospect of remaining with their employer (80.5% of Australians as opposed to 69.1% of Indonesians).

The questionnaire also asked respondents to compare LIS with other professions using a series of statements. Only those statements that may have implications for CPD and career planning are reported in Table XI, and again the ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly agree’ responses have been aggregated to simplify the comparison.

Table XI. Views of the LIS profession and career

	Indonesia %	Australia %
There is good quality training available for my profession	48.0	60.3
My remuneration is appropriate for my educational qualifications	50.1	42.4
My remuneration is appropriate for the work I do	43.5	48.1
Job satisfaction in my profession is high	44.2	52.2
My profession is well regarded by others	37.6	40.0
I believe people are interested in joining this profession	41.5	29.1
There will be lots of opportunities for LIS jobs in the future	76.9	37.6

Australian respondents appear to be more satisfied with the quality of training at their disposal than do their Indonesian counterparts (60.3% as compared to 48%). For other factors that might encourage individuals to aggressively pursue CPD (or even to seek a career change) the responses from the two countries are broadly consistent. The notable exception is with regard to the perception of future job opportunities, with 76.9% of Indonesian respondents expressing confidence in future “opportunities for LIS jobs”, compared to 37.6% of Australians.

Discussion and conclusion

This questionnaire, the results of which only a small part are reported in this paper, has sought to collect data which will establish a base for the understanding of the future development and implementation of LIS education and CPD in Indonesia. The questionnaire is one element of a multi-faceted research project that will include a second questionnaire focusing on academic

library managers (again based on a NEXUS questionnaire), and interviews with library staff and their managers. Some caution also needs to be expressed regarding the ‘transferability’ of some concepts between the two countries, particularly with regard training. That is, it is not always clear that respondents in the two countries share exactly the same understanding of what activities constitute a particular type of training, and despite making every effort to ensure that the choice of translated terms used in the Indonesian questionnaire captured the meaning of the NEXUS survey, there may have been some scope for misunderstanding. This is another element of the research that will be pursued when the qualitative stage is undertaken.

The data reported in this paper are therefore preliminary and partial. Nevertheless the results provide an initial insight into some of the existing CPD practices and attitudes of Indonesian academic librarians, and allow some meaningful comparisons to be made with the circumstances in Australia.

Firstly, it is apparent that the educational attainment of academic librarians in Australia is generally of a level higher than in Indonesia. A Bachelors degree (either in LIS, or in a non-LIS discipline followed by a LIS graduate qualification) is the ‘entry point’ for Australian academic librarians. In Indonesia there is a both a higher incidence of staff without an LIS qualification, and nearly half of those (47.5%) with a qualification have a Diploma of between one and three years. These discrepancies are very likely exacerbated by the *standards* of education that apply to these qualifications in the two countries. Australian LIS education for professional staff functions under the regulatory system of course recognition (or accreditation) established and managed by the Australian Library and Information Association. This independent scrutiny is an

important element in ensuring that acceptable standards are maintained with regard to curriculum; technology support and access; assessment; and quality of teaching staff. Unfortunately this level of monitoring does not apply in Indonesia, and on the evidence of the research reported in the introduction to this paper, standards are below those which apply in Australia and other developed higher education systems.

As a result of the lower education standards in Indonesia there is a heavy onus placed on CPD if some of the knowledge and skills shortfalls are to be minimised or eliminated. The evidence from the survey suggests that the CPD situation in Indonesia may be in quite a healthy state. Tables VII and VIII indicate that there is level of participation in CPD that is broadly equivalent to that in Australia, and that the training incorporates a similar variety in terms of foci. Some elements of CPD do appear to be lower than desirable, however, including conference attendance and professional reading. The low participation in these important forms of CPD is likely explained by Indonesia's development status. Conferences are an expensive form of staff development and often rely upon a strong, centralized professional association. Professional literature can also be expensive, and is frequently written by and published for the benefit of developed countries that have the resources and scholarly traditions required to support a healthy research and publishing culture. Professional readers in developing countries may find comparatively little published literature which is written with their needs in mind. It is worth noting, however, some of the apparent inconsistencies in the data, with Indonesian respondents indicating a higher participation level of "Attending formal conferences, workshops and training events" than their Australian counterparts (Table VII). Some further investigation of this issue is required.

There is also evidence in the results reported that the issues of ‘quality’ that trouble LIS education in Indonesia may also be apparent in the CPD. As Table IX indicates, the participation in CPD in Indonesia may be at an acceptable level, but the data also records a substantially lower level of satisfaction with the outcomes of the training than was recorded in Australia. This is another matter than requires closer examination in later stages of the research, but it can be speculated that CPD in Indonesia is poorly supported by the necessary planning, resourcing and professional delivery. Evidence for this may be found not only in the lower levels of perceived benefit, but also the significantly lower level of engagement with the management of ‘staff training and development’ (Table VII); the lower level of satisfaction with the current standard of ‘education, training and experience’ (Table X); and the less favourable perception of the quality of the training that is provided (Table XI).

On the basis of this research it can be concluded that Indonesian academic librarians may well have ‘what it takes’ in terms of their intrinsic abilities, but they are prevented from reaching their optimal performance by shortcomings in the quality of education and CPD.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Associate Professor Gill Hallam for her very generous assistance with the NEXUS survey data, and to the *Perpustakaan Nasional Indonesia* (National Library of Indonesia) for providing practical support to the research reported above.

References

Adanu, T. S. A. (2007), Continuing professional development (CPD) in state-owned university libraries in Ghana. *Library Management*, Vol. 28 Nos 6/7, pp. 292-305, available at: <<http://proquest.umi.com.dbgw.lis.curtin.edu.au/pqdweb?did=1337533751&Fmt=7&clientId=22212&RQT=309&VName=PQD>> Accessed [April 15, 2009]

Ardoni (2005). Teknologi informasi: Kesiapan pustakawan memanfaatkannya. *Pustaka: Jurnal Studi Perpustakaan dan Informasi*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 32-38, available at: <<http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00009457/01/Ardoni-Pustaka-des2005-05.pdf>> Accessed [February 22, 2009]

Azahari, A. (2000), Tinjauan tentang peningkatan kualitas manusia Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 2000, Vol. 5, p. 120.

Damayani, N. A. (2005), Pengembangan program pendidikan S1 dan S2 ilmu informasi & perpustakaan di Indonesia: masalah dan tantangan. In: *Proceedings Lokakarya Pengembangan Program Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Perpustakaan di Indonesia, Jakarta July 11-13, 2005*. Jakarta, pp. 1-10, available at: <<http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00009210/01/indonesia-information-lisbenchmark-speaker-ninis.pdf>> Accessed [May 28, 2009]

Ernawati, E. (2004), Kompetensi, komitmen, dan intrapreneurship pustakawan dalam mengelola perpustakaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pustakawan Indonesia*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 1-9, available at: <http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00009179/01/vol_4_no_2_1_art_erna.pdf> Accessed [May 30, 2009]

Fahmi, I. (2005), Development of Indonesia's National Digital Library Network. In: Theng, Y and Foo, S. (ed.) *Design and Usability of Digital Libraries: Case Studies in the Asia Pacific*. NTU Singapore: Idea Group Inc. Publishing, pp. 1-21, available at: <<http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00009380/01/idln-ismail-revision.pdf>> Accessed [April 30, 2009]

Farida, I., & Purnomo, P. (2006), Library and information education at Islamic universities in Indonesia: Obstacles and opportunities. In: Khoo, C., Singh, D., and Chaudhry, A.S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Conference on Library & Information Education & Practice 2006 (A-LIEP 2006), Singapore, 3-6 April 2006*, Singapore: School of Communication & Information, Nanyang Technological University, pp. 353-357, available at: <http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00011029/01/Ida_Farida_LIS_IAIN.pdf> Accessed [May 30, 2009]

Hasugian, J. (2003). Penerapan teknologi informasi pada sistem kerumahtanggaan perpustakaan perguruan tinggi, available at: <<http://library.usu.ac.id/download/lib/perpus-jonner2.pdf>> Accessed [April 30, 2009]

Hayward, F. M. (2006). Accreditation and quality assurance in university education in developing countries: insight and lessons from experience. In: *First International Conference on*

- Assessing Quality in Higher Education (ICAQHE) 2006: prosperity through quality education.* Lahore, available at:
<http://www.apqn.org/files/events/presentations/103/09_accreditation_and_quality_assurance_in_university_education_in_developing_countries.pdf> Accessed [April 30, 2009]
- Hernandono (2005), Meretas kebuntuan kepustakawanan Indonesia dilihat dari sisi sumber daya tenaga perpustakaan. In: *Orasi Ilmiah dan Pengukuhan Pustakawan Utama*, available at:
<http://pustakawan.pnri.go.id/uploads/karya/Meretas_Kebuntuan_Kepustakawanan_Indonesia.doc> Accessed [December 14, 2007]
- Kamil, H. (2005), Peran pustakawan dalam manajemen pengetahuan. *Pustaka: Jurnal Studi Perpustakaan dan Informasi*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 19-22.
- Lynch, B. P., Murray-Rust, C., Parker, S. E., Turner, D., Walker, D. P., Wilkinson, F.C., & Zimmerman, J. (2007), Attitudes of presidents and provosts on the university library. *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 213-227.
- Muttaqien, A. (2006), Membangun perpustakaan berbasis konsep knowledge management: transformasi menuju research college dan perguruan tinggi berkualitas internasional, available at:
< http://www.lib.ui.ac.id/readarticle.php?article_id=18> Accessed [May 30, 2009]
- Naibahi, K (2007), Perpustakaan sebagai salah satu indikator utama dalam mendukung universitas bertaraf internasional, available at:
<http://www.lib.ui.ac.id/files/kalarensi_naibaho.pdf> Accessed [November 15 2007]
- Nasution, L. H. (2006), Pemanfaatan internet untuk mendukung kegiatan perkuliahan mahasiswa pascasarjana UNIMED. Medan: Universitas Sumatera Utara, available at:
<<http://library.usu.ac.id/download/fs/06005176.pdf>> Accessed [April 30, 2009]
- Ocholla, D. N. (2008), The current status and challenges of collaboration in library and information studies (LIS) education and training in Africa. *New Library World*, 2008, Vol. 109 Nos. 9/10, pp. 466-479.
- Pendit, P.L. (2001), Otonomi perpustakaan. In: *Rapat Kerja Pusat ke-11 dan Seminar Ilmiah Ikatan Pustakawan Indonesia, November 5-7, 2001*, Jakarta, available at:
<<http://eprints.rclis.org/9635/>> Accessed [April 30, 2009]
- Rachmananta, D. P. (2002), Indonesia. In: *Annual Report to CDNL 2001-2002*. Edinburgh, available at: <<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s8/annual/cr02-id.pdf>> Accessed [November 25, 2007]
- Sulistyo-Basuki, L. (2006), Political reformation and its impact on library and information science education and practice: A case study of Indonesia during and post-president-Soeharto administration. In: Khoo, C., Singh, D., and Chaudhry, A. S. (eds.) In: *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Conference on Library & Information Education & Practice 2006 (A-LIEP 2006)*,

Singapore, 3-6 April 2006. Singapore: School of Communication & Information, Nanyang Technological University, pp. 172-179.

Woolls, B. (2005), Continuing professional education to continuing professional development and workplace learning: the journey and beyond. In: Genoni, P. and Walton, G. (eds.) *Continuing Professional Development – Preparing for New Roles in Libraries: A Voyage of Discovery, Sixth World Conference on Continuing Professional Development and Workplace Learning for the Library and Information Professions [International Federation of Library Association and Institutions]*. München : Saur, pp.14 – 25.

