

Faculty status for academic librarians : compliance with standards, opinions of university administrators, and a comparison of tenure-success records of librarians and instructional faculty
by Wilfrid Bede Mitchell

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University
© Copyright by Wilfrid Bede Mitchell (1989)

Abstract:
The problem of this study was to determine whether certain concerns about librarian faculty status are justified. The study inquired into whether key university administrators tend not to believe librarians merit faculty status, whether there is a trend away from adoption of librarian faculty status, whether the ACRL sanctions against institutions violating the ACRL Standards have been effective in any sense, and whether librarians are significantly less likely to earn tenure than are instructional faculty.

Academic affairs administrators, library directors, and librarians active in the librarian faculty status movement were surveyed by telephone and mail to answer the research questions. It was found that several Standards were not fully implemented on most campuses, most administrators thought librarian faculty status benefitted universities but that librarians do not merit the status that is held by instructional faculty, and librarians and instructional faculty were earning tenure at almost identical rates regardless of whether the librarians were required to publish. It was concluded that there has been no substantial trend toward or away from the adoption of the Standards, that most administrators supported an alternative status for librarians to that required by the Standards, and that publication requirements do not necessarily prevent librarians from achieving tenure at similar rates as instructional faculty.

FACULTY STATUS FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS: COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS, OPINIONS OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS, AND A COMPARISON OF TENURE-SUCCESS RECORDS OF LIBRARIANS AND INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

by

Wilfrid Bede Mitchell

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May, 1989

D378
M6965

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Wilfrid Bede Mitchell

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

May 15, 1989
Date

Chairman, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

May 15, 1989
Date

Donald L. Robson
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

May 22, 1989
Date

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute copies of the dissertation in and from microfilm and the right to reproduce and distribute by abstract in any format."

Signature Wilfrid Bede Mitchell

Date April 21, 1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

More people gave me important assistance and support during the work on this dissertation than I can possibly acknowledge here. Space limitations force me to cite only those who had the most direct influence on this project.

I am fortunate and proud to have had the opportunity to study under the faculty members who made up my doctoral committee: Dr. Eric Strohmeyer (chairman), Dr. Janis Bruwelheide, Dr. Stephen Hample, Professor William Johnstone, Dr. Dianne Lodge-Peters, and Dr. Earl Skogley. I also appreciate Dr. Donald Robson sitting in for Professor Johnstone at the conclusion of the dissertation process. All of these faculty members were especially cooperative under the trying circumstances that existed due to my need to complete this dissertation while working in North Carolina.

My greatest debt is to my parents, W. Bede Mitchell and Barbara P. Mitchell. Their love and support have been the most important factors in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Contribution to the Professional Literature	8
Definition of Terms	18
Review of Relevant Research	20
2. METHODOLOGY	51
Conceptual Framework	51
Population and Sampling Procedures	51
Hypotheses	53
Independent Variables, Data Categories, Methods of Data Collection	57
Analysis of Data	63
Limitations and Delimitations	65
3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	70
Discussion of Findings	90
4. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	118
5. LITERATURE CITED	123
APPENDICES	139
Appendix A - Questions for Library Directors	140
Appendix B - Questions for Academic Affairs Officers For Both Mail and Telephone Surveys	147
Appendix C - Questions for ACRL Executive Director and Library Directors at Sanctioned Institutions	152
Appendix D - Institutions Surveyed	155
Appendix E - Discussion of Telephone and Mail Survey Procedures	159

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Responses	70
2.	Advantages Outweigh Disadvantages? AAO's	71
3.	Advantages Outweigh Disadvantages? Library Directors	72
4.	Similar Duties? AAO's	73
5.	Similar Duties? Library Directors	74
6.	More Difficulty Meeting Faculty Tenure Criteria? AAO's	75
7.	More Difficulty Meeting Faculty Tenure Criteria? Library Directors	76
8.	Librarians Merit Instructional Faculty's Status? AAO's	77
9.	Librarians Merit Instructional Faculty's Status? Library Directors	78
10.	Compliance Trends	79
11.	Changes in Opinions of Library Directors	80
12.	Opinions of Directors After Status Changes Away from SFSCUL	81
13.	Opinions of Directors After Any Status Changes	82
14.	Status Changes Which Librarians Endorsed	83
15.	Status Changes Which Librarians Did Not Endorse.	84
16.	Tenure Achievement Data: All	85
17.	Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Who Must Publish	86
18.	Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Not Required to Publish	87

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

Table		Page
19.	Tenure Achievement Data: By Region, Type of University	88
20.	Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Who Do and Do Not Publish	89
21.	Compliance With ACRL Standards for Faculty Status	91
22.	Trends Toward Compliance With the ACRL Standards	96
23.	Status Changes: By Librarian Preference and Time Period	98
24.	Statements About Faculty Status for Librarians	106

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to determine whether certain concerns about librarian faculty status are justified. The study inquired into whether key university administrators tend not to believe librarians merit faculty status, whether there is a trend away from adoption of librarian faculty status, whether the ACRL sanctions against institutions violating the ACRL Standards have been effective in any sense, and whether librarians are significantly less likely to earn tenure than are instructional faculty. Academic affairs administrators, library directors, and librarians active in the librarian faculty status movement were surveyed by telephone and mail to answer the research questions. It was found that several Standards were not fully implemented on most campuses, most administrators thought librarian faculty status benefitted universities but that librarians do not merit the status that is held by instructional faculty, and librarians and instructional faculty were earning tenure at almost identical rates regardless of whether the librarians were required to publish. It was concluded that there has been no substantial trend toward or away from the adoption of the Standards, that most administrators supported an alternative status for librarians to that required by the Standards, and that publication requirements do not necessarily prevent librarians from achieving tenure at similar rates as instructional faculty.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On June 24, 1971 the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association (ALA), adopted faculty status standards for college and university librarians (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1972). Shortly thereafter, a joint statement endorsing faculty status for academic librarians was drafted by a committee of the ACRL, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association of American Colleges (Joint Committee on College Library Problems, 1972), and was subsequently endorsed by numerous academic organizations ("Organizations endorsing the joint statement on faculty status," 1977). The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians and the Joint Statement were hailed by many as important landmarks in the decades-long struggle of American academic librarians to achieve a professional status which adequately recognized and rewarded their contributions to higher education (Branscomb, 1970; Downs, 1958; Massman, 1972; Schmidt, 1979; Shiflett, 1981).

The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (SFSCUL) stipulated that colleges and

universities should grant to academic librarians a faculty status consisting of nine required components:

1. Professional responsibilities, self determination, and peer review.
2. Library governance modeled on an academic form of governance.
3. Eligibility of librarians to participate in institutional governance to the same degree and in the same ways as other faculty.
4. Salary scales for librarians identical to the salary scales of other faculty with equivalent education and experience. Librarians who must work during summer terms should receive added summer compensation, as do other faculty employed under an academic-year contract.
5. Tenure for librarians identical to the tenure awarded to other deserving faculty.
6. Eligibility of librarians for promotion through the same titles, ranks, and steps as other faculty. Promotion should be determined through peer review.
7. Eligibility of librarians for the same sabbatical and other similar research leaves as other faculty.
8. Equal access for librarians and other faculty to research funds.
9. Academic freedom for librarians as well as other faculty.

The justifications for librarian faculty status which

were included in the SFSCUL (as well as in the Joint Statement) revolved around the intellectual and highly complex contributions which librarians make to higher education, e.g., library collection development, bibliographical control of scholarly research, use of advanced technology in various aspects of library service, and instruction of library patrons in the use of library tools and resources. The SFSCUL concluded by warning institutions that violation of the Standards could result in the invoking of sanctions by the ACRL against the institutions. The possible sanctions included publicizing the violations, the refusal of American Library Association publications to carry job announcements from the violating institutions, and the discouragement of ACRL members from working for the violating institutions. Meanwhile, the Joint Statement supported the ACRL Standards and the justifications while also including an important statement that had not appeared in the ACRL Standards, i.e., not only should librarians have the same rights as other members of the faculty, but they should also have the same responsibilities and ". . . must go through the same process of evaluation and meet the same standards as other faculty members" (Joint Committee on College Library Problems, 1972, p. 210).

In spite of the fact that the ACRL SFSCUL and the Joint Statement were approved by a majority of the membership of

the ACRL as well as a number of other professional education organizations, a sizable group of academic librarians did not greet the documents with enthusiasm. Over the years, many librarians have argued that faculty status was inappropriate for librarians and therefore was not likely to enhance librarians' salaries, professional opportunities, or prestige (Brown, 1940; Campbell, 1977; Gore, 1971; Mason, 1972; Meyer, 1981; Thompson, 1970). Many critics of the faculty status movement, including some university academic affairs administrators (English, 1984), feared that although academic librarians appointed to tenure-track faculty status positions might be able to meet tenure criteria for general job performance and service (two of the three general categories usually used for evaluating faculty performance), they would frequently fail to pass the tenure review carried out at the university level because of an inability to meet research and publication requirements. Many of these critics claimed that academic librarians had not the time or training needed to do the research that is normally required of faculty members who wish to achieve tenure. For example, librarians typically hold full-year contracts, i.e., twelve months of service are required (including vacations), while other faculty members commonly hold academic-year contracts, i.e., only nine or ten months of service are required (Bentley, 1978; Dow, 1977; Jenkins, Cook, and Fox, 1981; Jesse and Mitchell, 1968).

Thus the instructional faculty have a substantial period of time each year in which they may carry out research unencumbered by other faculty duties.

Further, librarians rarely are allowed to work on research projects during a normal work day because of the demands of ensuring adequate services to library users (Emmick, 1984; Jenkins, et al, 1981; Rayman and Goudy, 1980), i.e., where librarians are encouraged to carry out research, time needed for research might conflict with time needed to carry out library service duties, inevitably resulting in a serious reduction in the level of service to library users (Bridegam, 1978). Finally, library science schools and departments have only recently begun to offer courses in research methods to students who do wish or need to study such techniques (Geahigan, Nelson, Saunders, and Woods, 1981; Houser and Schrader, 1978; Jenkins, et al., 1981; Toy, 1977). In other words, along with the rights and privileges of faculty status come responsibilities for which academic librarians may not be prepared or have the time to accomplish.

In response to the criticisms of the faculty status movement it might be argued that, if fully adopted and properly followed, the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status would ensure that librarians would have academic-year contracts and other time and opportunities to serve as full

members of the faculty while not neglecting their library service duties. However, in recent years the fears of the faculty status critics appear to have been confirmed by several studies of academic librarians' status, tenure criteria, benefits and responsibilities, and opinions (Davidson, Thorson, and Stine, 1983; Davidson, Thorson, and Trumpeter, 1981; English, 1983; Gray and McReynolds, 1983; Meyer, 1981; Mitchell and Swieszkowski, 1985; Payne and Wagner, 1984; Sharma, 1981). In particular, the surveys of English (1983) and Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985), which included many of the universities with the largest research libraries, discovered a trend in which most of the recent personnel changes within institutions which are members of the Association of Research Libraries or the Center for Research Libraries were away from faculty status and toward an alternative status. In addition, many of the studies found that a number of institutions which claimed to have faculty status for academic librarians had not in fact adopted all of the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status.

Librarians are not the only ones who continue to be uncertain about the faculty status issue. English (1984) interviewed forty-seven academic affairs administrators from major research universities and found that most of the respondents did not believe offering faculty status to librarians brings any benefits to the institutions. Further,

only 23.4 percent of the academic affairs administrators thought that librarians should be classified as faculty, and of the twenty-one administrators from universities where librarians had faculty status, ten (47.6 percent) felt librarians should be classed non-faculty and fourteen (66.7 percent) thought librarians would have considerably greater difficulty meeting traditional tenure criteria than in meeting modified tenure criteria.

Clearly, the issue of faculty status for librarians was not settled by the adoption of the ACRL Standards, leaving academic librarians and university administrators in a state of confusion over the proper role and status of librarians at a time when major trends in higher education and the publishing industry are creating unprecedented and often unforeseen changes in educational goals and in the dissemination of information (Briscoe, et al., 1986; Brody, 1986; Hendrick, 1986; Houser and Schrader, 1978; Lancaster, 1985; Shank, 1982; Veaner, 1985).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether certain concerns about librarian faculty status are justified. Specifically, the study inquired into whether key university administrators tend not to believe librarians merit faculty status, whether there is a trend away from

adoption of librarian faculty status, whether the ACRL sanctions against institutions violating the ACRL Standards have been effective in any sense, and whether librarians are significantly less likely to earn tenure than are instructional faculty.

Contribution to the Professional Literature

Several aspects of the study will make important contributions to the professional literature. First, the study sampled opinions regarding librarian faculty status which are held by academic administrators from universities classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II ("Carnegie Foundation's Classifications," 1987). In this study, the findings of the opinion survey are compared to the results of a similar survey by English (1984) which found that administrators at major research institutions tended to believe that academic librarians do not merit the same faculty status as is held by instructional faculty. A second contribution of the study is the inquiry into whether the trend away from librarian faculty status which English (1983) and Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) found among research universities also exists among Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II. Another important contribution is the test of the hypothesis that academic librarians are

significantly less likely to achieve tenure than other faculty members. The fourth contribution is the examination of the effectiveness of the ACRL's imposition of sanctions against institutions which do not observe the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status. The fifth contribution is the study's response to desires expressed in the professional literature for further substantive research into the subject of faculty status for academic librarians. The value of each of these contributions will be examined in turn.

Do Academic Administrators Believe Librarians Should Have Faculty Status?

The debate over faculty status for academic librarians is of critical importance to university administrators because of the implications for universities of assigning such a status to librarians. Practical considerations include the consequences of adding new faculty salaries to the payroll (especially where librarians were not already being paid salaries comparable to faculty salaries), adding new faculty members (the librarians) to tenure-track status, having new faculty members eligible for service in faculty governance and on university committees, the potential for increased competition for research funds and leaves, and the possible positive and negative effects of faculty status on the abilities of the librarians to provide expected library

services. In addition to these practical considerations, university administrators must be concerned with the justness of any classification of a group of employees. Attempting to play upon these concerns, proponents of librarian faculty status have often argued that while it is in the best interest of universities to ensure a high level of job satisfaction among academic librarians, the actual practice has been to place librarians in a sub-faculty status that was devastating to their morale and hampered efforts to attract and retain high quality library professionals. It has also been argued that librarians' salaries and benefits have not kept pace with their increasingly complex duties, especially during the post-war era when librarians have needed to pursue advanced graduate education and perform faculty-like functions. Further, many proponents argued that librarians must be protected by the same academic freedom enjoyed by instructional faculty in order to collect, classify, and circulate controversial intellectual materials. Pointing to the future, it has been claimed that the growing reliance of the American economy and society on information and information technologies will make the need for highly talented librarians even more important.

These arguments will be explored in more detail in the review of relevant literature. At this point it is enough to understand that many have argued that academic librarians

deserve faculty status because they have complex and sensitive faculty-like duties, and because universities need to attract outstanding students to librarianship, improve the quality of library service and, ultimately, improve the quality of higher education. However, since the adoption of the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status in 1971, several institutions have had the opportunity to test the validity of the claim that faculty status leads to greater job satisfaction on the part of academic librarians, and there is evidence that the morale of librarians is not enhanced by faculty status. If, as other evidence seems to indicate, librarians cannot or will not live up to such faculty responsibilities as performing research and publishing, is librarian faculty status beneficial to a university that grants it?

How have academic administrators responded to these questions? Virtually the entire librarian faculty status debate has been carried on in the professional literature and meetings of academic librarians. The rest of the literature of higher education is almost completely silent on the issue, despite intensified efforts by many librarians to achieve faculty status after the ACRL Standards were adopted. The most important recent attempt to study the attitudes of administrators regarding faculty status was carried out by English (1984). In interviews with English, a majority of

forty-seven administrators from major research institutions were able to cite only a few, if any, benefits to a university which were gained by offering faculty status to librarians, despite the claims that had been made by proponents of the movement. Further, the majority of academic administrators believed that the duties of librarians were essentially dissimilar to the duties of instructional and research faculty, and that if traditional faculty performance criteria were applied evenly for all untenured faculty the librarians would find it more difficult to achieve tenure than they would if expected to meet some alternative criteria. These opinions led English to conclude that proponents were failing to prove to university administrators that there was a rational basis for granting librarian faculty status, despite previous claims in the library literature that academic librarians were succeeding in their efforts to achieve faculty status. Since English's study was limited to administrators from research universities, and inasmuch as trends and conditions which exist among research universities may not be reflected among other institutions of higher education, this study attempted to determine whether the reservations expressed by English's respondents are shared by academic administrators from smaller universities, specifically the doctorate-granting universities which are not classified as research

universities by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The study will thus make an important contribution to the professional literature by documenting the extent to which academic administrators from Doctorate-Granting Universities I & II share the opinions of research university academic administrators that the advantages of librarian faculty status to a university do not outweigh the disadvantages of the status, and that the duties of librarians do not qualify librarians for faculty status. The results should be of interest to those librarians who favor faculty status and wish to identify the reasons (if any) why academic administrators are not persuaded that librarians deserve faculty status, as well as all librarians who are concerned with how they are viewed by academic administrators. The results should also be of interest to academic administrators who are confronted with a decision about the kind of status their librarians should have and who therefore wish to know what other academic administrators think about the subject.

Are University Librarians Beginning to Reject Faculty Status?

According to Schmidt (1979), 75 percent of academic librarians had achieved faculty status by 1976, five years after the Association of College and Research Libraries

approved the SFSCUL. However, recent studies by English (1983, 1984) and Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) discovered a trend among librarians in large research institutions to relinquish faculty status in favor of some alternative "academic status" which does not require the librarians to meet full faculty tenure criteria, but which recognizes the librarians' contributions to the educational enterprise and protects their freedom to collect and make available controversial educational materials. An alternative to faculty status was also preferred by a majority of academic librarians in the Southeast who responded to Sharma's 1981 survey. The results of these studies appear to indicate that faculty status for librarians has failed to build librarian morale and prestige in the ways expected by faculty status proponents. However, trends at the major research libraries may not be representative of trends at other higher education institutions. Therefore, an important contribution of this study is the investigation into whether librarians at Doctorate-Granting I and II institutions have recently been voluntarily relinquishing faculty status as their colleagues at research universities have been doing, or whether there has been a trend of university administrators revoking librarian faculty status over the objections of the librarians, and whether library directors at the sample universities support the ACRL SFSCUL in light of their

experiences with librarian faculty status.

The results will be important to higher education administrators who will have to deal with academic librarians and their employment status demands in the future, especially when the results are studied in relation to the findings of English, Mitchell and Swieszkowski. The findings will also be of interest to all academic librarians who have cause to be concerned with recent faculty status trends and the faculty status opinions of library directors, a group which might be expected to have some input into, if not a large influence over, the determination of the status of the librarians in their employ.

Are Academic Librarians Unable to Achieve Tenure at the Same Rates as Other Faculty at the Same Institutions?

An especially important aspect of this study is the test of the hypothesis that librarians with faculty status are significantly less likely to achieve tenure than are the instructional faculty. This hypothesis grew out of the concern that academic librarians lack the time and training to perform the research and publication activity that is typically required of university faculty members wishing to achieve tenure.

As will be seen in the review of relevant literature, a number of people have voiced their concern that tenure-

track librarians with full-year contracts are at a disadvantage compared to instructional faculty members with academic-year contracts because the instructional faculty have much more time during their "free" months to carry out research than do the librarians who continue to perform their regular duties. Further, the day to-day demands of librarians' duties are also thought by many to be impediments to carrying out the kind of research required of faculty members. Obviously, if these concerns are valid, one might hypothesize that librarians who are required to perform research and publish would achieve tenure at significantly lower rates than other faculty. Similarly, one might also hypothesize that librarians attempting to meet the faculty's tenure criteria would have significantly lower tenure-approval rates than librarians who must meet criteria specifically designed with the duties of librarians in mind, i.e., criteria that do not require librarians to do research and publish. If these hypotheses are valid, one would further expect the difficulties inherent in achieving tenure would lead to low morale among librarians, an outcome that would be contrary to the outcome desired by faculty status advocates.

To test the hypothesis that academic librarians are significantly less likely to achieve tenure than are other faculty, the study solicited the sample institutions for the

numbers of academic librarians and other faculty members whose tenure applications were reviewed at the university-review level. The frequencies of tenure approval and rejection of the librarians were compared with the same data for the other faculty members to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the two sets of data. The study was designed to include an analysis of the effects of the two factors which many fear are the most likely obstacles to librarians performing as faculty: lack of academic-year contracts for librarians, and the expectation that librarians meet full faculty tenure criteria which include the requirement to publish.

The analysis of the tenure-approval data of librarians and other faculty members should be of interest to anyone concerned with librarian faculty status because the analysis provides one test of the hypothesis that librarians cannot satisfy tenure criteria due to time constraints and difficulties in meeting research requirements. The results of the tenure data analysis should also indicate further avenues of research that may conclusively validate or invalidate the hypothesis.

When the ACRL Has Imposed Sanctions Against Institutions Which Do Not Observe the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status, What Effects Have the Sanctions Had?

The study attempted to gather information about the efforts of the ACRL to promote the adoption of the SFSCUL through the use of the sanctions set forth in the conclusion of the Standards. The investigation of the use of the ACRL sanctions should be of interest to anyone concerned with the issue of librarian faculty status.

Is There a Need for Further Research on the Issue of Faculty Status for Librarians?

The need for further study into the subject of faculty status for librarians is confirmed by recent articles in the professional literature, such as those by DeBoer and Culotta (1987), and Werrell and Sullivan (1987). In the words of DeBoer and Culotta, "Further reports on faculty status, both positive and negative, would be useful to librarians across the country. Academic librarians are continuing to search for the system that will function most effectively in individual libraries" (p.221). This study attempted to meet the need described by DeBoer and Culotta by building upon the recent research of English, Mitchell and Swieszkowski, and others.

Definition of Terms

Academic Librarian - One who holds a master of library science degree and whose primary job is as a practicing

professional librarian in a college or university library. Library science faculty members do not fall into this category unless they hold positions in both the academic library and in the library science department or school, and the preponderance of their work is as a practicing librarian in the library.

Academic Status - Defined by The ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science (Young, ed., 1983) as

> An official recognition by an institution of postsecondary education that librarians are part of the instructional and research staff, but normally without entitlement to ranks and titles identical to those of faculty, and frequently without commensurate benefits, privileges, rights, and responsibilities. (p.1)

Faculty Status - Defined by The ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science (Young, ed., 1983) as

> An official recognition by an institution of postsecondary education that librarians are part of the instructional and research staff by conferment of ranks and titles identical to those of faculty, and commensurate benefits, privileges, rights and responsibilities. (p.90)

In this study, full faculty status will refer to a status which includes full compliance with all nine of the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status, whereas librarians who are tenure-track but whose institutions do not observe all of the SFSCUL will be said to have some form of, but not full, faculty status.

Instructional Faculty - For the purposes of this study, the term "instructional faculty" is used to identify any faculty members who are not academic librarians with faculty status. For the sake of brevity, this term should be understood to include tenure-track investigators who do not have teaching assignments.

Tenure - Granted to probationary faculty members who have demonstrated competency, tenure confers the right to continuous employment from which a faculty member may normally only be discharged for adequate cause or due to bona fide financial exigency. Tenure is the means by which academic freedom is protected.

Review of Relevant Research

In 1968 Robert T. Blackburn wrote that one of the characteristics of a typical academic librarian is "an inordinate passion for status." Beginning in the latter part

of the nineteenth century the academic librarian's passion for status has often been for the same rights and privileges as those enjoyed by the faculty. Many justifications for librarian faculty status have evolved, but a sizable opposition to faculty status has also arisen within the ranks of academic librarians. A review of the debate will clarify the need to answer this study's research questions. This section will begin with a very brief historical overview of the trends and conditions which affected the evolving role and status of academic librarianship, and will proceed with the review of relevant literature.

Historical Overview

Prior to the late nineteenth century, full time academic librarians were almost non-existent. College libraries were usually directed by a member of the teaching staff or by the college president (Holley, 1976; Shiflett, 1981). Most college libraries were small, open limited hours, and played a very minor role in the traditional curriculum of classical languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, and moral philosophy (Holley, 1976; McAnally, 1971). However, the emergence in higher education of vocational and applied sciences, the service orientation for agriculture and other aspects of American society, and the increasing importance of research and graduate education, all combined to change the

roles of the faculty and the library. Faculty members no longer had time to administer an academic library, partly because their evolving institutions were requiring heavy new teaching, research, and service loads, and also because of the increasing demands being made upon the libraries. The demands of research and graduate education required expanded library collections and services which could only be provided by librarians with specialized knowledge of subject fields, book markets, bibliography, and the ability to help researchers in locating useful library materials. Thus did academic librarianship become a full time job with a role different and distinct from the faculty role (Holley, 1976; McAnally, 1971; Shiflett, 1981).

At the same time that the modern functions of academic librarians were becoming established, improved library education was producing librarians better able to use library materials to supplement the traditional lecture. As the twentieth century progressed, faculty became more and more reliant on library collections and services to accomplish their instructional goals (Holley, 1976; McAnally, 1971).

The evolution of the role of academic librarians and their growing importance to college educational programs picked up speed as librarian education continued to improve, as the American Library Association and other professional organizations provided means for professional development

beyond library school, and as accrediting agencies put pressure on institutions to strengthen library collections and services. The rapidly growing rate of publication that had begun at the end of the previous century became a flood after the Second World War, requiring even greater specialization among librarians (McAnally, 1971). In addition, the post-war era saw the emergence of computers and other technologies which improved access to, and organization of, information but which also created many new problems in library administration (Hamlin, 1981).

As the role of academic librarians became more complex, librarians also became more vocal about their dissatisfaction with the lack of recognition they received for their important educational contributions. As early as 1911 researchers began reporting that the head college librarians usually had some form of academic or faculty status, but few of the studies found that a majority of the staff librarians shared the head librarians' status (Gelfand, 1948; Henry, 1911; Maloy, 1939; McMillen, 1940; Works, 1927). An examination of librarian statuses at 108 southern colleges and universities appears to be the first which found that a majority of academic librarians had joined their directors in holding academic or faculty status (Spain, 1948). Several more surveys showed that while the increasing importance of academic librarians in the post-war era was often reflected

in academic status for librarians, full faculty rights and privileges were still not granted (Cassata, 1970; Downs, 1957, 1964; Hintz, 1968; Littleton, 1971; Lundy, 1951; Madan, Hetler, and Strong, 1968; McAnally, 1957; Muller, 1953; Stieg, 1950).

A milestone in the faculty status movement was the 1956 decision of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to allow professional academic librarians to become members, but only under certain conditions (McAnally, 1971). In 1958 another professional organization, the Association of College and Research Libraries, assumed the leading role in the faculty status movement by forming the Committee on Academic Status. The Committee began by defining librarian faculty status and endorsing it as a policy and a right. The subsequent work of the Committee served as the basis for the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (McAnally, 1971).

The 1971 approval of the ACRL Standards, the Joint Statement on Faculty Status (Joint Committee, 1972), and the decision of the AAUP that all academic librarians employed at least half-time were eligible for AAUP membership ("Academic Status," 1972) together seemed evidence of the complete and final victory of the pro-faculty status forces, at least within the library profession if not throughout all of higher education. Instead, there began a period of re-examination

and retrenchment in the search for the most appropriate academic librarian status. Advocates of faculty status rallied around the ACRL Standards while opponents looked for (and often found) signs that librarians did not really want faculty responsibilities.

With the foregoing to serve as background, the rest of this section will review the relevant faculty status literature.

Arguments for Faculty Status for Librarians

While faculty status for librarians has been justified in several ways, the justifications may be grouped into two types of arguments. The first argument says that the professional, highly complex work of librarians is an essential part of higher education, can be done effectively only by those who have received advanced education in librarianship, and merits faculty status by virtue of the complexity and requisite education. The second argument says that if librarians had faculty status they would perform their duties more effectively because of the increased prestige and because of the many rights and responsibilities entailed by faculty status. These two sets of arguments will be examined in turn.

Since the beginning of the faculty status movement, proponents have attempted to show that librarians were

performing highly specialized professional duties which required advanced theoretical preparation and made unique, essential educational contributions to a college or university. The earliest to advance this claim were Robinson (1876) and Sawtelle (1878), followed by writers like Henry (1911), Wyer (1920), Shores (1934) and Pratt (1940). These authors focused on the way in which the reading guidance offered by librarians was tantamount to teaching because it implied a considered judgment about a student's educational background and capabilities, as well as an understanding of the relative intellectual merits of the library's books.

Smith (1970) detected an expansion of this instructional function resulting from two post-war trends. Smith said the library's role of accumulating and providing access to recorded information had become indispensable to higher education as students took advantage of library resources to fulfill class assignments and enhance formal classroom instruction with self-directed learning. Meanwhile, as faculty members became more specialized in their scholarly pursuits they also became more oriented toward their discipline than toward their institutional role, thus making higher education more reliant on librarians working with students on an individual basis to meet educational needs that once were met by the instructional faculty.

The theme of librarian-as-teacher was refined in the

writings of people like Sewell (1983), who thought librarians should be regarded as teachers by virtue of their term paper counseling, research consultation, and library-use instruction. Negherbon (1964), Budd (1982), and Swan (1983), pointing out that such arguments applied mainly to reference librarians, addressed themselves to the question of whether other librarians teach. Believing that the concept of teaching is too narrowly defined when it only includes traditional classroom and laboratory instruction, they offered the following examples of the kind of indirect teaching done by non-reference librarians: selecting books and other materials which will support the institution's curriculum and the research of the faculty and students, organizing library materials into subject classifications, and maintaining circulation policies which ensure the supply of library materials meets demand.

In addition to their role as teachers, the contributions of librarians to higher education grew in other ways after World War II. According to Ditzion (1947) and Downs (1954), the widening educational scope of colleges and universities and the changes in instructional methods had made higher education inconceivable without excellent library resources. As proof of this assertion they referred to the need of scholars for the ready access to recorded knowledge that can only be obtained through the organizational and

administrative skills of specially trained librarians, the need for subject-specialist librarians to perform reference work and book selection, and the need for librarians with the intellectual background and interests to understand and serve the research needs of faculty and students. This articulation of higher education's increased need for excellent librarians in light of post-war trends was an extremely influential re-casting of the traditional conception of librarians' unique educational role, greatly influencing the faculty status proselytizing of Vosper (1962), Galloway (1967), and Blake (1970).

A number of writers believed the importance of librarians will continue to grow as we enter the Twenty-first Century as a result of the evolving "information society," thus strengthening the argument for faculty status. Shank (1982) and Veaner (1985) predicted that future academic librarians will be like operators of an information utility, providing actual information directly to users rather than just the sources of information (books, journals, and so on) as they presently do. Lancaster (1985) thought electronic data storage and related information technologies will lead to an essentially "paperless society" where librarians will deal with ever greater problems of information management. While Briscoe, et al (1986) did not believe a paperless society was either likely or wise, they did expect that

electronic information storage would become so prevalent that publishers would take advantage of the economic benefits of only allowing individuals to access information from electronic data bases for a fee, instead allowing libraries to purchase hard copies of the documents for circulation to the public. The authors warned that such an eventuality might mean that information which was not being frequently requested, and hence was not economically viable, would be erased from the electronic data bases and lost forever in order to make room for newer material.

Should anything like these visions come to pass, faculty members and students might well become increasingly dependent on librarians for access to information. In the words of another forecaster, "the librarian will become the critical factor in the successful management of knowledge" (Hendrick, 1986). If so, faculty status proponents may become more persuasive than ever when they point to the extreme complexity of librarianship, the importance of librarians to the teaching and research of faculty and students, and the inability of alternative statuses to adequately compensate the academic contributions of librarians in terms of salary, rights, and prestige.

To summarize the first set of arguments in favor of librarian faculty status, academic librarians have been said to play a unique and important role in higher education,

performing intellectually demanding duties which require advanced training. In the second set of arguments supporting faculty status, many proponents claimed librarians would be able to perform their important and essential duties more effectively as a result of faculty status. It is to these arguments that we will now turn.

Forgotson (1961) described how the failure of the faculty and administrators to understand the important role of librarians had led to librarians being alienated and isolated from the institutional goals and academic programs which they were supposed to serve. Downs (1960) asserted that such problems would continue to be endemic to higher education if salaries and benefits continued to not adequately recognize librarians' academic training, expertise, and educational contributions. While it has been difficult for researchers to make meaningful comparisons between salary and benefit data for faculty and librarians (e.g., the faculty data are usually for academic-year contracts while the librarian data are for full-year contracts), the conclusions reached have invariably not favored the librarians (Boughter, 1958; Cameron and Heim, 1974; Massman, 1972; Ray and Rubin, 1987; Schiller, 1969; Talbot and von der Lippe, 1976; Westerman, 1982; and Wright, 1970).

In agreeing with the assessments of Forgotson and Downs,

many writers contrasted the benefits of faculty status (enhanced prestige and morale, better quality students attracted to librarianship) with the harm that would be caused to librarians' morale by inappropriate, unsatisfactory alternatives that only offered "half a loaf" (Blake, 1973; Brody, 1986; DePriest, 1973; Galloway, 1967; Muller, 1970; Negherbon, 1964; Perrault, 1966; Schmidt, 1977; Toy, 1977; Vosper, 1962). As proof that faculty status would make librarians more productive and enhance their morale, proponents could point to surveys in which a majority of southern California librarians (Hyman and Schlachter, 1973) and New York state librarians (Josey, 1972) favored faculty status, as well as to a set of interviews which reported positive experiences with faculty status (Reynolds and Whitlatch, 1976).

In addition to improving morale, librarian faculty status has been alleged to enhance the performance of librarians in other ways. The ACRL Standards call for a form of library governance based upon the model of an academic department or school. This form of governance would mean that the librarians would collegially establish policies concerning themselves and their work, vote on new appointments and recommendations for promotion and tenure, and, in general, reject any attempts to maintain traditional hierarchical models of library administration. The alleged

benefits of this shared decision-making model were that those closest to daily problems are best equipped to resolve them, communication among the staff is increased, diverse viewpoints are encouraged, and staff morale is raised. In contrast, benevolent despots were said to often be incompetent and bad for staff morale, while the bureaucratic administrative model supposedly tends to be unresponsive, unimaginative, and inimical to innovation (Ackerman, 1980; Alward, 1982; Cieslicki, 1982; Hendricks, 1982; Matzek, 1970; McAnally, 1963, 1971; McCabe and Gamaluddin, 1988; Sewell, 1983; Sternberg, 1979; Tallau and Beede, 1974).

Another way in which faculty status was said to make librarians more effective in the performance of their duties was through ensuring participation in campus governance. Lundy (1951), Galloway (1967), Muller (1970), and Sewell (1983) argued that if librarians served on faculty committees they would have a better understanding of curricular goals and requirements, teaching methods, research interests of faculty members, and the learning abilities and styles of students. Josey (1971) added that librarians would bring to the committees an interdisciplinary perspective that was unique on most campuses. However, librarians were typically forced to work in isolation from campus planning and decision making, according to Battin (1984), Bergen (1963), Forgotson (1961), and Marchant (1969).

Another important justification offered for awarding faculty status to librarians was espoused by Blake (1968), Branscomb (1965), Massman (1969), McAnally (1971), and Muller (1970). They claimed that academic librarians needed the academic freedom conferred by tenure in order to acquire controversial books for the library collection and withstand attacks on intellectual freedom. This justification was based upon the conception of academic freedom which, in its most influential articulation by the American Association of University Professors in 1940 (1984), includes complete freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching within the institution, and the Constitutionally-guaranteed freedom of speech. Tenure has evolved into the protection of academic freedom, ensuring the right to continuous employment for those professors who successfully complete a stipulated period of probationary employment. Tenured faculty members may only be terminated if they decide to retire, are found to be incompetent, are guilty of gross misconduct, or if financial exigency exists on the campus. Librarians have sought academic freedom mostly because of threats of censorship (DeVinney, 1986), but Branscomb identified several responsibilities which are integral parts of a librarian's role and must be protected by academic freedom from unreasonable demands: collection development, setting circulation policies, determining where to locate and/or

display controversial materials, employing people with allegedly nonconformist opinions, publishing bibliographies about controversial subjects, building a defensible but unorthodox library facility, defending library policies from unjust criticism, defending free speech and unhindered pursuit of truth, adopting promising but unproven management techniques, advising patrons about what to read or study, and using defensible but unorthodox book classifications, book labels, or subject designators in catalogs.

A final way in which faculty status has been said to help librarians perform better than they might otherwise was described by Montanelli and Stenstrom (1986). In their view, librarians who embarked upon research benefitted in a number of ways, including job advancement, personal recognition, closer relationships with instructional faculty, a greater adaptability to change and innovation, and improved library service resulting from the research findings and experience.

In summary, the two types of arguments in favor of librarian faculty status have been described and reviewed. In the next section the responses to the faculty status justifications will be considered.

Opposition to Faculty Status for Librarians

First to be examined will be the responses to the arguments that librarians merit faculty status by virtue of

their duties.

> Until academic librarians are recognized for what they really do rather than for a dimly defined and selectively relevant "teaching" function, their role in the mission of the college or university will continue to be misunderstood and, inevitably, undervalued. (Query, 1985, p.16)

Thus did Query unflatteringly characterize the "librarians teach" argument forcefully made by faculty status proponents like DePriest, Negherbon, Budd, and Swan. Query, like many others, was not willing to accept the broader definition of teaching that included the activities of librarians. Pourciau (1975) evaluated the librarian-as-teacher argument (as well as other arguments for librarian faculty status) using a philosophical argument analysis paradigm and concluded that the argument was weak because as stated it omitted essential argument elements, such as adequate backing for assertions.

There have also been those who did accept the broader definition but did not believe that the typical librarian's teaching function was substantial enough to justify faculty status. Brown (1940), Peele (1984), Thompson (1970), and Kister (1971) thought librarians only needed to be concerned with how-to-find, not what-to-learn, and thus could not be said to have the level of teaching responsibility that

instructional faculty have when they plan courses and the content to be covered. Wilson (1979) derided the claim that librarians teach as an organizational fiction, a sociological term for a myth which is accepted by an organization's members because they believe holding the contrary would render the organization incapable of united action. Wilson theorized that many librarians did not really believe they are teachers but chose to pretend otherwise because they hoped to enhance their status.

Mason (1973), Pierson (1971), Gore (1971), and Batt (1985) thought the claim that librarians are teachers was unfair to all non-public service librarians who did not advise patrons on what to read because it implied that they did not deserve the same status as public service librarians. Peele agreed, dismissing the various attempts to argue that non-public service librarians teach. In other words, these writers thought faculty status justifications based upon general descriptions of librarian functions were incomplete and misleading because they failed to take into account the differences between duties among librarians. Mason pointed out that this distinction had not been lost on the American Association of Colleges, which had refused to endorse the 1972 Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians because the Statement ignored the distinction between the duties of public and technical

service librarians.

The claims that librarians performed very complex, important, and essential duties which merited faculty status have been balanced by reservations (held by many in and out of the field) about whether librarianship even qualified as a profession, much less for faculty status. Bundy and Wasserman (1968) denied that academic librarianship was a profession, academic or otherwise, because they thought the relationship of the librarian to the clients, parent organization, and other professionals was subservient and therefore below the standards of the professional model. In the view of Houser and Schrader (1978), librarianship had not developed a theoretical knowledge base and was therefore incapable of scientifically advancing itself as a profession must be able to do.

One writer outside of librarianship who addressed himself to this issue was Goode (1967), a sociologist who thought that in spite of the changes in the field since World War II librarianship still lacked a key requisite of a true profession: a theoretical knowledge base consisting of organized, abstract principles that can be applied to concrete problems. Goode added that unlike real professionals (e.g., doctors, lawyers, and architects), librarians were unable to demonstrate that the values guiding their policies were epistemologically superior to those of

their clients.

Drucker (1976), another non-librarian, identified a different reason why many did not believe librarians to be professionals: ". . . the library is a place where an incredible amount of donkey work goes on" (p.12). In this, Drucker was saying from outside librarianship what librarians like McAnally (1957) and Sparks (1980) were warning from within: faculty and administrators will not believe librarians deserve faculty status when librarians are frequently observed spending considerable time (involuntarily or otherwise) performing menial tasks.

A number of surveys have borne out the fact that many faculty members viewed the duties of librarians as being less than professional. Knapp (1955; 1959) and Batt (1985) found that a majority of surveyed faculty members favored faculty status for the librarian who provided reference assistance, but not for those who worked in the "non-teaching" areas, like cataloging or circulation. Massman (1972) reported comments from some faculty members to the effect that librarians did not perform professional duties, despite the fact that the faculty respondents ranked librarians only behind the academic dean and the instructional faculty as the most important employees on campus. And although the studies of Holbrook (1968), Cook (1981), and Budd and Coutant (1981) all found that a majority

of sampled faculty members favored faculty status for librarians if they were required to conduct research, the differences between the duties of librarians and those of faculty members have usually been perceived by faculty members and administrators as being too great for librarians to merit faculty status (Meskill and Meskill, 1975; English 1984), especially when librarians have rarely been viewed as distinguished scholars or imaginative researchers (Douglass, 1957).

Faculty status skeptics have also responded to the claims that aspects of faculty status would enable librarians to better perform their duties. Stevens (1973), Krieger (1978), Biggs (1981), Meyer (1981), DePew (1983), Batt (1985), and Bechtel (1985) believed librarians would perform best under an alternative status which did not include tenure-track appointments but did include benefits and responsibilities not always associated with non-faculty status, such as serving on campus committees. Their documentation of serious problems encountered with faculty requirements might have included the case study of Cieslicki (1982), and headlines like "University of Utah Librarians Lose Faculty Status" (1977) and "University of Wyoming Proposals Ask Librarian Status Changes" (1985). Further, a survey of ten Missouri academic library directors showed little agreement about the desirability of faculty status

(Lawson, 1987), while a test of academic librarian job satisfaction administered to 128 college and university librarians in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska showed that job satisfaction was not related to faculty status (Hegg, 1986).

Speaking to the argument that librarian faculty status implies a collegial system of library governance which enhances library effectiveness, Dickinson (1978) expressed strong reservations about the wisdom of using the faculty governance model in libraries, as did Bailey (1976) and Meyer (1980). All three feared that the time required of librarians to make collegial governance work properly would inevitably come out of the time needed by librarians to administer adequate library services. Opposition to collegial governance has also stemmed from concerns over potential loss of authority: Byerly (1980) found that only thirty-six percent of the academic libraries in Ohio employed a collegial governance system, and sixty-eight percent of the directors whose institutions did not have such a system indicated that they did not want it.

One of the gravest concerns of faculty status skeptics has been the likelihood of librarians being able to meet traditional faculty tenure criteria. It is this issue that will be examined next.

While many have rejected the claim that librarians should have the protection of tenure (D. G. E. Sparks, 1980; Weber, 1966; Wiener, 1985), the most common concern about tenure-track status has been that the problems would outweigh the various benefits. R. Sparks (1975) alleged that tenure would inhibit creativity and that rejected tenure applications would disrupt staff morale. Pierson (1967), Mason (1972, 1973), and Wilson (1979) thought it was simply unreasonable that anyone should be expected to fulfill the two very different roles of librarian and faculty member. Their concerns were echoed in the warnings made by many writers on both sides of the issue: librarians with faculty status would almost certainly be required to meet the traditional faculty criterion of research and publication (Bridegam, 1978; Davey and Andrews, 1978; Dougherty, 1975; Hintz, 1968; Isaac, 1983; McAnally, 1963; Moriarty, 1970; Pierson, 1967, 1971; Schmid, 1978; Seibert, 1961). That these writers were correct appeared to be proven by the adoption of the Joint Statement on Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (Joint Committee on College Library Problems, 1972), which required that librarians meet the same evaluation standards as other faculty. In addition, a survey of 1,026 tenured librarians found that a majority thought the most important criteria to be met for tenure was research and publication (Smith, Frost, Lyons, and Reichel, 1984).

Moriarty (1970) stated the commonly-held belief that librarians lacking the education and the opportunities to perform research would be unable to meet the standards acceptable to institutional tenure committees, resulting in "forced mobility" among young librarians. There is abundant evidence that the librarians who publish most prolifically have earned advanced education in addition to the library degree; studies by Bloomfield (1966), Burlingame and Repp (1981), Morrison (1969), and Watson (1977) all found that holders of additional advanced degrees published more than did librarians whose only advanced degree was the master of librarianship.

The fact that not many academic librarians had earned additional advanced degrees was not the only reason that skeptics questioned librarians' abilities to meet the traditional faculty requirement to publish. A number of writers warned that faculty members with nine-month contracts will have more free time to pursue research projects than will librarians with full-year contracts (Axford, 1977; Blake, 1970, 1973; Bridegam, 1978; Gates, 1972; Lyle, 1963; Oboler, 1973).

On the other hand, Batt (1985) believed that academic-year contracts for librarians were out of the question since the work of a library continues during the summer months. The problem identified by Batt is a key reason why achieving

academic-year contracts has been extremely difficult for librarians. All of the surveys which included questions on whether the librarians held academic-year contracts found that the overwhelming majority of librarians did not hold such contracts (Bentley, 1978; Davidson, Thorson, and Stine, 1983; Dow, 1977; English, 1983; Parker, 1972; Payne and Wagner, 1984; Pontius, Swinton, and van Antwerp, 1978; Reeling and Smith, 1983; Ryans, 1977; Sharma, 1981).

A number of institutions have sought a compromise between the needs of tenure-track librarians required to publish and the ongoing work of the library. Many institutions allowed release time for graduate classwork and research projects, and some appointed staff development committees which reviewed and advised on research projects (Axford, 1975; Bechtel, 1985; Goudy and Goudy, 1988; Jenkins, Cook, and Fox, 1981; Kellam and Barker, 1968; Rayman and Goudy, 1980; Stine, 1982).

Yet some studies theorized that lack of time was not a major problem for librarians struggling to do research. Massman (1972) determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the quantity of publications by librarians with academic-year contracts and those with full-year contracts. Burlingame and Repp (1981) surveyed 220 actively publishing librarians, most of whom had not found release time to be an important stimulus to publication

efforts. Boice, Scepanski, and Wilson (1987) compared the styles of coping with pressures to publish which were adopted by instructional faculty members and librarians and concluded that the publishing efforts of both the librarians and the instructional faculty members suffered more from insecurities, entrenched work habits, and unsupportive workplace cultures than from lack of time.

In any event, the issue of publishing productivity was deemed important because of the fear that librarians' publishing records would not compare favorably with the publishing records of instructional faculty. Massman (1972) offered a comparison of publishing productivity by librarians and instructional faculty after surveying 224 librarians and 205 faculty members in three midwestern states. The faculty members proved to be much more productive, publishing an average of 1.7 articles per person over a two year period as compared to the .7 articles per librarian over the same two year period. Massman did not address the issue of whether the librarians' publication records had harmed their tenure applications. Watson (1977) looked at the publication activity of librarians at ten large research universities and concluded, as did Massman, that librarians tended not to publish as much as faculty. Of particular concern to Watson was the low productivity of librarians with five or fewer years of professional experience. Since probationary periods

for tenure are commonly five to seven years, the lack of productivity among newcomers to the field suggested that they might have difficulty gaining tenure, as some had theorized they would. The same concern was echoed by a majority of academic administrators surveyed by English (1984), and Campbell (1977) documented a case where a librarian had been terminated because of an inadequate publication record. However, the study by Smith and DeVinney (1984) indicated that these concerns might be unfounded: of 526 tenured librarians, 248 (47.1 percent) had never published anything as of the date that they had been granted tenure. Further, while Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) found that the most frequent cause of librarians being rejected for tenure was reported by respondents to be an inadequate publication record, the study also found an 81.5 percent tenure-approval rate among the 329 librarians who applied for tenure between 1980 and 1984. This tenure-approval rate contrasted sharply with the fifty-eight percent success rate of faculty applicants reported in a survey of 1978-79 faculty tenure-approval rates (Atelsek and Gomberg, 1980).

In light of these studies, what should be made of the fears that librarians cannot meet tenure criteria? Perhaps librarians have had exaggerated perceptions of the amount of publishing required of faculty, as Galloway maintained in 1979. Another explanation was offered by tenured librarians

in the 1984 study of Smith, Frost, Lyons, and Reichel: publication requirements for librarians were becoming stiffer than they were when the respondents had earned tenure, and so the real test of the abilities of librarians to achieve tenure was yet to come. But yet another explanation was to be found in the results of several studies conducted between 1978 and 1985: contrary to the aforementioned claims that publication was the most important criterion to be met in order to achieve tenure (Smith, Frost, Lyons, and Reichel, 1984), the majority of institutions where academic librarians had tenure-track status did not require the librarians to show evidence of research and publication (Davidson, Thorson, and Stine, 1983; English, 1983; Gray and McReynolds, 1983; Mitchell and Swieszkowski, 1985; Payne and Wagner, 1984; Pontius, Swinton, and van Antwerp, 1978; Rayman and Goudy, 1980; Sharma, 1981).

That so many institutions employing tenure-track librarians did not require publication might indicate that the institutions were aware of the obstacles preventing many librarians from being productive publishing scholars. Nevertheless, where publication was required for librarians to achieve tenure, it acted as a significant stimulus to publication activity (Burlingame and Repp, 1981; Krausse and Sieburth, 1985; Watson, 1985).

While more studies of certain key issues are needed, the

current literature on librarians' publishing activities indicates that librarians tend not to publish frequently, librarians with an advanced degree in addition to the MLS publish more frequently than librarians who do not have a second advanced degree, publishing requirements for tenure stimulate publishing activity, and librarians may (but will not necessarily) encounter difficulties in carrying out publication activities due to lack of training and time. Opponents of faculty status have argued that because, in their view, research and publication activity is not a primary function of academic librarians, it only serves to divert energies from more important tasks and may become a barrier to librarians who try to gain tenure. However, the little evidence that exists shows that the effects of weak publishing records on librarians' chances for achieving tenure have not been uniformly negative because of a tendency for institutions not to require their librarians to publish.

Conclusion of Review of Relevant Research

In sum, the "inordinate passion for status" described by Blackburn has been the result of many librarians' perceptions that they are underpaid and underappreciated. The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians and the Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians were intended to help

rectify the perceived injustices of the past by making librarians fully fledged members of the faculty. However, implementation of the Standards in universities has been very slow and fraught with compromises. Several national and regional surveys have been undertaken to document the extent to which sample institutions have complied with the ACRL SFSCUL:

- Professional responsibilities and self determination: all of the surveys reported a majority of respondents claimed to have peer review and professional responsibilities in the form of some type of faculty status;
- Collegial library governance: all of the surveys which inquired after the library governance structure reported the overwhelming majority of respondents did not have collegial governance;
- College and university governance: of the respondents who were queried on this point, the large majority with faculty status reported eligibility for service on campus policy-making committees;
- Compensation: the great majority of respondents with faculty status thought their salaries were not commensurate with the salaries of peer faculty, and the overwhelming majority did not receive academic-year contracts;
- Tenure: the majority of respondents with faculty status reported eligibility for tenure, and the criteria for

tenure usually did not include the requirement to publish;

- Promotion: while most faculty status respondents reported the use of ranks for promotion ladders, the use of equivalent titles was more common than was use of professorial titles, and the criteria for promotion usually did not include the requirement to publish;
- Leaves: of the respondents which reported the availability of research leaves and sabbaticals for faculty, the majority with faculty status said the librarians were also eligible for such leaves;
- Research funds: of the respondents which reported the availability of research funds for faculty, the majority with faculty status said the librarians were also eligible for such funds;
- Academic freedom: most of the researchers did not specifically inquire as to whether faculty status and non-faculty status respondents believed they had academic freedom; the assumption appeared to be that if librarians were eligible for tenure, then they were assured of academic freedom (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1981; Association of Research Libraries, 1980; Benedict, Gavryck, and Selvin, 1983; Byerly, 1980; Cargile, 1973; Davidson, Thorson, and Trumpeter, 1981; Davidson, Thorson, and Stine, 1983; Dow, 1977; English, 1983; Gray and McReynolds, 1983; Hawkins, Burlinson, Karimkhani, and

Russell, 1978; Jackson, 1977; Lawson, 1987; Manchikes and Crabb, 1976; Payne and Wagner, 1984; Pontius, Swinton, and van Antwerp, 1978; Reeling and Smith, 1983; Ryans, 1977; Sharma, 1981; Stefani and Smith, 1981; Tassin, 1984; Virginia Library Association, 1972).

Thus there has been widespread violation of several Standards in spite of some optimistic assessments of overall compliance (Galloway, 1979; Josey, 1977; Schmidt, 1979). In fact, the inability to achieve full faculty status as defined by the ACRL SFSCUL led some librarians to attempt to do so through a bargaining unit, but these efforts were only moderately successful (Bentley, 1978).

In an attempt to build upon these and other studies, this research examined several of the concerns raised in the debate about whether librarians merit faculty status and whether they will have difficulty meeting tenure criteria. The study tried to determine the extent of SFSCUL compliance of a segment of higher education not previously surveyed, to measure the relationship of publishing requirements and contract type with the abilities of academic librarians to achieve tenure at comparable rates to other faculty, to determine whether there is a trend of librarians trading faculty status for an alternative professional status, and to determine whether academic affairs officers and library directors currently favor faculty status for librarians.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

This investigation was intended to investigate several aspects of the recent experiences of selected universities with faculty status, as discussed in the previous chapter. This chapter will describe the survey population and the sampling procedures, the hypotheses that were tested, the independent variables that were examined, the methods of data collection and the precautions taken to ensure accuracy of the collected data, the analytical techniques employed in the hypothesis tests, and the limitations and delimitations of the study.

Population and Sampling Procedures

The research by English (1983, 1984) and Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) attempted to study various aspects of the recent experiences of major American research libraries with librarian faculty status and answer similar questions to those posed in this study. In order to build upon this prior work and provide a more complete picture of the faculty status experiences in American academic libraries, the population surveyed in this study was ninety-eight

universities classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Doctorate-Granting Institutions I and II. These two classifications of institutions are identified by the Carnegie Foundation as offering a full range of baccalaureate programs and awarding less than fifty doctorate degrees annually. The only such institutions not included in the study were those which are served by research library systems that were part of the groups of institutions studied by English, Mitchell and Swieszkowski (Columbia Teachers College, Dartmouth, Alabama, California at Riverside, Notre Dame, Tulane, Kent State, Rice, Houston, and Brigham Young), or which are not served by a library system affiliated with the institution (the International College, the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities Graduate School). The complete list of the ninety-eight surveyed institutions appears in Appendix D.

The library directors at all ninety-eight institutions were sent surveys and eighty-one directors responded. In order to survey the academic affairs administrators at the universities whose library directors had responded to the first survey, two equal-sized samples of forty institutions each were selected from the group of responding library directors. One set of institutions were to be surveyed by mail and the other by telephone, for reasons which are related below in the next section, Independent Variables,

Data Categories, Methods of Data Collection. The two samples were stratified to include the same proportions of the following institutional characteristics: public or private (25 public and 15 private were in both groups), geographic distribution (9 northeast in both groups, 9 southeast in one group and 10 in the other, 9 midwest in both groups, 5 northwest and mountain in both groups, and 8 southwest in one group and 7 in the other), librarians with tenure-track status (17 in one group, 18 in the other) and without tenure-track status (23 in one group and 22 in the other), and institutional classification (15 Doc-I and 25 Doc II in one group, and 16 Doc-I and 24 Doc-II in the other group). A table showing the stratifying characteristics making up the two groups appears in Appendix D.

Hypotheses

1. The responses of the library directors and academic affairs officers to the following questions are distributed in the same manner as the responses from the academic affairs officers surveyed by English:

- On balance, do you believe the advantages to a university of granting faculty status to librarians outweigh the disadvantages?
- To what extent do you believe the duties of academic librarians are similar to the duties of instructional and

research faculty?

- If the same faculty performance criteria were applied to librarians as is applied to all other untenured faculty, do you believe untenured librarians would find it considerably more difficult to achieve tenure, somewhat more difficult to achieve tenure, or no more difficult to achieve tenure?
- Do you agree that librarians are qualified by virtue of their duties and abilities for the same faculty status as is held by instructional faculty?

2. The library directors' evaluations of the librarian status changes at their universities since 1971 as being toward or away from compliance with the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status are uniformly distributed.

3. The library directors' responses to the question of whether their experiences with librarian faculty status made them change their minds about whether librarians merit faculty status are uniformly distributed.

4. Library directors' opinions about librarians meriting full faculty status is independent of whether the directors were directors during a status change away from full or partial faculty status.

5. Status changes toward and away from faculty status among the academic libraries where librarians have voluntarily changed their employment status since 1971 are uniformly distributed.

6. Status changes toward and away from faculty status among the academic libraries where librarians have involuntarily changed their employment status since 1971 are uniformly distributed.

7. Success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian when the data from all responding institutions are aggregated.

8. Success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian in each of the following comparisons:

- librarians with academic-year contracts and publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and no publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- librarians with full-year contracts and publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- librarians with full-year contracts and no publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- all librarians with academic-year contracts versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- all librarians with full-year contracts versus

instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- all librarians with publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions;
- all librarians with no publishing requirements versus instructional faculty at the same institutions.

9. Success of librarians in achieving tenure is independent of the identified variables in the following comparisons:
- all librarians with academic-year contracts versus all librarians with full-year contracts;
- all librarians with publishing requirements versus all librarians with no publishing requirements;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and publishing requirements versus librarians with academic-year contracts and no publishing requirements;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and publishing requirements versus librarians with full-year contracts and publishing requirements;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and publishing requirements versus librarians with full-year contracts and no publishing requirements;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and no publishing requirements versus librarians with full-year contracts and publishing requirements;
- librarians with academic-year contracts and no publishing requirements versus librarians with full-year contracts and

no publishing requirements;

- librarians with full-year contracts and publishing requirements versus librarians with full-year contracts and no publishing requirements;
- librarians at public universities and librarians at private universities;
- librarians in different geographic regions of the United States.

10. Where the ACRL has imposed sanctions against institutions which violated one or more of the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status, the library directors' opinions about whether the sanctions have effected librarian recruitment, retention, or any other aspect of the library and university are uniformly distributed.

Independent Variables, Data Categories, Methods of Data Collection

The information required to test the hypotheses was gathered through a mail survey of library directors at the sample institutions, a mail survey and phone interviews with the institutions' academic affairs officers, a review of the professional literature, and interviews with five librarians who held relevant offices in the ACRL since the adoption of the SFSCUL.

The survey instruments appear in Appendices A through C.

Library directors were asked to provide information about the extent of institutional compliance with each ACRL Standard for Faculty Status, any changes in librarian employment status since 1971, the nature of and reason(s) for the changes, and, where librarians have tenure-track status, the the number of librarians whose tenure applications were approved and the number rejected during 1985-86, 1986-87, 1987-88. The library directors were also asked to provide information needed to sort the responding institutions according to the independent variables to be studied for their possible influence on tenure-approval rates of academic librarians. The independent variables were academic-year contract vs. full-year contract, and whether librarians must show evidence of research and publication to earn tenure.

In addition, all of the library directors were asked the same questions which English (1984) asked of the academic administrators in his sample: what are the advantages and disadvantages of librarian faculty status which accrue to the university, do the advantages to university of offering librarian faculty status outweigh the disadvantages, to what extent are the duties of librarians similar to the duties of instructional faculty, would librarians find it more difficult to achieve tenure if they had to meet traditional tenure criteria, and do librarians merit faculty status. However, before respondents were asked to answer these

questions they were asked to agree or disagree with a series of statements which summarized the most frequently stated arguments for and against librarian faculty status. The answers to these statements were not intended to be analyzed but were included in part to ensure that respondents were familiar with the most important arguments for and against librarian faculty status before they responded to the questions that were to be analyzed. By asking the respondents to agree or disagree with the statements, the researcher could be certain that the statements had been read and considered by the respondents. The responses to the statements also provided additional information that helped the researcher interpret the statistical analyses within a broader context. These responses are found in the Chapter 3 section entitled "Discussion."

Finally, the library directors were asked if their opinions on these issues have changed in light of their recent experiences, if any, with librarian faculty status.

The academic administrators in both samples were also asked the same questions which English asked of the academic administrators in his sample, and were asked to agree or disagree with the same arguments for and against librarian faculty status which the library directors were asked.

The academic administrators at institutions where librarians have tenure-track status were also solicited for

the number of all instructional faculty and librarians which have applied for tenure and which have been granted tenure during 1985-86, 1986-87, 1987-88.

The academic affairs officers in one set of institutions were surveyed by mail, while the second set were asked to be interviewed by telephone.

In general, the terms and issues addressed to the library directors were familiar to them, but a pre-test of the data gathering instruments for both the library directors and the academic affairs officers was carried out at two of the population's institutions, Montana State University and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Questions and ambiguous responses were clarified through follow-ups with the pre-test respondents. Of course, the fact that the opinions of the library directors and academic affairs officers were elicited by using the questions and responses found in English's study meant that a certain amount of pre-testing had already been done.

The library directors of the population were asked to respond by a deadline which was about three weeks from the date on which they were expected to receive the questionnaire. One week before the response deadline, postcards were sent to all members of the sample population to remind them of the survey deadline and the importance of the study. Approximately one to one-and-a-half weeks after

the response deadline, another copy of the survey instrument was mailed to non-respondents in case they had misplaced their original questionnaire. A final request for their participation was made at that time, with a final deadline specified.

A similar survey approach was taken with the set of academic affairs officers who received questionnaires in the mail. The other set of academic affairs officers received a letter from the researcher which explained the purpose and importance of the study, described the questions to which answers were being sought, and asked that the recipients indicate their willingness to be interviewed by telephone by so indicating on an enclosed stamped, self-addressed postcard to be mailed to the researcher. The researcher then arranged to schedule appointments for the telephone interviews.

The telephone interview method of gathering the opinions was used because it tends to offer a researcher several advantages over a mail questionnaire, including the increased likelihood of obtaining a responses to the survey as a whole as well as to individual questions, the ability to probe more deeply into responses, the opportunity to clarify issues and answers when necessary, and the opportunity to elicit opinions through the use of open-ended questions (Dillman, 1983; Frey, 1983; Guba and Lincoln, 1981). These advantages were especially important in the case of the academic affairs

officers survey because many of them may not have been as familiar with the issues relating to librarian faculty status as the library directors were expected to be, and because of the sensitivity of the tenure-approval data. The researcher anticipated that the advantages of the telephone interview method would help obtain thoughtful, informed opinions from the respondents, as well as giving the researcher the opportunity to gain enough trust from the respondents so they would be willing to provide the tenure-approval data. However, the time and expense of surveying all of the academic affairs administrators by telephone required resources which the researcher lacked. Therefore half of the academic affairs officers were surveyed by mail. A comparison of the response rates and the quality of responses obtained by the two data gathering methods appears in Appendix E.

The last set of phone interviews involved five librarians who served as chair of the ACRL Academic Status Committee and in related relevant capacities since the adoption of the SFSCUL. These librarians were asked the questions found in Appendix C regarding the ACRL sanctions.

Similarly, the library directors at the sanctioned institutions were to be asked to be interviewed by phone regarding the imposition of sanctions and asked to evaluate the effects of the sanctions, if any, on the library and the

university. However, as will be seen in the summary of findings, this step proved to be impossible because the ACRL has never imposed the SFSCUL sanctions.

Analysis of Data

The statistical analyses of the data were carried out using either the Chi square goodness of fit test or the Chi square test of independence as appropriate and as explained below. As will be seen in Chapter 3, not all of the analyses could be carried out because the responses failed to meet important requirements of the statistic. In any event, the following summarizes the statistics that were used, or were intended to be used. The authority for the appropriateness of these tests for these hypotheses is Ferguson, 1981.

To test the first hypothesis, the responses of English's sample group served as the model distribution against which the responses of this study's library directors and academic affairs officers were compared using the Chi square goodness of fit test. This test was appropriate because the response data are nominal level and ordinal level. The .05 level of significance was used to test this hypothesis.

Hypotheses 2, 3, and 5 were tested using the Chi square goodness of fit test, with a distribution of 50/50 serving as the model against which the ordinal level responses were compared. The test was appropriate because the distribution

of responses was what was being tested. The .05 level of significance was used to determine which differences were significant. Hypotheses 6 and 10 would also have been tested in this manner but the tests were not possible due to insufficient cell frequencies.

Hypothesis 4 was to have been tested using the Chi square test of independence. However, the test was not possible due to insufficient cell frequencies.

Hypotheses 7 and 8 were tested using the Chi square test of independence. This test was appropriate because the hypotheses related to whether success in achieving tenure is independent of being a librarian or an instructional faculty member. The .05 level of significance was used to determine whether the differences were significant.

Hypothesis 9 was tested using the Chi square test of independence because the hypothesis inquired into whether the librarians' success in achieving tenure is independent of type of contract and the requirement to publish. The .05 level of significance was used to determine whether the null hypothesis should be retained.

Phone interviews with present and former chairs of the ACRL Academic Status Committee provided important background to the study and are summarized in the Discussion section of Chapter 3.

Phone interviews with library directors at institutions

sanctioned by the ACRL were to be reported as case studies, with patterns and similarities between the cases highlighted and explored for their possible significance for the future of the librarian faculty status movement. This could not be done because the ACRL has never imposed the sanctions. The reason for this is found in the Discussion section where the interviews with the current and former chairs of the ACRL Academic Status Committee are summarized.

Limitations and Delimitations

The following limitations of this study result from circumstances beyond the researcher's control.

1. The ability of the researcher to gather the data required to answer the study's general questions was heavily dependent upon the adequacy of the record keeping of the sample institutions, as well as the willingness of the individuals interviewed to provide the information solicited.
2. The accuracy of the data was largely dependent upon the responses to the questionnaires and interviews. Some responses may be based upon conjecture of the respondents but not identified as such. Further, because of the confidential nature of tenure application records, the researcher was unable to independently confirm the accuracy of that data.

The following delimitations have been imposed upon the

study by the researcher for the reasons given.

1. Data about tenure applications from no more than the last three years were sought because of the concern that many universities might find it difficult, if not impossible, to to retrieve information about tenure applications from further back.

2. The study was concerned only with institutional-level tenure reviews and not with tenure reviews carried out at the department, school, or library level. While it might be the case that tenure applications of librarians are significantly less likely to succeed at the library level than are the tenure applications of other faculty at their own department-review levels, or vice versa, concerns about this possibility are rarely expressed in the professional literature. A comparison of tenure-approval rates at the department levels is a logical follow up to the present study.

3. The reasons for rejection of individual tenure applications were not solicited in the interest of maximizing the response rate. The amount of work involved in searching through university promotion and tenure committee records for such data from the past three years would be extremely time consuming and would have discouraged the academic affairs officers from participating in the study. Therefore, should librarians with publishing requirements have significantly lower tenure-approval rates than all other librarians, there

will be cause to identify publishing requirements as factors of particular concern for institutions and librarians who are evaluating tenure criteria, but it cannot be definitely concluded that the publishing requirement was the only, or even the primary, reason for the lower tenure-approval rates.

4. The analysis of tenure data utilized data from all responding institutions which grant tenure-track status to academic librarians, even if that tenure-track status did not constitute full faculty status as defined by the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status, or the Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians. Plainly, those tenure-track librarians who had not been required to publish or did not have academic-year contracts (the independent variables of particular interest in this study) might not be considered to have full faculty status because publishing requirements are implicitly a part of the Joint Statement's requirements for librarian faculty status, and academic-year contracts are part of the ACRL Standards. While the study may appear to be implicitly assuming that the failure to comply with one or more of the other ACRL Standards does not significantly relate to tenure-approval rates, the questionnaires sent to the library directors solicited information about which of the Standards are not being observed, and thus enabled the researcher to look for further patterns among the characteristics of any librarian

categories with significantly lower tenure-approval rates.

5. It is important to note that the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians do not assume that faculty status is always and everywhere defined the same way for instructional and research, i.e., non-librarian, faculty. In other words, faculty members from different campuses do not necessarily enjoy identical privileges and carry out the same responsibilities due to their status as faculty members. That the ACRL recognizes there exist variations in faculty rights and responsibilities among different campuses can be seen in the way the Standards consistently call for librarians to have equivalent rights, responsibilities, and opportunities as other faculty on the same campuses. Such wording of the Standards plainly allows for variation among campuses. The researcher assumed that such variation does not significantly relate to any tenure-approval rate differences between tenure-track librarians and other faculty at the same institutions.

6. Due to the voluminous amount of literature on the subject of librarian faculty status, the researcher chose to review only that literature which relates to faculty status for academic librarians in the United States. This was appropriate because the ACRL SFSCUL were mainly intended to apply to American colleges and universities and cannot necessarily be applied in other nations where the higher

education conditions may be quite different. Therefore, the decision to exclude the literature on faculty status for librarians in Canada and other nations should in no way be interpreted as a reflection on the quality of that literature.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the survey responses and tests of hypotheses will be summarized and followed by a discussion of the findings.

Table 1. Summary of Responses.

Library Directors	
Questionnaires sent:	98
Responses received:	81 (82.7%)
Universities with tenure-track librarians:	35 (43.2%), of which 28 (80%) had actually reviewed librarians for tenure during 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88.
Academic Affairs Officers	
Questionnaires sent:	40
Telephone interviews requested:	40
Questionnaire responses received:	33 (82.5%)
Telephone interviews granted:	24 (60%)
Overall response rate:	57 (71.3%)
Universities providing tenure success data:	17 of 28 (60.7%)

(Other characteristics of the institutions will be indicated within the appropriate hypothesis analysis.)

Hypothesis 1 - This hypothesis stated that the responses of library directors and academic affairs officers (AAO's) to four questions about librarian faculty status would be distributed in the same manner as the responses from the academic affairs officers surveyed by English. Therefore a Chi square goodness of fit test was used to compare the responses. The comparisons yielded the following results:

Question 1 - On balance, do you believe the advantages to the university of offering faculty status to librarians outweigh the disadvantages?

Table 2. Advantages Outweigh Disadvantages? AAO's.

	Yes	No	Total
English's AAO's	19	28	47
This study's AAO's	27	21	48
	(19.4)	(28.6)	
Total	46	49	95

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 4.997. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study

finds that the opinions relating to question 1 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the academic affairs respondents to this survey, with English's respondents being less likely than this study's academic affairs officers to agree that the advantages of librarian faculty status to a university outweigh the disadvantages.

Table 3. Advantages Outweigh Disadvantages? Library Directors

	Yes	No	Total
English's AAO's	19	28	47
Library directors	47	27	74
	(29.9)	(44.1)	
Total	66	55	121

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 16.41. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 1 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the library directors, with English's respondents being less likely than

the library directors to agree that the advantages of librarian faculty status to a university outweigh the disadvantages.

Question 2 - To what extent do you believe the duties of librarians are similar to the duties of instructional and research faulty?

Table 4. Similar Duties? AAO's.

	similar	dissimilar	Total
English's AAO's	9	12	21
This study's AAO's	11	44	55
	(23.6)	(31.4)	
Total	20	56	76

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 11.78. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 2 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the academic affairs respondents to this survey, with this study's

academic affairs officers being even more likely than expected to believe the duties of librarians and instructional faculty are more dissimilar than similar.

Table 5. Similar Duties? Library Directors.

	similar	dissimilar	Total
English's AAO's	9	12	21
Library directors	30	49	79
	(33.9)	(45.1)	
Total	39	61	100

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is .786. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained. The study finds that the opinions of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English and the library directors relating to question 2 are not significantly different.

Question 3 - If the same faculty performance criteria were applied to librarians as is applied to all other untenured faculty, do you believe untenured librarians would find it considerably more difficult to achieve tenure, somewhat more

difficult to achieve tenure, or no more difficult to achieve tenure?

Table 6. More Difficulty Meeting Faculty Tenure Criteria? AAO's.

	Considerably more	Somewhat more	No more	Total
English's AAO's	14	3	4	21
This study's AAO's	40	13	4	57
	(38)	(8.2)	(10.8)	
Total	54	16	8	78

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 7.195. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with two degrees of freedom must equal or exceed 5.99, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 3 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the academic affairs respondents to this survey. This study's academic affairs officers were even more likely than English's respondents to believe librarians would find it more difficult to earn tenure if required to meet the

instructional faculty's criteria.

Table 7. More Difficulty Meeting Faculty Tenure Criteria? Library Directors.

	Considerably more	Somewhat more	No more	Total
English's AAO's	14	3	4	21
Library directors	45	20	4	69
	(46)	(9.9)	(13.1)	
Total	59	23	8	90

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 16.64. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with two degrees of freedom must equal or exceed 5.99, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 3 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the library directors. The library directors were even more likely than English's respondents to believe librarians would find it more difficult to earn tenure if required to meet the instructional faculty's criteria.

Question 4 - "Librarians are qualified by virtue of their duties and abilities for the same faculty status as is held by instructional faculty." Agree or disagree?

Table 8. Librarians Merit Instructional Faculty's Status? AAO's.

	agree	disagree	Total
English's AAO's	11	36	47
This study's AAO's	22	33	55
	(12.9)	(42.1)	
Total	33	69	102

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 8.39. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 4 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the academic affairs respondents to this survey, with this study's academic affairs officers more likely to believe librarians merit the same faculty status as is held by the instructional faculty.

Table 9. Librarians Merit Instructional Faculty's Status? Library Directors.

	agree	disagree	Total
English's AAO's	11	36	47
Library directors	34	35	69
	(16.2)	(52.9)	
Total	45	71	116

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is 25.62. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected. The study finds that the opinions relating to question 4 of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are significantly different from the opinions of the library directors, with the library directors more likely to believe librarians merit the same faculty status as is held by the instructional faculty.

Hypothesis 2 - This hypothesis stated that there would be no significant trend toward or away from compliance with the SFSCUL among the sample universities since the Standards were adopted in 1971. Of the eighty-one responding library

directors, thirty-six (44.4%) indicated that their institutions had modified one or more of the employment conditions which relate to the ACRL Standards. Twenty-one of the thirty-six (58.3%) described the changes as being toward greater compliance with the SFSCUL, while fifteen believed that their changes had resulted in less overall compliance. A Chi square goodness of fit test comparing these responses to expected values of 50% toward compliance and 50% away from compliance yielded the following results:

Table 10. Compliance Trends.

	Changes toward compliance	Away
Expected	18	18
Observed	21	15

The Chi square calculation is 1.0. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained. The study finds most status modifications have been toward greater compliance with the SFSCUL, but the trend is not significant.

Hypothesis 3 - This hypothesis stated that the library directors' answers to the question of whether their

experiences with faculty status made them change their minds about librarians meriting faculty status were uniformly distributed. Of the eighty-one responding library directors, sixty-nine (85.2%) responded to this question. Of the sixty-nine, fourteen (20.3%) stated their opinions were the opposite of what they had been before their experience with faculty status, while fifty-five stated their opinions had not changed as a result of their experiences. A Chi square goodness of fit test comparing these responses to expected values of 50% changing their opinions and 50% not changing their opinions yielded the following results:

Table 11. Changes in Opinions of Library Directors.

	Opinion changes	No opinion changes
Expected	34.5	34.5
Observed	14	55

The Chi square calculation is 24.36. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is rejected and the study finds that a statistically significant majority of library directors have not modified their opinions as to whether librarians merit faculty status as a result of their

experiences with librarian faculty status.

Hypothesis 4 - This hypothesis stated that whether library directors believed librarians merit faculty status is independent of whether the library directors were directors during a status change away from full or partial faculty status. Of the eighty-one responding library directors, only eight (9.9%) indicated that they had been directors during such a change. This made it impossible to test the hypothesis because of the inability to meet the requirement of the Chi square test of independence that at least 80% of the expected values will be five or more, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Opinions of Directors After Status Changes Away From SFSCUL.

	Libns. merit the instructional faculty's status:		
	agree	disagree	Total
Directors during changes away	3	5	8
(Expected values)	(3.9)	(4.1)	
All other directors	31	30	61
(Expected values)	(30.1)	(30.9)	

However, as seen in Table 13, it was possible to test the more general hypothesis that whether library directors believe librarians qualify for faculty status is independent of their having been directors during any status change.

Table 13. Opinions of Directors After Any Status Changes.

	Libns. merit the instructional faculty's status:		
	agree	disagree	Total
Directors during status changes	7	10	17
(Expected values)	(8.4)	(8.6)	
All other directors	27	25	52
(Expected values)	(25.6)	(26.4)	

The Chi square calculation is .612. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained. Library directors' opinions about librarians meriting faculty status is independent of whether the directors were directors during a change in the librarians' status.

Hypothesis 5 - This hypothesis stated that status changes toward and away from faculty status among the libraries where

the librarians had voluntarily changed their status since 1971 are uniformly distributed. Twenty-eight library directors reported that their librarians had either voluntarily modified their employment status or had agreed to a change in status, with nineteen of the twenty-eight (67.9%) indicating that the changes had brought their institutions into greater compliance with the SFSCUL and nine indicating that their changes had done the opposite. A Chi square goodness of fit test comparing these responses to expected values of 50% toward compliance and 50% away from compliance yielded the following results:

Table 14. Status Changes Which Librarians Endorsed.

	Voluntary changes toward compliance	Away
Expected	13.5	13.5
Observed	18	9

The Chi square calculation is 3.0. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of confidence the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained and the study finds that while the majority of cases of librarians voluntarily modifying their statuses brought the institutions into greater compliance with the SFSCUL, the trend is not

statistically significant.

Hypothesis 6 - This hypothesis stated that status changes toward and away from faculty status among the libraries where the librarians had involuntarily changed their status since 1971 are uniformly distributed. However, only nine library directors reported that their librarians had involuntarily had their employment status modified, which made it impossible to meet the Chi square requirement that 80% of all expected values be greater than or equal to five. However, the change frequencies are reported below for comparison with the previous table:

Table 15. Status Changes Which Librarians Did Not Endorse.

	Involuntary changes toward compliance	Away
Expected	4.5	4.5
Observed	3	6

Hypothesis 7 - This hypothesis stated that success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian when the data from all respondents are aggregated. Of the eighty academic affairs officers who were surveyed, twenty-eight served at universities where some librarians had been reviewed for

tenure during the three year period from 1985 to 1988. Seventeen of the twenty-eight (60.7%) provided the data necessary to carry out the Chi square test of independence. The test yielded the following results:

Table 16. Tenure Achievement Data: All.

	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Instructional faculty	908	151	1059
	(907.6)	(151.4)	
Librarians	51	9	60
	(51.4)	(8.6)	
Total	959	160	1119

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The Chi square calculation is .022. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained. The study finds that success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian when all the tenure data are aggregated.

Hypothesis 8 - This hypothesis stated that success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional

faculty member or librarian, regardless of the type of contract held by the librarians or whether the librarians were required to publish. However, librarians at only two of the surveyed universities held academic-year contracts, and none were considered for tenure during the period in question. Therefore it was impossible to make the tenure-approval comparisons involving length of librarian contract.

For the remaining comparisons, of the seventeen universities which provided tenure data, twelve (70.6%) required their librarians to show evidence of research and publication in order to achieve tenure, while five had no such requirement.

Table 17. Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Who Must Publish.

	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Instructional faculty	670	104	774
	(669.2)	(104.8)	
Publishing librarians	39	7	46
	(39.8)	(6.2)	
Total	709	111	820

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

In this Chi square test of independence, the Chi square

calculation is .126. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained; success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian when the librarians are required to publish.

Table 18. Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Not Required to Publish.

	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Instructional faculty	238	47	285
	(238.3)	(46.7)	
Non-publishing librarians	12	2	14
	(11.7)	(2.3)	
Total	250	49	299

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

While only 75% of the expected frequencies are five or higher, this comparison is included as a contrast with the previous comparison. The Chi square calculation is .049 and does not equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained; success in achieving tenure is independent of position as instructional faculty member or librarian when the librarians are not required to publish.

Hypothesis 9 - Hypothesis 9 stated that success in achieving tenure among librarians is independent of certain variables.

Table 19. Tenure Achievement Data: By Region, Type of University

Region	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Northwest/mountain	5	4	9
(Expected)	(7.7)	(1.4)	
Southeast	28	4	32
(Expected)	(27.2)	(4.8)	
Midwest	7	0	7
(Expected)	(7.7)	(1.4)	
Southwest	7	1	8
(Expected)	(6.8)	(1.2)	
Northeast	2	0	2
(Expected)	(1.7)	(0.3)	
Totals	51	9	60

Institutions	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Public	49	9	58
(Expected)	(49.3)	(8.7)	
Private	2	0	2
(Expected)	(1.7)	(0.3)	
Totals	51	9	60

As Table 19 shows, it was impossible to make the tenure-approval comparisons involving length of librarian contract because all of the librarians' tenure data was for librarians with full-year contracts. It was similarly impossible to test the librarians tenure-approval data using geographic distribution and public/private institutional support as independent variables because the Chi square requirement that at least 80% of the expected values be greater than or equal to five was not met.

However, the remaining comparison involving tenure data for librarians who are and are not required to publish is included in Table 20 in order to provide a contrast with the data in Tables 17 and 18, even though only 75% of the expected frequencies are five or higher.

Table 20. Tenure Achievement Data: Librarians Who Do and Do Not Publish.

	Tenured	Rejected	Total
Publishing librarians	39	7	46
	(39.1)	(6.9)	
Non-publishing librarians	12	2	14
	(11.9)	(2.1)	
Total	51	9	60

(Numbers in parentheses represent expected frequencies)

The data in Table 20 are from seventeen universities which provided tenure data, twelve of which (70.6%) required their librarians to show evidence of research and publication in order to achieve tenure, while five had no such requirement. The Chi square calculation in this test of independence is .007. For the values to be significant at the .05 level of significance the Chi square calculation with one degree of freedom must equal or exceed 3.84, so the null hypothesis is retained. The study finds that the frequency of success in achieving tenure of librarians is independent of the requirement to publish.

Hypothesis 10 - This hypothesis could not be tested because there have been no cases where the ACRL has imposed sanctions against institutions not in compliance with the SFSCUL.

Discussion of Findings

Hypotheses 2, 5, and 6 -

Each responding library director characterized the general extent of his/her institution's compliance with each ACRL Standard and the recent trends, if any, toward and away from compliance. The results of these responses are summarized in Table 21 below. Interestingly, these results are very similar to the results reported in other studies published since 1971, despite the fact that most of those

studies did not distinguish between full and partial compliance: full compliance is least likely with Standards 2, 4, and 6, with Standards 1 and 5 constituting special cases.

Table 21. Compliance with ACRL Standards for Faculty Status.

	Full	Partial	Non
1. Professional responsibilities and self determination	33	36	12
2. Library governance	21	23	37
3. College and university governance	50	9	21
4. Compensation	**	**	**
5. Tenure ##	31	12	38
6. Promotion	32	18	31
7. Leaves	40	14	27
8. Research funds	40	22	17
9. Academic freedom	75	3	3

** - For the purposes of this study, compliance with this Standard was considered to be the granting of academic-year contracts to librarians; only two of eighty-one universities were in such compliance.

- Of the 43 which reported partial or full compliance, 35 reported tenure-track status while 8 reported eligibility for earning continuous employment but not tenure.

In the interests of keeping the questionnaire as short as possible to maximize the response rate, the survey did not

ask library directors to indicate the specific ways in which their institutions were not in full compliance with a given Standard. However, some conjectures can be made about the cases of Standards 2, 4, and 6. First, because of the difficulties they could be expected to have in gathering and interpreting relevant data for comparing the salaries of librarians and instructional faculty, the directors were only asked to indicate the extent of compliance with Standard 4's requirement for academic-year contracts. Therefore it is not surprising that only two universities were in compliance with Standard 4; as was evident in the review of the professional literature, librarians have been unlikely to obtain academic-year contracts in light of the year-round workflow in most university libraries.

With regard to Standard 6, a number of respondents stated that they were not in full compliance because their promotion ranks did not use the very same titles as are used for instructional faculty, i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor.

On the other hand, while the finding that few of the sample university libraries are in full compliance with Standard 2 parallels Byerly's findings, this study elicited no indications that help generate theories to explain the lack of compliance. Further research is needed to discover why more libraries have not adopted a collegial form of

governance.

General compliance with Standard 1 was found in the majority of previous surveys, while this study found more library directors who thought their institutions were in partial compliance than those who thought their universities were in full compliance. The lack of peer review would seem to be a more likely type of partial compliance than the existence of professional librarians who are not assigned professional librarian duties. On the other hand, a careful examination of the wording of Standard 1 might have led some library directors to conclude that their universities were not in full compliance because their librarians do not "have maximum possible latitude in fulfilling these responsibilities." Neither theory can be supported here because the directors were not asked to specify the ways in which their institutions were not in full compliance with any given Standard. Further research is needed to determine whether lack of peer review or less-than-maximum professional latitude are responsible for so many universities only partially complying with Standard 1.

In the case of tenure, it is not always clear when reviewing previous studies whether they distinguished between tenure and continuous employment. While the latter is similar to tenure in that librarians who have earned it may only be terminated for cause, it does not necessarily imply

that the librarians holding it have all of the rights and responsibilities held by tenured instructional faculty, or even tenured librarians at other campuses. Due to the uncertainty regarding what are the full range of rights and responsibilities of librarians with continuous employment (and whether they are the same at all campuses which grant continuous employment), the institutions which grant this can at best be described as in partial compliance until further research into continuous employment is done. Thus it can only be said that among the respondents to this study, thirty-one believed themselves to be in full compliance with the tenure standard, while four others whose librarians do have tenure-track status felt themselves not to be in full compliance with other tenure provisions that apply to the instructional faculty. What those other provisions may have been were not specified, nor did the study's questionnaire ask that such specification be made.

Even considering these complicating factors, the responses of this study's library directors regarding compliance with the SFSCUL show a substantial number of universities do not comply, or comply to a limited extent, with certain Standards. In particular, few library directors reported having an academic form of governance, the overwhelming majority of institutions do not grant librarians academic-year contracts, and thirty-eight universities do not

appoint their librarians to tenure-track positions as opposed to thirty-five (excluding those who grant continuous employment) who do. This is consistent with previous studies.

Perhaps some would regard the above as evidence of general compliance with most of the Standards, and perhaps only a purist would believe the faculty status movement was failing in some way if most universities were not fully complying with all of the ACRL SFSCUL. Still, though it is true that universities often employ non-tenure-track faculty members who are very productive and valued, the tenure requirement would seem to be the heart of the librarian faculty status movement, the primary goal to be achieved. And if academic-year contracts are truly essential for librarians to have the time to meet tenure criteria, then it would appear that the current state of affairs at the sampled universities is rather bleak for faculty status proponents. Whether librarians with full-year contracts really have had greater difficulty in achieving tenure than have instructional faculty will be examined later; here it is necessary to test the three hypotheses involving the recent trends (if any) toward and away from the ACRL SFSCUL to see if the picture is any brighter for faculty status proponents.

As seen in the analysis of the data to test Hypothesis 2, even though 58.3% of thirty-six post-1971 status changes

have been toward the SFSCUL, there is no statistically significant trend toward or away from the SFSCUL when we compare the change frequencies to a model distribution of eighteen changes toward and eighteen changes away. This is in spite of the evidence given above and in previous studies that many universities are not fully complying with several of the SFSCUL. Further, Table 22 shows that there is even less evidence of a trend toward the SFSCUL in very recent years:

Table 22. Trends Toward Compliance With the ACRL Standards.

	Changes toward SFSCUL	Changes away from SFSCUL
1985-88	1	2
1980-84	6	3
1971-79	9	9
Year unknown	5	1
Totals	21	15

Thus in the past three years more institutions have been moving away from the SFSCUL rather than toward them, and during this decade there is an almost even split between status changes toward (7) and away (5) from the SFSCUL. While there have been five changes toward the SFSCUL at

universities where the library directors did not know the years in which the changes took place, it seems unlikely that these changes took place very recently. If the changes had taken place very recently it seems probable that even first-year directors would know that. In any event, it seems safe to say that there has not been a substantial trend toward the SFSCUL when the number of changes away are also considered.

On the other hand, the trend data may be interpreted in another way. Of the thirty-six status changes, twenty-seven (75%) took place with the blessing of the librarians and eighteen of those twenty-seven (67%) changes were toward faculty status. Further, at the nine universities where the status changes were made over the objections of the librarians, six were away from the SFSCUL and three were toward them. Thus although it was concluded after the test of Hypothesis 5 that there is no statistically significant trend toward or away from the SFSCUL at institutions where the majority of the librarians agreed with the status changes, the status change data can be interpreted to show that in twenty-four of the thirty-six status change cases the librarians' preferences were in favor of faculty status. Table 23 below displays this interpretation as broken down into the three time periods used in Table 22, and the results are in marked contrast with what is found in Tables 10 and 22.

Table 23. Status Changes: By Librarian Preference and Time Period.

	Prefer faculty status	Do not prefer faculty status
1985-88	2	1
1980-84	7	2
1971-79	12	6
Year unknown	3	3
Totals	24	12

Here it seems quite clear that in spite of the fact that there is not a significant trend toward the adoption of the SFSCUL, when status changes occurred in the 1980's librarians favored the faculty status options nine to three. In other words, the fact that there is no trend toward the SFSCUL does not prove by itself that most academic librarians no longer favor faculty status. However, since this study gathered no information about the nature of the status changes other than that they were toward or away from the SFSCUL (in the opinion of the library directors), it may be that the preferences of the librarians for the options which complied more with the SFSCUL were not necessarily indicative of an overall preference for faculty status. In other words, it is not possible to conclusively extrapolate a ringing endorsement of faculty status from these data.

In a further effort to study trends toward and away from the SFSCUL, the researcher interviewed five librarians who have served as the chairperson of ACRL's Academic Status Committee since the adoption of the SFSCUL. These chairpersons (as they will be called for convenience) were very generous with their time and opinions about recent activities within the faculty status movement.

The chairpersons agreed that institutions are less likely to be in compliance with the Standards now than they were ten years ago, and they agreed that this was due in part to lack of leadership from the ACRL and its Academic Status Committee. After having been very active in the 1970's immediately after the SFSCUL were adopted, the Committee appeared to lose leadership continuity and direction. Most of the chairpersons now viewed the Committee as not having enough staff, prestige, or influence. The Standards themselves were also cited as being part of the problem. The Standards' tendency to require various faculty status provisions be "the same as those of other faculty" was thought to be vague and unhelpful to librarians trying to decide if they should adopt faculty status. This tendency led one chairperson to sarcastically ask whether that meant librarians should be governed by the provisions covering a chain gang, if those were the provisions the other faculty were forced to observe.

What trends should be expected in the future? The Academic Status Committee is in the process of submitting Guidelines for Academic Status for approval by the membership of the ACRL. The Guidelines describe an alternative to faculty status that retains many of the same responsibilities but does not include the requirements of tenure or academic-year contracts. Drafted by the Committee as the result of several requests from librarians around the country, the Guidelines are intended to co-exist with the Standards by providing a framework for defining librarians' status at institutions where faculty status is out of the question for whatever reason. The Committee is also planning to review the SFSCUL and possibly make modifications. The review process will include hearings at which members can express their opinions about the Standards. The review, coupled with a future conference program on the subject of faculty status, should either provide a focal point around which a new generation of proponents can gain impetus, or provide a forum in which librarians can indicate that faculty status is no longer the goal desired by the majority. However, all of the chairpersons thought that faculty status may never again be a bandwagon issue because of the pressures of library service, tight university budgets, and related factors in higher education.

Two of the chairpersons voiced particular concern about

what they perceived as the overall decline of the movement because they believed faculty status is a motivating factor and has helped librarians realize their leadership capabilities. However, the other three thought the difficulties librarians had had with full faculty status at some universities showed that alternative professional statuses were more appropriate and actually made librarians better able to do their jobs than did faculty status. They also thought it was significant that librarians had asked the Academic Status Committee to write the Guidelines of Academic Status, and had said nothing about revising the Standards. Alleging that at many universities librarians now serve on university committees, have access to research funds and leaves when desired, and have greater recognition in general, these chairpersons concluded that perhaps most librarians have gained the aspects of faculty status which make them more productive without having the troubles caused by unnecessary tenure-track duties. It may be that, in a paraphrase of one chairperson, the effort was worthwhile even if the issues were not framed correctly.

The opinions of library directors and academic affairs officers regarding librarian faculty status may also shed light upon the compliance and trend findings, as well as give some clues as to the future likelihood of greater SFSCUL compliance. These opinions will now be examined.

Hypothesis 1 -

These research questions inquired into the opinions of the sample universities' academic affairs officers and library directors regarding librarian faculty status. Their opinions are summarized in Tables 2 through 9 and are compared to the opinions of the academic affairs officers surveyed by English. The questions themselves were originally developed by English and were duplicated in this study to make it possible to perform such a comparison.

In all cases but one, the opinions of this study's library directors and academic affairs officers varied significantly from the model distribution of opinions of academic affairs officers surveyed by English. An examination of the observed and expected frequencies in Tables 2 through 9 shows that this study's respondents were more likely than expected to think the advantages of librarian faculty status for a university outweigh the disadvantages, were more likely than expected (except for the library directors) to judge the duties of librarians and instructional faculty to be more dissimilar than similar, were less likely than expected to believe that librarians could meet the instructional faculty's tenure criteria with no greater difficulty, and were more likely than expected to believe librarians merit the same status as is held by instructional faculty.

These four questions can be divided into two pairs for the purposes of further analyzing the administrators' responses. One pair of questions delved into whether the administrators believed librarians merit faculty status, and whether it was to the overall advantage of a university to offer librarians faculty status even if they do not merit it. The other pairs of questions dealt with whether the administrators thought librarians' duties were similar to the duties of instructional faculty and whether the administrators believed librarians would have greater difficulty in achieving tenure if they had to meet the same criteria as do instructional faculty. The responses to the latter pair of questions (and the responses to other background questions asked during the interviews and in the questionnaires) may help explain the administrators' answers to the first pair of questions.

As seen in Tables 2 and 3, of the three groups of administrators the library directors were the most likely to believe the benefits of librarian faculty status outweigh the disadvantages to a university, while the academic affairs officers surveyed by English are least likely to so believe. More important, not only did the opinions of the two groups surveyed for this study vary significantly from the opinions of English's respondents, but 74 of the 122 (60.7%) of the administrators at the Doctorate-Granting Universities I and

II, library directors and academic affairs officers alike, agreed that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Thus it appears plausible to suppose that experiences with librarian faculty status at the Doctorate-Granting I and II institutions have been somewhat more positive than those at research universities where English's respondents worked.

On the other hand, Tables 8 and 9 show that a majority of all three groups of administrators believe librarians do not merit the faculty status held by the instructional faculty, even though the administrators in this study were significantly more likely than expected to believe librarians merit that status. That a bare majority of library directors rejected the idea may be the most surprising of the three sets of responses to the question. If any of the groups might be expected to believe librarians merit faculty status, it is the library directors.

Is it possible to reconcile the apparently anomalous beliefs of this study's respondents, i.e., most agree that the advantages of librarian faculty status outweigh the disadvantages but most disagree that librarians merit exactly the same faculty status that is held by the instructional faculty? Perhaps the beliefs can be reconciled by observing that the respondents believed librarians did not merit the same status as instructional faculty. This suggests that faculty status proponents might be most successful advocating

a modified form of faculty status, one that includes the Standards which most institutions appear to accept, and justifying that status on the basis of pragmatism ("improving librarians' morale") rather than on merit ("the duties of librarians mean librarians deserve full faculty status").

The responses to the second pair of questions summarized in Tables 4 through 7 lend some support to this suggestion. When a large majority of library directors and academic affairs officers think the duties of librarians and instructional faculty are more dissimilar than similar, and that librarians would find it considerably harder to meet the instructional faculty's tenure criteria than typical librarian tenure criteria, it appears unlikely they could be persuaded to adopt full librarian faculty status on the basis of librarians' duties.

This theory is apparently confirmed by the responses of the academic affairs officers to the background faculty status questions asked during the phone interviews and in the questionnaire. In these questions, the administrators were asked to indicate on a five point Likert scale the extent of their agreement or disagreement with statements about librarian faculty status. Many of the statements were quotes from some of English's respondents, while other statements represented commonly-held beliefs about faculty status found in other professional literature. The administrators were

also invited to expand upon their answers in the hope that further commentary would clarify the contexts in which their opinions had been formed and strengthened. Table 24 summarizes these responses.

Table 24. Statements About Faculty Status for Librarians.

A. Faculty status tends to attract a better qualified, more academically-oriented professional to library service.

13	27	8	9	0
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

B. Faculty status tends to improve the morale and self-esteem of librarians, giving them a closer feeling of belonging to the university, rather than feeling like second-class citizens.

20	30	5	2	0
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

C. Faculty status is an effective recruiting device, attracting many qualified applicants for the institution's professional librarian positions.

10	28	11	7	1
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

D. Faculty status tends to prompt the acceptance of librarians as professional peers by faculty members in other disciplines.

11	15	6	20	5
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Table 24. Continued.

E. Faculty status tends to motivate librarians to act responsibly, exhibit a professional attitude toward their duties, and develop research programs.

2	21	11	18	5
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

F. Faculty status opens the way for librarians to participate in all faculty curriculum deliberations and thus understand the course and direction of university academic policy.

5	26	2	19	4
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

G. Librarians have difficulty in meeting traditional standards of teaching and scholarship due to having different basic responsibilities from other faculty members.

28	22	2	5	0
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

H. Faculty status actually harms librarians' morale because certain terms and conditions of employment are inevitably imposed which librarians find neither advantageous nor desirable.

2	15	14	18	7
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

I. Non-librarian faculty members tend to reject the idea that librarians should be considered faculty.

3	21	16	15	2
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

J. The need for librarians with faculty status to perform faculty duties means that the librarians have less time to perform the library duties essential to the proper functioning of the library.

3	21	9	20	4
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

What seems most striking about these responses is that once again most administrators agreed with statements which indicated that librarian faculty status yielded practical benefits (note items A, B, C, and F), even though they generally thought librarians would have considerable difficulty meeting instructional faculty tenure criteria (note item H). Thus the pattern seems to be clear and consistent.

Not unexpectedly, the academic affairs officers interviewed by phone tended to be more willing to elaborate on their opinions, but the additional comments from both the interviewees and those who filled out questionnaires were quite similar. The majority agreed that librarians' morale is a key issue, and some form of faculty status may be useful if it makes the librarians feel more comfortable and motivated. However, many respondents pointed out that faculty status itself would not bring about all of the desired goals. For example, librarians' salaries are more likely to be driven by supply and demand rather than faculty status, just as the salaries of English faculty tend to be lower than the salaries of engineering faculty because English faculty are not in the same demand as are the engineering faculty. Further, many respondents felt that other faculty status goals, e.g., librarian participation in curricular planning and cooperative relations between

librarians and instructional faculty, could be promoted without adopting full librarian faculty status. Finally, people did not agree that librarian faculty status leads to a greater likelihood of librarians performing responsibly and professionally. But most important were the comments which confirmed the respondents' beliefs that librarians might deserve a kind of faculty status but do not merit the same status that is typically held by instructional faculty.

The academic affairs officers stressed the general lack of classroom teaching and research functions as the primary reasons why librarians do not qualify for full faculty status. They felt that it is difficult to evaluate the tenure resumes of librarians because they did not resemble the kinds of records normally submitted by instructional faculty. For example, a number of respondents characterized as "demonstrating, not teaching" those librarian functions which some have argued constitutes teaching. Also, librarians tend not to receive teaching evaluations of the kind frequently given to instructors.

Due to these and similar evaluation problems, several administrators echoed a comment that English received from some of his respondents, that tenure criteria had to be modified or relaxed for librarians. However, other administrators asserted that the idea of one set of tenure criteria for all faculty is a myth, that there are often

substantive differences between the tenure criteria applied to various campus faculties. Examples that were cited included the cases of Extension agents who hold faculty status but are not judged by all of the "traditional" tenure criteria, and faculty members in the performing arts disciplines. In addition, many administrators said it would be inappropriate to hold librarians to traditional tenure criteria due to the time constraints imposed by librarians' schedules. Therefore, the fact that different tenure criteria might be necessary for librarians is not by itself necessarily a disqualifying factor for faculty status.

Nevertheless, most of the respondents still maintained that the responsibilities of librarians are too different for them to be considered for the same faculty status that instructional faculty have. They believed the overall educational goals might be the same but the methods for achieving those goals were quite different. Many tended to regard librarians as being more like administrators than like faculty. Others described librarians as professional information specialists who help students learn to use library resources just as some computer center personnel teach students how to use hardware and software as other kinds of educational resources.

In short, the additional comments of most of the academic affairs officers clarified their reasons for

thinking librarians should have a modified form of full faculty status. In terms of what the administrators' opinions might mean for the future of the faculty status movement, it is worth reiterating the suggestion that faculty status proponents might be most persuasive when arguing for a variation of full faculty status based on pragmatic justifications. While that might be an unsatisfactory compromise to faculty status proponents, others might prefer to believe that the opinions of the academic affairs officers confirm the above-cited assertion of one of the ACRL Academic Status Committee chairpersons, that the struggle was worthwhile even if the issues were not framed correctly. Put another way, perhaps the war has been won, even if the battle was lost. Three of the Academic Status Committee chairpersons pointed out that many of the SFSCUL are commonly found at universities while the others, even tenure, may not be necessary or even helpful to librarians, and there was a general feeling among the administrators that librarians had made great strides in gaining the respect of their campus colleagues by being among the most innovative of university employees. As one respondent put it, "the most successful librarians are those who have close contact with the faculty, stay current in librarianship trends, and take the initiative in reaching out to their public."

Hypotheses 3 and 4 -

These questions attempted to elicit a rough measure of the way in which the experiences of library directors with faculty status have influenced their opinions on the subject. Hypothesis 4 could not be analyzed statistically because not enough respondents had been library directors during changes away from the SFSCUL for the data to meet the Chi square requirement that 80% of all expected frequencies be greater than or equal to five. However, a test was performed of the more general hypothesis that belief that librarians merit the instructional faculty's status is independent of having been library directors during any status changes, but as Table 13 shows the null hypothesis must be retained. Those who were library directors during status changes were not significantly more or less likely than other directors to believe librarians merit the instructional faculty's status.

The test of hypothesis 3 provided a more interesting case. As seen in Table 11, a statistically significant majority of the respondents (fifty-five of sixty-nine, or 79.7%) said all of their experiences with faculty status had not changed their opinion about whether librarians merit that status. Taken in conjunction with the fact that thirty-four library directors believed librarians merit faculty status and thirty-five did not, this finding seems to indicate that library directors' allegiance or opposition to librarian

faculty status tend to be philosophical positions that are not often altered by experience.

However, in the fourteen cases where experience did result in a change of opinion, only one director (7.1%) had decided librarians did merit faculty status while nine (64.3%) decided they did not and four (28.6%) could no longer reach a decision. Apparently if experience with faculty status does have an effect on opinions it is more likely to change proponents into opponents than the other way around.

Hypotheses 8 and 9 -

These research questions were intended to test the general theory that librarians would encounter greater difficulties in achieving tenure than would instructional faculty, especially when librarians have full-year contracts and must meet publication requirements. Unfortunately, the tenure-approval data received were not sufficient to test geographic region, academic-year contract, or public-versus-private institution as independent variables. However, the data did prove to be very revealing and may have made the lack of academic-year librarian data moot.

Tables 16 through 18 show that at the responding universities, librarians have achieved tenure at rates that are almost identical to the success rates of instructional faculty. This is true whether all librarians are compared to

all faculty from the same institutions, whether only librarians required to publish are compared with the faculty at their institutions, or whether librarians not required to publish are compared with the faculty at their institutions. With that in mind, obviously librarians required to publish achieved tenure at the same rates as librarians not required to publish, as seen in Table 20.

At first glance it appears that the requirement to show evidence of research and publication has not been a major factor in preventing librarians from achieving tenure. It may also be fair to speculate that contract type does not interfere unduly with the librarians' efforts to achieve tenure since all of the librarians held the full-year contracts that many feared would be impediments. However, two caveats are in order before drawing such conclusions.

First, nothing in the study's findings gives any indication of how much harder librarians with full-year contracts may have had to work than instructional faculty in order to meet tenure criteria. The cold figures in the tables say nothing about the toll on morale exacted by the personal sacrifices made by librarians which the academic-year instructional faculty do not have to make. It is just these sacrifices to which faculty status skeptics point.

Second, the data do not indicate whether poor publication record is more likely to be the cause of

librarians being rejected for tenure than it is for instructional faculty. It is important to recall the anecdotal reports of tenure difficulties at research universities reported by the ACRL Academic Status Committee chairpersons, English, and other researchers. Perhaps it is much more difficult for librarians (and instructional faculty, for that matter) to achieve tenure at research universities. Also, it might be that librarians whose tenure applications appear weak are not as likely to be forwarded to university tenure review committees, i.e., only the strongest librarians are reviewed for tenure. Why this should be is unclear, but these and other hypotheses should be investigated.

Nevertheless, in spite of the caveats it is important to note that the tenure approval data reported herein are very similar to the data found in the research by Mitchell and Swieszkowski. The librarians in their study were approved for tenure at a rate of 81.5%, whereas the librarians in this study were approved at a rate of 85%. Thus the only tenure-approval data available show that, at whatever personal cost, librarians have been gaining tenure at rates that are similar to the approval-rates of the instructional faculty at the same universities. In addition, research into librarian and instructional faculty work habits by Boice, Scepanski, and Wilson (1987) indicated that <u>both</u> groups have difficulty

finding time for research, and yet in the opinion of the researchers both groups also evidenced sufficient time for scholarship. Unless research at other kinds of institutions shows the librarians are not similarly competitive in achieving tenure, this study's findings should enable future faculty status debates to place less emphasis on fears that librarians are unable to meet tenure criteria and concentrate instead on the relevant philosophical justifications.

Hypothesis 10 -

After a careful review of the professional literature, the interviews with the five chairpersons of the ACRL Academic Status Committee, and phone conversations with various staff members of the ACRL offices, the researcher could find no cases where the ACRL had imposed its sanctions against universities violating the SFSCUL. The researcher did find one report in the professional literature where an investigative committee of the American Library Association censured a small private Minnesota college for, among other things, non-compliance with the Standards, but the committee did not even mention the sanctions, much less impose them (American Library Association, 1978).

Why have the sanctions never been imposed when numerous studies have shown widespread violation of at least some of the Standards? Why were the sanctions not imposed in the

case of the Minnesota college, where the investigating committee held that non-compliance with the SFSCUL was part of the reason a librarian had been fired without due process? Some of the chairpersons speculated that no one had ever asked, or known who to ask, to have a university investigated for non-compliance. One stated that the sanctions would never be imposed because the ACRL and its parent organization, the ALA, are unable to deal with any legal actions that might result. Most of the chairpersons agreed the sanctions would probably not be effective or enforceable, and would be ignored. Another answer to the questions about the sanctions never having been used came from the chairperson who had served on the committee that investigated the Minnesota college. She believed that any attempt to impose the sanctions would be a violation of the association's nonprofit, tax exempt status. However, attempts to confirm this opinion through discussions with ACRL officers were unsuccessful.

Whatever is the true reason for the sanctions having never been imposed, in light of the chairpersons' beliefs that the sanctions could serve no useful purpose it appears that if the ACRL wishes to promote the SFSCUL it might be better off relying on persuasion.

This study will now conclude with a summary of findings and proposals for future research.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Before stating the study's conclusions it will be useful to summarize the study's findings which provided the basis for the conclusions:

- A substantial number of the sample universities did not comply, or complied to a limited extent, with several of the SFSCUL;
- there has been no significant trend toward or away from the adoption of the SFSCUL in the past three years;
- five librarians who chaired the ACRL Academic Status Committee since the adoption of the SFSCUL agreed that the faculty status movement has lost some of its impetus and direction;
- most of the surveyed library directors and academic affairs officers believed the advantages to a university of librarian faculty status outweighed the disadvantages, but most of the administrators also believed librarians do not merit the same faculty status as is held by the instructional faculty;
- most of the surveyed library directors said they did not alter their original beliefs about whether librarians merit the instructional faculty's status as a result of actual

experiences with librarian faculty status, although where experience with faculty status does have an effect on opinions it is more likely to change proponents into opponents than the other way around;

- librarians who had to show evidence of research and publication were just as likely to achieve tenure as were instructional faculty and librarians who were not required to publish;
- the ACRL sanctions against institutions that do not comply with the SFSCUL have never been imposed and, in the opinion of the five Academic Status Committee chairpersons interviewed for this study, could probably not be enforced or effective;
- the telephone survey method yielded slightly more detailed and informative responses from the academic affairs administrators than did the mail survey.

From these findings the researcher concludes the following:

1. The commitment of academic librarians to full implementation of the ACRL SFSCUL is weak. The findings of previous studies, confirmed by this study, that most universities do not comply with several Standards have not caused academic librarians to call for the sanctions to be enforced or resulted in a trend toward adopting the Standards

that remain to be implemented.

2. Most academic affairs administrators have not been convinced by the arguments of full faculty status proponents that academic librarians merit the same status as instructional faculty. Unless they can construct more persuasive arguments, the faculty status proponents may need to find conclusive evidence showing that full faculty status leads to improved library service before they can hope to change the academic administrators' minds.

3. While librarians' tenure criteria might appropriately take into consideration the librarians' work schedules and duties, there is only weak anecdotal evidence to show that publication requirements are preventing librarians from earning tenure at similar rates as the instructional faculty. The findings of this study show the contrary, that librarians at the sampled institutions are earning tenure at almost identical rates as the instructional faculty, regardless of whether the librarians are required to publish.

4. The SFSCUL sanctions should be abolished due to the ACRL's lack of will to enforce them.

5. When resources permit, the telephone survey method should be used in future studies which try to elicit the opinions of academic affairs officers about faculty status for librarians.

The following are research questions which, if answered in the future, would contribute considerably to the understanding of librarian faculty status issues:

1. Where institutions are only in partial compliance with a certain SFSCUL, what is the nature of the partial compliance?
2. What are the most frequent reasons for university libraries not having a collegial form of governance? Are library directors less likely to favor such a system than are other librarians?
3. How many university libraries lack a peer review process? Why is such a process not in place?
4. How many university libraries do not allow their librarians maximum latitude for fulfilling their professional duties? Why is this Standard not being observed?
5. What is the level of support for the SFSCUL among librarians who are not directors? Have their opinions been modified by direct experience with librarian faculty status?
6. Do tenure-track librarians have to make personal sacrifices to achieve tenure that instructional faculty usually do not have to make? What are the implications of these sacrifices for the morale of the librarians and their views on librarian faculty status?
7. Are librarians more or less likely to be rejected for tenure by department-level review committees than are instructional faculty? If either is so, why?

8. Are tenure-track librarians less likely to gain promotions than are instructional faculty at the same institutions? If so, why?

9. Are the tenure criteria for librarians required to publish usually different from the instructional faculty's tenure criteria in any important respects, including non-publishing criteria?

10. How does continuous employment differ from tenure in terms of responsibilities, privileges, benefits, and the criteria necessary to earn it? Do continuous employment statuses vary too much to be considered as a single classification?

11. What role has faculty status played in the career development of prominent leaders in the field of librarianship?

12. Research similar to that carried out in this study is needed at colleges and universities in other Carnegie classifications in order to advance knowledge about librarian faculty status in American higher education.

LITERATURE CITED

Academic Status. (1972). American Libraries, 3, 5.

Ackerman, P. (1980). Governance and Academic Libraries. Library Research, 2, 3-28.

Alward, E. (1982). Must it be autocracy or chaos? Journal of Academic Librarianship, 8, 30-31.

American Association of University Professors. (1984). Academic freedom and tenure, 1940 statement of principles and 1970 interpretive comments. In Policy documents and reports (pp.3-9). Washington, D. C.: Author.

American Library Association, Staff Committee on Mediation, Arbitration, and Inquiry. (1978). SCMAI case report. American Libraries, 9, 54-58.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Academic Status Committee. (1972). Standards for faculty status for college and university librarians: revision. College and Research Libraries News, 33, 210-212.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (1981). Academic status survey. College and Research Libraries News, 42, 171.

Association of Research Libraries. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. (1980). The status of librarians in ARL libraries: an overview. (SPEC Kit no. 61). Washington: Author.

Atelsek, F. J., & Gomberg, I. L. (1980). Tenure practices at four-year colleges and universities. Washington: American Council on Education.

Axford, H. W. (1975). [Editorial]. College and Research Libraries News, 36, 70-71.

Axford, H. W. (1977). The three faces of Eve: or the identity of academic librarianship. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2, 276-278.

Bailey, M. J. (1976). Some effects of faculty status on supervision in academic libraries. College and Research Libraries, 37, 48-52.

Batt, F. (1985). Faculty status for academic librarians: justified or just a farce? In P. Spyers-Duran and T. W. Mann, Jr. (Eds.), Issues in academic librarianship (pp. 115-128). Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood.

Battin, P. (1984). The library: center of the restructured university. College and Research Libraries, 45, 170-176.

Bechtel, J. M. (1985). Academic professional status: an alternative for librarians. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 11, 289-292.

Benedict, M. A., Gavryck, J. A., & Selvin, H. C. (1983). Status of academic librarians in New York state. College and Research Libraries, 44, 12-19.

Bentley, S. (1978). Collective bargaining and faculty status. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, 75-81.

Bergen, D. P. (1963). Librarians and the bipolarization of the academic enterprise. College and Research Libraries, 24, 467-480.

Biggs, M. (1981). Sources of tension and conflict between librarians and faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 182-201.

Blackburn, R. T. (1968). College libraries - indicted failures: some reasons - and a possible remedy. College and Research Libraries, 29, 171-177.

Blake, F. M. (1968). Tenure for the academic librarian. College and Research Libraries, 29, 502-504.

Blake, F. M. (1970). Faculty status: where it's at. American Libraries, 1, 767-768.

Blake, F. M. (1973). [Letter to the editor]. College and Research Libraries, 34, 159-160.

Bloomfield, M. (1966). The writing habits of librarians. College and Research Libraries, 27, 109-119.

Boice, R., Scepanski, J. M., & Wilson, W. (1987). Librarians and faculty members: coping with pressures to publish. College and Research Libraries, 48, 494-503.

Boughter, V. R. (1958). Salaries, work week, vacations, benefits, and privileges of college librarians. College and Research Libraries, 19, 126-128.

Branscomb, L. C. (1965). Tenure for professional librarians on appointment at colleges and universities. College and Research Libraries, 26, 297-298, 341.

Branscomb, L. C. (Ed.). (1970). The case for faculty status for academic librarians. Chicago: American Library Association.

Bridegam, W. (1978). A research requirement for librarians? Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, 135-136.

Briscoe, P., Bodtke-Roberts, A., Douglas, N., Heinold, M., Koller, N., & Peirce, R. (1986). Ashurbanipal's enduring archetype: thoughts on the library's role in the future. College and Research Libraries, 47, 121-126.

Brody, C. T. (1986). Faculty status for academic librarians: the dream and the reality. Bookmark, 45, 42-47.

Brown, H. G. (1940). College librarians are not teachers. Library Journal, 65, 910-911.

Budd, J. (1982). Librarians are teachers. Library Journal, 107, 1944-1947.

Budd, J., & Coutant, P. (1981). Faculty perceptions of librarians: a survey. Washington, D. C.: Education Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 697).

Bundy, M. L., & Wasserman, P. (1968). Professionalism reconsidered. College and Research Libraries, 29, 5-26.

Burlingame, D. F., & Repp, J. (1981). Factors associated with academic librarians' publishing in the 70s: prologue for the 80s. In M. D. Kathman & V. F. Massman (Eds.), Options for the 80s: Proceedings of the Second National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries (pp. 395-404). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI.

Byerly, G. (1980). The faculty status of academic librarians in Ohio. College and Research Libraries, 41, 422-429.

Cameron, D. F., & Heim, P. (1974). Librarians in higher education: their compensation structures for the academic year 1972-73. Washington, D. C.: Council on Library Resources.

Campbell, J. D. (1977). Publish or perish, library-style. Wilson Library Bulletin, 52, 250.

Cargile, A. C. (1973). A survey of the academic status of librarians in North Carolina's colleges and universities. North Carolina Libraries, 31, 20-22.

Carnegie Foundation's classifications of more than 3,300 institutions of higher education. (1987, July 8). Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 22-30.

Cassata, M. B. (1970). Teach-in:the academic librarian's key to status? College and Research Libraries, 31, 22-27.

Cieslicki, D. H. (1982). A new status model for academic librarians. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 8, 76-81.

Cook, M. K. (1981). Rank, status, and contribution of academic librarians as perceived by the teaching faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. College and Research Libraries, 42, 214-223.

Davey, N., & Andrews, T. (1978). Implications of faculty status for university librarians, with special attention to tenure. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, 71-74.

Davidson, R., Thorson, C. C., & Stine, D. (1983). Faculty status for librarians: querying the troops. College and Research Libraries, 44, 414-420.

Davidson, R., Thorson, C. C., & Trumpeter, M. C. (1981). Faculty status for librarians in the Rocky Mountain region: a review and analysis. College and Research Libraries, 42, 203-213.

DeBoer, K., & Culotta, W. (1987). The academic librarian and faculty status in the 1980s: a survey of the literature. College and Research Libraries, 48, 215-223.

DePew, J. N. (1983). The ACRL standards for faculty status: panacea or placebo. College and Research Libraries, 44, 407-413.

DePriest, R. (1973). That inordinate passion for status. College and Research Libraries, 34, 150-158.

DeVinney, G. (1986). Academic librarians and academic freedom in the United States: a history and analysis. Libri, 36, 24-39.

Dickinson, D. W. (1978). Some reflections on participative management in libraries. College and Research Libraries, 39, 253-262.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: Wiley.

Ditzion, S. H. (1947). College librarians and the higher learning. College and Research Libraries, 8, 50-53.

Dougherty, R. M. (1975). Faculty status - a sharp two-edged sword. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1, 3.

Douglass, R. R. (1957). The personality of the librarian. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Dow, R. F. (1977). Academic librarians: a survey of benefits and responsibilities. College and Research Libraries, 38, 218-220.

Downs, R. B. (1954). Are college and university librarians academic? College and Research Libraries, 15, 9-14.

Downs, R. B. (1957). The current status of university library staffs. College and Research Libraries, 18, 375-385.

Downs, R. B. (1958). The status of American college and university librarians. Chicago: American Library Association.

Downs, R. B. (1960). The place of librarians in colleges and universities. North Carolina Libraries, 18, 34-41.

Downs, R. B. (1964). Status of university librarians - 1964. College and Research Libraries, 25, 253-258.

Downs, R. B. (1968). Status of academic librarians in retrospect. College and Research Libraries, 29, 253-258.

Drucker, P. F. (1976). Managing the public service institution. College and Research Libraries, 37, 4-14.

Emmick, N. J. (1984). Release time for professional development : how much time for research? In S. C. Dodson & G. L. Menges (Eds.), Academic libraries: Myths and realities (pp. 129-134). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

English, T. G. (1983). Librarian status in the eighty-nine U.S. academic institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982. College and Research Libraries, 44, 199-211.

English, T. G. (1984). Administrators' views of library personnel status. College and Research Libraries, 45, 189-195.

Ferguson, G. A. (1981). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Forgotson, J. (1961) A staff librarian views the problem of status. College and Research Libraries, 22, 275-281, 306.

Frey, J. H. (1983). Survey research by telephone. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Galloway, R. D. (1967). Academic benefits for academic librarians. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 53, 61-63.

Galloway, R. D. (1979). Status or stasis: academic librarians ten years later. American Libraries, 10, 349-352.

Gates, H. R. (1972). The academic status illusion and the nine-month contract. Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly, 36, 3-6.

Geahigan, P., Nelson, H., Saunders, S., & Woods, L. (1981). Acceptability of non-library/information science publications in the promotion and tenure of academic librarians. College and Research Libraries, 42, 571-575.

Gelfand, M. A. (1948). The college librarian in the academic community. College and Research Libraries, 10, 129-134, 139.

Goode, W. J. (1967). The librarian: from occupation to profession. American Library Association Bulletin, 61, 544-555.

Gore, D. (1971). Faculty status for the librarians at Arbuthnot. American Libraries, 2, 283-295.

Goudy, F. W., & Goudy, A. W. (1988). The dilemma of library faculty workload: one solution. Library Administration and Management, 2, 36-39.

Gray, B. B., & McReynolds, R. (1983). A comparison of academic librarians with and without faculty status in the southeast. College and Research Libraries, 44, 283-287.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hamlin, A. T. (1981). The university library in the United States: Its origins and development. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Hawkins, J. A., Burlinson, C., Karimkhani, D., & Russell, K. (1978). The status of status: the status of librarians in Texas academic libraries. Washington, D. C.: Education Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 178 042).

Hegg, J. L. (1986). Faculty status: some expected and some not-so-expected findings. Journal of Library Administration, 6(4), 67-79.

Hendrick, C. (1986). The university library in the twenty-first century. College and Research Libraries, 47, 127-131.

Hendricks, D. D. (1982). Faculty status and participative governance in academic libraries. In G. B. McCabe, B. Kreissman, & W. C. Jackson (Eds.), Advances in library administration and organization, vol. 1 (pp. 127-137). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI.

Henry, W. E. (1911). The academic standing of college library assistants and their relation to the Carnegie Foundation. American Library Association Bulletin, 5, 258-262.

Hintz, C. W. E. (1968). Criteria for appointment to and promotion in academic rank. College and Research Libraries, 29, 341-346.

Holbrook, F. (1968). The faculty image of the academic librarian. Southeastern Librarian, 18, 174-193.

Holley, E. G. (1976). Academic libraries in 1876. College and Research Libraries, 37, 15-47.

Houser, L., & Schrader, A. M. (1978). The search for a scientific profession. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow.

Hyman, R., & Schlachter, G. (1973). Academic status: who wants it? College and Research Libraries, 34, 472-478.

Isaac, F. (1983). Librarian, scholar, or author? The librarian's new dilemma. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 9, 216-220.

Jackson, B. J. (1977). Status of academic librarians in Louisiana. Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, 39, 99-104.

Jenkins, D. L., Cook, M. K., & Fox, M. A. (1981). Research development of academic librarians: one university's approach. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 7, 83-86.

Jesse, W. H., & Mitchell, A. E. (1968). Professional staff opportunities for study and research. College and Research Libraries, 29, 87-100.

Joint Committee on College Library Problems. (1972). Joint statement on faculty status of college and university librarians. College and Research Libraries, 33, 209-210.

Josey, E. J. (1971). Toward a solution of faculty status for college and university librarians. The Bookmark, 30, 214-218.

Josey, E. J. (1972). Full faculty status this century. Library Journal, 97, 984-989.

Kellam, W. P., & Barker, D. L. (1968). Activities and opportunities of university librarians for full participation in the educational enterprise. College and Research Libraries, 29, 195-199.

Kister, K. (1971). A view from the front. Library Journal, 96, 3283-3288.

Knapp, P. B. (1955). The college librarian: sociology of a professional specialization. College and Research Libraries, 16, 66-72.

Knapp, P. B. (1959). College teaching and the college library. Chicago: American Library Association.

Krausse, S. C., & Sieburth, J. F. (1985). Patterns of authorship in library journals by academic librarians. The Serials Librarian, 9(3), 127-138.

Krieger, T. (1978). Calling a bull "cow" won't get you milk, or is too much of a good thing, good? Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, 130-131.

Lancaster, F. W. (1985). The paperless society revisited. American Libraries, 16, 553-555.

Lawson, V. L. (1987). Faculty status of academic librarians in Missouri. Show-Me Libraries, 38, 3-8.

Littleton, I. T. (1971). The current status of university librarians in ASERL libraries. Southeastern Librarian, 21, 25-35.

Lundy, F. A. (1951). Faculty rank of professional librarians. College and Research Libraries, 12, 11-19, 109-122.

Lyle, G. (1963). The president, the professor, and the college library. New York: H. W. Wilson.

Madan, R., Hetler, E., & Strong, M. (1968). The status of librarians in four-year state colleges and universities. College and Research Libraries, 29, 381-386.

Maloy, M. C. (1939). Faculty status of college librarians. American Library Association Bulletin, 33, 232-233, 302.

Manchikes, A., & Crabb, G. (1976). A survey of faculty status policies in Kentucky and surrounding states. Southeastern Librarian, 26, 219-225.

Marchant, M. P. (1969). Faculty-librarian conflict. Library Journal, 94, 2886-2889.

Mason, E. (1972). A short happy view of our emulation of faculty. College and Research Libraries, 33, 445-446.

Mason, E. (1973). [Letter to the editor]. College and Research Libraries, 34, 224.

Massman, V. F. (1969). Considerations regarding faculty status. Mountain-Plains Library Quarterly, 14, 7-9.

Massman, V. F. (1972). Faculty status for librarians. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow.

Matzek, R. A. (1970). Academic status for librarians - standards and sanctions. Connecticut Libraries, 12, 15-18, 24.

McAnally, A. M. (1957). The dynamics of securing academic status. College and Research Libraries, 18, 386-395.

McAnally, A. M. (1963). Privileges and obligations of academic status. College and Research Libraries, 24, 102-108.

McAnally, A. M. (1971). Status of the university librarian in the academic community. In J. Orne (Ed.), Research librarianship (pp. 19-50). New York: R. R. Bowker.

McCabe, G. B., & Gamaluddin, C. E. (1988). Committees with clout: a case for shared management in an academic library. Library Administration and Management, 2, 24-27.

McMillen, J. A. (1940). Academic status of library staff members of large universities. College and Research Libraries, 1, 138-139.

Meskill, V. D., & Meskill, L. D. (1975). Let's consider the faculty status of librarians. Educational Horizons, 53, 176-180.

Meyer, R. W. (1980). Library professionalism and the democratic way. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 6, 279.

Meyer, R. W. (1981). Faculty status and academic librarians: are there second thoughts? North Carolina Libraries, 39, 41-47.

Mitchell, W. B., & Swieszkowski, L. S. (1985). Publication requirements and tenure approval rates: an issue for academic librarians. College and Research Libraries, 46, 249-255.

Montanelli, D. S., & Stenstrom, P. F. (1986). The benefits of research for academic librarians and the institutions they serve. College and Research Libraries, 47, 482-485.

Moriarty, J. H. (1970). Academic in deed. College and Research Libraries, 31, 14-17.

Morrison, P. (1969). The career of the academic librarian. Chicago: American Library Association.

Muller, R. H. (1953). Faculty rank for library staff members in medium-sized universities and colleges. American Association of Univesity Professors Bulletin, 29, 421-431.

Muller, R. H. (1970). Institutional dynamics of faculty status for librarians. In L. C. Branscomb (Ed.), The case for faculty status for academic librarians (pp. 30-41). Chicago: American Library Association.

Negherbon, V. R. (1964). Faculty rank and faculty status among librarians. Catholic Library World, 35, 551-553.

Oboler, E. M. (1973). [Letter to the editor]. College and Research Libraries, 34, 69-70.

Organizations endorsing the joint statement on faculty status. (1977) College and Research Libraries News, 38, 31-32.

Parker, J. C. (1972). Faculty status and the academic work year. California Librarian, 33, 143-149.

Payne, J., & Wagner, J. (1984). Librarians, publication, and tenure. College and Research Libraries, 45, 133-139.

Peele, D. (1984). Librarians as teachers: some reality, mostly myth. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 10, 267-271.

Perrault, J. M. (1966). What is academic status? College and Research Libraries, 27, 207-210, 232.

Pierson, R. M. (1967). [Letter to the editor]. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 53, 249-250

Pierson, R. M. (1971). The proposed standards for faculty status: a dissenting opinion. College and Research Libraries News, 32, 121-125.

Pontius, J. E., Swinton, C. W., & van Antwerp, F. J. (1978). Faculty status, research requirements, and release time. Washington, D. C.: Education Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 183 147)

Pourciau, L. J., Jr. (1975). The status of American academic librarians: an inquiry into the logic in use in the literature. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 2468A. (University Microfilms No. 75-23, 496)

Pratt, E. C. (1940). Administrative standpoint [Letter to the editor]. Library Journal, 65, 1054.

Query, L. (1985). Librarians and teaching faculty: disparity within the system. Academe, 71, 13-16.

Ray, J. M., & Rubin, A. B. (1987). Pay equity for women in academic libraries: an analysis of ARL salary surveys, 1976/77-1983/84. College and Research Libraries, 48, 36-49.

Rayman, R., & Goudy, F. W. (1980). Research and publication requirements in university libraries. College and Research Libraries, 41, 43-48.

Reeling, P., & Smith, B. K. (1983). Faculty status: a realistic survey. New Jersey Libraries, 16, 17-25.

Reynolds, J., & Whitlatch, J. B. (1976). Experiences with faculty status in academic libraries. California Librarian, 37, 32-35.

Robinson, O. H. (1876). Proceedings. American Library Journal, 1, 123-124.

Ryans, C. C. (1977). The academic status of the professional librarian. Ohio Library Association Bulletin, 47, 6-8.

Sawtelle, H. A. (1878). The college librarianship. Library Journal, 3, 162.

Schiller, A. R. (1969). Academic librarians' salaries. College and Research Libraries, 30, 101-111.

Schmid, T. M. (1978). Shoemaker, stick. . . Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, 136-137.

Schmidt, C. J. (1977). A letter to H. W. Axford. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2, 281-282.

Schmidt, C. J. (1979). Faculty status in academic libraries: retrospective and prospect. In R. D. Stueart & R. D. Johnson (Eds.), New horizons for academic libraries (pp. 411-417). New York: K. G. Saur.

Seibert, R. H. (1961). Status and responsibilities of academic librarians. College and Research Libraries, 22, 253-255.

Sewell, R. G. (1983). Faculty status and librarians: the rationale and the case of Illinois. College and Research Libraries, 44, 212-222.

Shank, R. (1982). New expectations from users of academic libraries. In T. Galvin & B. Lynch (Eds.), New directions for higher education: Priorities for academic libraries, 39 (pp. 25-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharma, P. (1981). A survey of academic librarians and their opinions related to nine-month contracts and academic status configurations in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi. College and Research Libraries, 42, 561-570.

Shiflett, O. L. (1981). Origins of American academic librarianship. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Shores, L. (1934). Library education. Library Journal, 59, 460-461.

Smith, E. (1970). Academic status for college and university librarians - problems and prospects. College and Research Libraries, 31, 7-13.

Smith, K. F., & DeVinney, G. (1984). Peer review for academic librarians. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 10, 87-91.

Smith, K. F., Frost, T. U., Lyons, A., & Reichel, M. (1984). Tenured librarians in large university libraries. College and Research Libraries, 45, 91-98.

Spain, F. L. (1948). Faculty status of librarians in colleges and universities of the south. Papers and Proceedings, 13th Biennial Conference, Southeastern Library Association (pp. 45-53). Louisville, Kentucky: Southeastern Library Association.

Sparks, D. G. E. (1980). Academic librarianship: professional strivings and political realities. College and Research Libraries, 41, 408-421.

Sparks, R. (1975). Tenure: solution or problem. Michigan Librarian, 41, 9-10.

Stefani, J., & Smith, S. H. (1981). The status of academic librarians in Mississippi. Mississippi Libraries, 45, 10-12.

Sternberg, M. (1979). Academic library governance: what do you do after you decide to have it? The Bookmark, 38, 112-115.

Stevens, R. E. (1973). [Letter to the editor]. College and Research Libraries, 34, 159.

Stieg, L. F. (1950). Retirement plans for college and university librarians. College and Research Libraries, 11, 10-16.

Stine, D. (1982). Research release time at the University of New Mexico Library. College and Research Libraries News, 43, 380-382.

Swan, J. C. (1983). Librarians are still teachers [letter to the editor]. Library Journal, 108, 1624.

Talbot, R. J., & von der Lippe, A. (1976). Salary structures of librarians in higher education for the academic year 1975-76. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Tallau, A., & Beede, B. R. (1974). Faculty status and library governance. Library Journal, 99, 1521-1523.

Tassin, A. G. (1984). Faculty status for librarians: progress and perplex. Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, 47, 83-86.

Thompson, R. C. (1970). Crutches and crying towels. [Letter to the editor]. Library Journal, 95, 1260.

Toy, B. J. (1977). An apt summary. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2, 279-280.

University of Utah librarians lose faculty status; retain academic status. (1977, June). Mountain-Plains Library Association Newsletter, 21, 7.

University of Wyoming proposals ask librarian status change. (1985). Library Journal, 110, 20-21.

Veaner, A. B. (1985). 1985 to 1995: the next decade in academic librarianship. College and Research Libraries, 46, 209-229, 295-308.

Virginia Library Association. (1972). Results of the questionnaire on faculty status of Virginia academic librarians. Virginia Librarian, 19, 6-7.

Vosper, R. (1962). Needed: an open end career policy. American Library Association Bulletin, 56, 833-835.

Watson, P. D. (1977). Publication activity among academic librarians. College and Research Libraries, 38, 375-384.

Watson, P. D. (1985). Production of scholarly articles by academic librarians and library school faculty. College and Research Libraries, 46, 334-342.

Weber, D. C. (1966). Tenure for librarians in academic institutions. College and Research Libraries, 27, 99-102.

Werrell, E., & Sullivan, L. (1987). Faculty status for academic librarians: a review of the literature. College and Research Libraries, 48, 95-103.

Westerman, M. (1982). Salary comparisons between academic librarians and instructional faculty. College and Research Libraries, 43, 346-351.

Wiener, P. B. (1985). The right status. . . tenure. Catholic Library World, 57, 112-113.

Wilson, P. (1979). Librarians as teachers: the study of an organizational fiction. Library Quarterly, 49, 146-162.

Works, G. A. (1927). College and University Library Problems. Chicago: American Library Association.

Wright, J. (1970). Fringe benefits for academic library personnel. College and Research Libraries, 31, 18-21.

Wyer, J. I., Jr. (1920). College and university library salaries. School and Society, 11, 351-353.

Young, H. (1983). The ALA glossary of library and information science. Chicago: American Library Association.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS FOR LIBRARY DIRECTORS

1. The following are the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status. For each Standard, please circle the appropriate response to indicate whether your institution is in full, partial, or non-compliance.

a. Professional responsibilities and self determination. Each librarian should be assigned general responsibilities within his particular area of competence. He should have maximum possible latitude in fulfilling these responsibilities. However, the degree to which he has fulfilled them should be regularly and rigorously reviewed. A necessary element of this review must be appraisal by a committee of peers who have access to all available evidence.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

b. Library governance. College and university libraries should adopt an academic form of governance. The librarians should form as a library faculty whose role and authority is similar to that of the faculties of a college, or the faculty of a school or a department.
[RESEARCHER'S NOTE: This Standard refers to a collegial form of governance in which librarians have legislative power through a "librarians' council."]

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

c. College and university governance. Librarians should be eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent body at their college or university on the same basis as other faculty.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

d. Compensation. The salary scale for librarians should be the same as that for other academic categories with equivalent education and experience. Librarians should normally be appointed for the academic year. If a librarian is expected to work through the summer session, his salary scale should be adjusted similarly to the summer session scale of other faculty at his college or university. [Due to the difficulty of comparing the salaries of all faculty members, please answer FULL or PARTIAL if librarians are normally appointed for the academic year, or answer NON if librarians are normally appointed to a twelve month contract, with vacation.]

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

e. Tenure. Librarians should be covered by tenure provisions the same as those of other faculty. In the pre-tenure period, librarians should be covered by written contracts or agreements the same as those of other faculty.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

f. Promotion. Librarians should be promoted through ranks and steps on the basis of their academic proficiency and professional effectiveness. A peer review system similar to that used by other faculty is the primary basis of judgment in the promotion process for academic librarians. The librarians' promotion ladder should have the same titles, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

g. Leaves. Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians on the same basis, and with the same requirements, as they are available to other faculty.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

h. Research funds. Librarians should have access to funding for research projects on the same basis as other faculty.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

i. Academic freedom. Librarians in colleges and universities must have the protection of academic freedom. Library resources and the professional judgment of librarians must not be subject to censorship.

FULL COMPLIANCE PARTIAL COMPLIANCE NON-COMPLIANCE

2. If your librarians are appointed to tenure-track positions, must they show evidence of research and publication in order to earn tenure, as must other faculty? (Please circle the appropriate response.)

yes no librarians not tenure-track

3. Was the current status of academic librarians implemented since 1971? (Please circle the appropriate response.)

yes no don't know

4. If the answer to #3 is yes, please check whichever of the following is the more appropriate description of the current status:

Current status complies more with the ACRL Standards_____

Current status complies less with the ACRL Standards_____

5. In what year was the current status adopted? _____

Were you the library director at that time? yes no

6. The current status was adopted (circle appropriate letter)
   a. at the request of the librarians
   b. because of a decision by the university administration, which the librarians supported
   c. because of a decision by the university administration, which the librarians did not support
   d. other - please explain

7. Which, if any, of the following benefits and drawbacks do you believe accrue to a university which grants faculty status to librarians? (Please circle the star above the appropriate response.)

Faculty status tends to attract a better qualified, more academically-oriented professional to library service.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to improve the morale and self-esteem of librarians, giving them a closer feeling of belonging to the university, rather than feeling like second-class citizens.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status is an effective recruiting device, attracting many qualified applicants for the institution's professional librarian positions.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to prompt the acceptance of librarians as professional peers by faculty members in other disciplines.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to motivate librarians to act responsibly, exhibit a professional attitude toward their duties, and develop research programs.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status opens the way for librarians to participate in all faculty curriculum deliberations and thus understand the course and direction of university academic policy.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Librarians have difficulty in meeting traditional standards of teaching and scholarship due to having different basic responsibilities from other faculty members.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status actually harms librarians' morale because certain terms and conditions of employment are inevitably imposed which librarians find neither advantageous nor desirable.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Non-librarian faculty members tend to reject the idea that librarians should be considered faculty.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

The need for librarians with faculty status to perform faculty duties means that the librarians have less time to perform the library duties essential to the proper functioning of the library.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Please indicate other benefits and drawbacks below - please use additional pages if needed.

8. On balance, do you believe the advantages to the university of offering faculty status to librarians outweigh the disadvantages?
(Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

   a. the advantages outweigh the disadvantages
   b. the advantages do not outweigh the disadvantages
   c. don't know

9. To what extent do you believe the duties of librarians are similar to the duties of instructional and research faculty? (Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

   a. very similar
   b. somewhat similar
   c. somewhat dissimilar
   d. very dissimilar

10. During the past three years (1985-86, 1986-87, 1987-88), how many librarians were reviewed for tenure by your university tenure-review committee? (Do not include any applications which were considered within the library but not deemed worthy of forwarding to the university tenure-review committee.)

_____

11. How many of all of the tenure applications were successful?

_____

12. If traditional faculty performance criteria were applied evenly and stringently for all untenured faculty, do you believe untenured librarians would:

    a. find it considerably more difficult to achieve tenure
    b. find it somewhat more difficult to achieve tenure
    c. find it no more difficult to achieve tenure
    d. not applicable because we already do this

    (Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

13. The Association of College and Research Libraries Standards for Faculty Status require that academic librarians be granted the same faculty status as is granted to instructional faculty. Do you agree that librarians, by virtue of their duties, qualify for the same faculty status as is held by instructional faculty? (Please circle one)

    yes no not sure

14. Is your answer to #13 the opposite of what your opinion was prior to your experiences with faculty status for librarians?

    yes no not sure

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. Please return the form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Results of the survey will be sent to you.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICERS

FOR BOTH MAIL AND TELEPHONE SURVEYS

SURVEY OF OPINIONS ABOUT FACULTY STATUS FOR LIBRARIANS

1. Which, if any, of the following benefits and drawbacks do you believe accrue to a university which grants faculty status to librarians? (Please circle the star above the appropriate response.)

Faculty status tends to attract a better qualified, more academically-oriented professional to library service.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to improve the morale and self-esteem of librarians, giving them a closer feeling of belonging to the university, rather than feeling like second-class citizens.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status is an effective recruiting device, attracting many qualified applicants for the institution's professional librarian positions.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to prompt the acceptance of librarians as professional peers by faculty members in other disciplines.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status tends to motivate librarians to act responsibly, exhibit a professional attitude toward their duties, and develop research programs.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status opens the way for librarians to participate in all faculty curriculum deliberations and thus understand the course and direction of university academic policy.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Librarians have difficulty in meeting traditional standards of teaching and scholarship due to having different basic responsibilities from other faculty members.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Faculty status actually harms librarians' morale because certain terms and conditions of employment are inevitably imposed which librarians find neither advantageous nor desirable.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Non-librarian faculty members tend to reject the idea that librarians should be considered faculty.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

The need for librarians with faculty status to perform faculty duties means that the librarians have less time to perform the library duties essential to the proper functioning of the library.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

Please indicate other benefits and drawbacks below - please use additional pages if needed.

2. On balance, do you believe the advantages to a university of granting faculty status to librarians outweigh the disadvantages? (Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

   a. the advantages outweigh the disadvantages
   b. the advantages do not outweigh the disadvantages
   c. don't know

3. To what extent do you believe the duties of academic librarians are similar to the duties of instructional and research faculty? (Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

   a. very similar
   b. somewhat similar
   c. somewhat dissimilar
   d. very dissimilar

4. If the same faculty performance criteria were applied to librarians as is applied to all other untenured faculty, do you believe untenured librarians would:

   a. find it considerably more difficult to achieve tenure
   b. find it somewhat more difficult to achieve tenure
   c. find it no more difficult to achieve tenure
   d. not applicable because we already do this

   (Please circle the letter of the appropriate response)

5. "Librarians are qualified by virtue of their duties and abilities for the same faculty status as is held by instructional faculty." Please circle the star above the response that best describes how you feel about that statement.

*	*	*	*	*
strongly agree	agree somewhat	no opinion	disagree somewhat	strongly disagree

6. Please indicate below and on the next page the ways in which you believe librarians could contribute more fully to their university than they already do.

7. If you do not believe librarians merit faculty status, would you change your mind if they were were contributing in the ways you have indicated in 6 above? (circle one)

yes no don't know not applicable

8. Please fill in the boxes below only if your librarians hold tenure-track positions. If no librarians have been reviewed for tenure during the three years in question, please so indicate.

	In 1985-86	In 1986-87	In 1987-88
# of instructional faculty reviewed for tenure by the univ. tenure review comm.			
# of instructional faculty who were granted tenure			
# of librarians reviewed for tenure by the univ. tenure review comm.			
# of librarians who were granted tenure			

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. Please return the form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Results of the survey will be sent to you.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS FOR CHAIRPERSONS OF THE ACRL ACADEMIC STATUS COMMITTEE AND LIBRARY DIRECTORS AT SANCTIONED UNIVERSITIES

QUESTIONS FOR THE CHAIRPERSONS OF THE ACRL ACADEMIC STATUS COMMITTEE

Do you believe the faculty status movement has progressed satisfactorily since the adoption of the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians? Why or why not?

Please describe the activities which ACRL has carried out to promote the adoption of the Standards. Have these activities been effective? If so, in what ways? Are there other activities which should be tried?

When the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians were approved, the Association also adopted sanctions which might be invoked against institutions which did not comply with the Standards. Have any of these sanctions ever been imposed? If so, where?

Which Standards were being violated?

Which sanctions were imposed?

When were the sanctions imposed? Are they still in effect?

Were the sanctions effective in persuading each of the sanctioned institutions to comply with the ACRL Standards? Please summarize how the sanctions were or were not effective.

Is there any evidence to show that the use of sanctions, or the threat of the use of sanctions, has been effective in persuading institutions to adopt all of the ACRL Standards?

Several studies have documented the fact that there are many institutions which do not observe all of the ACRL Standards. Why have sanctions not been imposed on these institutions? Have other efforts been made to effect compliance at those specific institutions (as distinct from the general efforts of ACRL)?

What are the implications of the newly-proposed "Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Librarians" for the faculty status movement?

What do you think lies in the future for the faculty status movement and the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status? What should faculty status proponents hope to accomplish and how long should it take to accomplish those goals?

QUESTIONS FOR LIBRARY DIRECTORS AT UNIVERSITIES SANCTIONED BY ACRL

Which ACRL sanctions have been imposed on your institution?

What effects, if any, have the sanctions had on

a. recruitment of librarians?

b. retention of librarians?

c. the status of librarians on your campus?

What other effects, if any, have the sanctions had on your librarians and institution?

Are you in favor of faculty status for your librarians, as defined by the ACRL Standards? If yes, have the sanctions been helpful? If no, have the sanctions created any problems for you?

Are the sanctions still in effect, as far as you know?

What other comments do you have about the use of sanctions by ACRL, both at your institution and in general?

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED

Asterisks denote institutions not included in the survey of academic affairs officers.

DOCTORATE-GRANTING UNIVERSITIES I - CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

Arkansas
Claremont (Ca.)
United States International (Ca.)*
California - Santa Cruz
Denver (Co.)*
Northern Colorado
American (D.C)*
Catholic (D.C.)
Nova (Fla.)*
Georgia State
Illinois Institute of Technology
Loyola of Chicago
Northern Illinois
Ball State (Ind.)
Louisville (Ky.)*
Boston College (Mass.)
Tufts (Mass.)*
Western Michigan
Mississippi
Southern Mississippi
St. Louis (Mo.)
Montana
City U. of New York*
Fordham (NY)
St. John's (NY)
SUNY - Binghamton*
Bowling Green (Oh.)
Miami (Oh.)
Ohio
Akron (Oh.)*
Toledo (Oh)
Lehigh (Pa.)
Clemson (SC)
Memphis State (Tn.)
North Texas State
Texas Tech
Texas Women's
College of William and Mary (Va.)
Marquette (Wisc.)
Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Other institutions not included in this study:

Alabama
California - Riverside
International College (Ca.)
Notre Dame (Ind.)
Tulane (La.)
Dartmouth (NH)
Columbia Teachers (NY)
Kent State (Oh.)
Union for Experimenting Colleges and U. (Oh.)
Houston (Tx.)
Rice (Tx.)
Brigham Young (Ut.)

DOCTORATE-GRANTING UNIVERSITIES II - CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

Alabama - Birmingham
Northern Arizona
Biola (Ca.)
Loma Linda (Ca.)
Pepperdine (Ca.)
San Francisco (Ca.)*
Colorado School of Mines
Florida Atlantic
Florida Institute of Technology
South Florida
Atlanta (Ga.)*
Idaho
Idaho State
Illinois State
Indiana State*
Drake (Io.)
Louisiana Tech
New Orleans (La.)
Maine - Orono
Maryland - Baltimore
Clark (Mass.)
Northeastern (Mass.)
Andrews (Mich.)
Mississippi College
Missouri - Kansas City
Missouri - Rolla
Missouri - St. Louis*
Montana State
Nevada - Reno
New Hampshire
Rutgers - Newark*
Stevens Institute of Technology (NJ)
Adelphi (NY)
Clarkson (NY)
Hofstra (NY)
New School for Social Research (NY)
Polytechnic Institute of New York*
SUNY - Environmental Sci. and Forestry
North Carolina - Greensboro
North Dakota
North Dakota State
Cleveland State (Oh.)
Portland State (Or.)
Tulsa (Ok.)
Drexel (Pa.)
Duquesne (Pa.)
Hahnemann (Pa.)
South Dakota
Middle Tennessee St.
Tennessee Tech
Baylor (Tx.)
East Texas State
So. Methodist (Tx.)
Texas - Arlington
Texas - Dallas*
Texas Christian*
Old Dominion (Va.)*
Vermont

STRATIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS FOR THE SURVEY OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICERS: 40 INSTITUTIONS IN EACH GROUP

Mail Survey		Phone Survey
15	Doctorate-Granting I	16
25	Doctorate-Granting II	24
25	Public	25
15	Private	15
12	Tenure-Track, Publishing Required	12
5	Tenure-Track, No Publishing	6
23	Not Tenure-Track	22
9	Northeast	9
9	Southeast	10
9	Midwest	9
5	Northwest/Mountain	5
8	Southwest	7

APPENDIX E

DISCUSSION OF TELEPHONE AND MAIL SURVEY PROCEDURES

The two groups of academic affairs officers who were surveyed for this study were asked the same set of questions, but two methods of asking the questions were used. One group was asked to complete a questionnaire while the other group was asked to be interviewed by telephone. The telephone interview method has been shown to have several advantages over mail surveys, of which the following are relevant to this study: open-ended questions can be explained and the answers probed, respondents are less likely to avoid certain questions altogether, and overall response rates tend to be higher. However, in the case of this study the latter advantage proved not to hold true, although the other two advantages did.

Even the most superficial review of the returned questionnaires shows few instances where the open-ended questions were answered, whereas at least some kind of answer to those questions was given by most of the people who were interviewed by phone. Indeed, more questions of any kind were skipped by mail respondents than phone interviewees, as expected. What was not expected was the difference in response rates. There was a substantially higher response to the mail survey than to the phone survey: thirty-three of forty mail questionnaires were returned (82.5%) whereas twenty-four (60%) of the forty requested telephone interviews were granted. This is in marked contrast to the averaged

response rates that Dillman reported for Total Design Method mail and telephone surveys: 77% for mail and 91% for telephone. Since the Total Design Methods were used in this study, why was the response to the mail survey higher than the response to the telephone survey?

One possible explanation is that mail surveys do have some inherent advantages over telephone surveys, and in the case of this study those advantages outweighed the advantages which telephone surveys have over mail surveys. Some of the advantages of mail surveys can be quickly dismissed as causes of the unexpected difference in response rates. First, some are administrative or relate to data accuracy, and are thus unlikely to affect response rates, e.g., that mail surveys allow for greater question complexity, that social desirability bias is more likely to be avoided, that interviewer distortion and subversion is more likely to be avoided, and that some costs may be lower. An advantage of mail surveys that can affect response rates is question construction, but in this study there do not appear to be any of the major problems that can arise with the construction of telephone questions. First, the respondents received a copy of the questions ahead of the interview so they would be familiar and in front of the interviewees during the interview. Further, the questions were not very long, did not contain more than four response categories

except in the case of the five point Likert scale, were not items in a series, and were not used for screening.

I will offer three possible causes for the unexpected difference in response rates. All three possibilities may have cumulatively resulted in a higher mail response. One viable theory involves the kind of advance letter that this study used to request the telephone interviews. Dillman suggests two types of advance letter for use in contacting people to be interviewed. One letter describes the need for the study and in effect states "You will soon be called" about participating in the study. The other approach was the one used in this study: the advance letter asks that the recipient let the researcher know when to call for the interview. In this study a stamped, self-addressed postcard was included on which the academic affairs officers were to indicate the time and date on which they would be willing to be interviewed. This approach was chosen in recognition of the administrators' busy schedules; to call their offices without an interview appointment would in most cases have simply led to the making of an appointment at a greater expense (long distance call) than is involved in the postcard method. I believe that the cost consciousness that was necessary had an effect on the response rate because it is easier not to return a postcard (intentionally or otherwise) than it is to simply refuse an interview to someone who has

called on the telephone.

Another possible reason for the higher response rate to the mail survey is that people have more control over their time when they fill out a questionnaire than they do when they are being interviewed. While the letters of introduction to the potential mail respondents and telephone interviewees both stressed that the time required for the interview or questionnaire would be about twenty minutes, it is easier for people to stop filling out a questionnaire if they decide to do so than it is to politely terminate an interview. This lack of control which the subjects have over the interview may have been more discouraging in this study than were the factors which tend to discourage people from completing a questionnaire. This theory may run contrary to received opinion and recent research, but it seems intuitively viable to me.

A third possible explanation is that the opinions being sought in this survey were of a sensitive nature. Frey cites research that shows mail surveys obtain the lowest item non-response rate to sensitive items while telephone surveys obtain the highest. Since so many items in this study were soliciting opinions about the issue of faculty status, perhaps many of the potential interviewees chose not to respond, while the sensitive nature of the opinions seemed less important to those who received questionnaires. A

related issue is that of anonymity/confidentiality. If the items were indeed considered to be sensitive, the potential interviewees may have thought that their anonymity would not be possible in a telephone interview.

Apart from the issue of response rates, there were a couple of other interesting comparisons between the two survey methods. I was unable to discern any pattern of misunderstanding on the part of mail or telephone respondents to any questions (mostly because I had no means of independently verifying factual data or the respondents' opinions) and therefore cannot say that the opportunity to clarify questions that is afforded by telephone interviews was an advantage in this study. On the other hand, there is no doubt that I was able to seek clarification of many responses, responses which tended to be more lengthy (and thus more complete?) than those found on the mail questionnaires.

It appears that there was not a tendency for the telephone respondents to give "socially desirable" answers. Certainly the fact that most respondents did not believe librarians merited the same status as instructional faculty (33 vs. 22) is evidence that respondents were not trying to please the interviewer. Further, a Chi square test of independence on two critical questions (whether librarians merit the same status as instructional faculty, and whether

the advantages of librarian faculty status outweigh the disadvantages for a university) found that respondents' answers were independent of whether they were interviewed or responded to the mail questionnaire.

I will conclude by saying that I think Guba and Lincoln identified the most important disadvantage of interviews: they are difficult to replicate. While I cannot cite specific examples, there is little reason to doubt that the quality of my interviewing technique varied according to how I felt on a given day, how much else was on my mind, the apparent receptiveness of a given subject to the research topic, and other similar factors. While I think the interviews enhanced the quality of the study and therefore the disadvantages were outweighed, the experience of doing the interviews certainly increased my awareness of the inherent difficulties involved in the technique.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1762 10154496 1