



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

Neenah Bond

25% COTTON FIBER

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

Earl Strohmeyer
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 Strohmeier (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, Scepaniski, 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

