

The Nether World of Academic Librarians:
Issues of Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

A Dissertation submitted
to the Graduate School
Valdosta State University

in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in Curriculum and Instruction

in the Department of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology
of the Dewar College of Education

December 2009

Alan Michael Bernstein

M.L.I.S., Valdosta State University, 2003
M.A., Valdosta State University, 1995
M.Ed., Valdosta State University, 1993
B.A., Valdosta State College, 1981

© Copyright 2009 Alan Michael Bernstein

All Rights Reserved

This dissertation, "The Nether World of Academic Librarians: Issues of Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place," by Alan Michael Bernstein, is approved by:

**Dissertation
Committee
Chair**

Jane E. Zahner, Ph.D.
Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology

**Committee
Member**

Nicole M. Gibson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology

Dianne C. Dees, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology

Melanie S. Byrd, Ph.D.
Professor of History

**Dean of the College
of Education**

Philip L. Gunter, Ph.D.
Professor of Special Education

**Interim Dean of the
Graduate School**

Karla M. Hull, Ed.D.
Professor of Special Education

Fair Use

This dissertation is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 940553), revised in 1976). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of the material for financial gain without the author's expressed written permission is not allowed.

Duplication

I authorize the Head of Interlibrary Loan or the Head of Archives at the Odum Library at Valdosta State University to arrange for duplication of this dissertation for educational or scholarly purposes when so requested by a library user. The duplication shall be at the user's expense.

Signature_____

I refuse permission for this dissertation to be duplicated in whole or in part.

Signature_____

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study examined correlations between academic librarian organizational classification and sense of place (defined as job satisfaction and personal motivation) and sense of involvement with the educative mission of the institution. Further, this study examined whether there were any significant correlations between academic librarian career path and their sense of place and sense of involvement with the educative mission.

An abundance of literature on academic librarians' organizational classification maintains librarians ought to be classified as faculty with commensurate rights and privileges. An often tacit implication of this position is academic librarians classified as faculty are (or would be) happier and have a greater sense of involvement with their school's educative mission.

The study surveyed 372 academic librarians at colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. Analysis of surveys found there were no statistically significant correlations between organizational classification and sense of place or between organizational classification and sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission. Analysis of surveys further found that there were no statistically significant correlations between career path and sense of involvement with the institutional educative mission and there was a slight positive correlation between career path and sense of place.

It was concluded though there is strong support and justification for academic librarians being classified as faculty, an academic librarian's sense of place or sense of

involvement with the institutional educative mission is not dependent on such classification.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Statement of the Problem.....	3
	Theoretical Framework.....	5
	Definition of Terms.....	6
	Significance of the Study.....	10
	Limitations of the Study.....	11
	Organization of the Dissertation.....	12
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	13
	Overview.....	13
	History of the Classification Controversy.....	14
	Librarians as Respected Members of the Academic Community.....	18
	The Path to Becoming an Academic Librarian.....	19
	Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory.....	21
	Academic Librarians’ Job Satisfaction, Motivation, and Sense of Place...	24
	The Nature of Faculty Status.....	27
	The Case that Librarians Should Be Classified as Faculty.....	29
	The Case that Librarians Should Not Be Classified as Faculty.....	31
	Alternatives to Faculty Status for Academic Librarians.....	33
	Academic Librarians and Their Institutions’ Educative Mission.....	35
	Summary.....	39
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	40
	Research Questions.....	41

Research Design.....	41
Instrumentation.....	42
Participants.....	43
Data Collection.....	44
Ethical Considerations.....	44
Limitations.....	45
Quantitative Data Analysis.....	45
Qualitative Data Analysis.....	46
IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	48
Introduction.....	48
Quantitative Data Results.....	48
Additional Findings.....	62
Qualitative Data Results.....	67
Summary.....	76
V. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND OBSERVATIONS.....	77
Overview of the Study.....	77
Summary of the Findings.....	78
Conclusions.....	78
Implications and Recommendations for Further Research.....	81
Discussion and Personal Observations.....	82
REFERENCES.....	88
Appendix A: URLs of USG School Policy on Faculty Status, Tenure, and Promotion.....	102

Appendix B: Survey Instrument.....	105
Appendix C: Institutional Review Board Approval Form.....	115

LIST OF TABLES

1. Quantitative Methodological Approach to the Study's Four Research Questions.....	47
2. Frequency Counts for Selected Variables.....	50
3. Frequency Counts for Level of Education Sorted by Highest Frequency.....	53
4. Frequency Counts for Career Choice of Librarianship Sorted by Highest Frequency.....	54
5. Frequency Counts for Selected Variables Sorted by the Frequency that Respondents Answered Affirmatively.....	55
6. Descriptive Statistics for Selected Opinion Items Sorted by the Highest Mean Rating.....	56
7. Psychometric Characteristics for Summated Scale Scores.....	58
8. Correlations for Selected Variables with the Sense of Place and Sense of Involvement.....	60
9. Backward Elimination Regression Model Predicting Sense of Involvement Based on Selected Variables.....	64
10. Backward Elimination Regression Model Predicting Sense of Place Based on Selected Variables.....	66

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my entire dissertation committee. Their collective help, guidance, and support were invaluable in moving an embryonic idea to a completed project.

Jane Zahner has been a good friend, mentor, and professional colleague for many years. Her enthusiasm in agreeing to chair my committee and her persistent, patient, and precise suggestions for improvements in my dissertation throughout the project were invaluable and gratefully accepted.

Nicole Gibson helped steer me through the labyrinth of statistical methodology with seeming effortlessness. This was an enormous comfort and made the technical aspects of the dissertation flow much smoother than I had imagined they would.

Dianne Dees, as a fellow degreed librarian, understood many of the issues discussed in the study and her comments, criticisms, and suggestions for improvement were crisp, to the point, and welcomed.

Melanie Byrd, also a fellow degreed librarian, has also been a close friend for many years. Her willingness to serve as an outside reader on my committee and her valuable insights, particularly with some difficult theoretical issues, were always gratefully appreciated.

I want to thank the librarians at Odum Library and the faculty members of the MLIS program at Valdosta State University for helping me create a tighter, stronger, and more appropriate survey instrument.

As so often is the case with major research projects, the Interlibrary Loan department of Odum Library assisted me with securing many articles and books necessary for the successful completion of this study. I am grateful for their help.

My wife, Deborah S. Davis, deserves an immeasurable debt of gratitude, not merely for her putting up with my physical and mental absences from our home for what seemed an eternity during this degree program, but her enormous practical help in editing every page of this project and offering constant, valuable suggestions to strengthen the final product.

Not just out of tradition, but with all sincerity and affection, I thank my mother and father for instilling within me a true love of learning.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Debbie, for her constant encouragement, support, help, and love through a challenging and, often, difficult time. It is usually trite to say ‘I could not have done it without her.’ In this case, it is an absolute truth.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The academic librarian plays an important role in the overall mission of any university (Bell, 2000; Farber, 1999; Guskin, Stoffle, & Boisse, 1979/1980). This role is both overt in the day-to-day involvement between librarian, students, and faculty in the institution as well as subtle in the librarian's continual awareness of changes in available resources and technologies to aid the campus community (Cardina & Wicks, 2004; MacAdam, 2000). Though the academic librarian, clearly, is a vital member of the university community, his or her organizational classification in the hierarchy of the institution can be murky and this murkiness may have effects, both understated and profound, on the librarian's involvement with the library's and institution's educative mission, as well as the librarian's personal attitude, motivation, and outlook regarding his or her chosen profession (Hill, 1994; Julien & Given, 2002/2003).

This study examined classification status of academic librarians relative to (a) sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission and (b) sense of place in the academic community. Sense of place is defined in this study as the sum of job satisfaction and level of motivation. Further, this study investigated the relationship between how academic librarians *came to be* academic librarians and, again, sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission and sense of place. The specific focus of this inquiry was academic librarians working in the 35 colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia (USG).

A mixed methods approach for this research was employed involving a 36-question survey instrument that included demographic, classification, and attitudinal questions. The questions were all multiple-choice with two questions allowing for discursive follow-up. The data gleaned allowed, primarily, quantitative analysis with the survey respondents' discursive comments on select questions offering the opportunity for qualitative scrutiny.

An enormity of literature has appeared in library and librarian journals during the last 30 years on the subject of what classification academic librarians have, or should have, in the university environment (Benedict, 1991; Cary, 2001; English, 1983; Mitchell, 1989). Most of the literature, likely due to its appearance in library-related publications, support a faculty-level classification for academic librarians with the rights and privileges such status imparts (Bryan, 2007; Hill, 1994; McGowan & Dow, 1995; Welch & Mozenter, 2006). A particular theme running through many articles is librarians, insofar as they are directly involved in the educative mission of their institution through teaching and guiding students' research skills, are as professionally important in the college or university community as teaching faculty, and should be classified and remunerated as such. Batt (1985) writes, ". . . librarian functions should be recognized and rewarded for what they are: an integral part of the educational process . . ." (p. 125). One of the fundamental interests in this study was whether there were significant relationships between the classification status of academic librarians and their involvement with the elemental calling these librarians have -- participation and support for the educational missions of their institutions.

A topic addressed much more sparsely in the literature is how individuals came to be academic librarians at all. This gap may have relevance to academic librarians' opinions and beliefs regarding classification status, involvement with their institution's educative mission, and their sense of place in their institution. Many present academic librarians did not select the profession as a first career choice as they progressed through college and graduate school (Deeming & Chelin, 2001; Tucker, 2008). Indeed, there is some evidence that *many* librarians became librarians after aborted career paths in other academic or nonacademic fields (Deeming & Chelin). The relevance of this phenomenon was one worthy of pursuit and was examined in more detail, both historically in the literature review, and actively as part of the methodology in this study. Alternately, there were several interesting articles on librarians who moved into other fields of endeavor after spending time in a professional librarian capacity (e.g., Pergander, 2006; Zemon, 2002). Though this was not a central theme in this study, some examination of this phenomenon appears in the literature review as well.

Statement of the Problem

Of particular interest in this study was not the specific nature of different institutions' classification schemata for librarians, in itself, but *how* the classification affects librarians' regard for the educative mission both of the library and the institution, levels of motivation, and overall job satisfaction. The practical rudiments of having faculty classification are numerous: opportunity for tenure; opportunity for professorial promotion; opportunity for sabbatical (research) leaves of absence; generally higher salaries than university staff; and, the opportunity to serve on faculty committees, and, thus, play a role in shared university governance (Cary, 2001; DeBoer & Culotta, 1987;

Guideline for the appointment, 2005; Guidelines for academic status, 2007). The preeminent psychological component of faculty classification may be less overt than the material factors mentioned above, but is no less significant; namely, the perceived sense of having “equal status,” however that phrase is defined, to the teaching faculty on campus (Buschman, 1989; Feldman & Sciammarella, 2000; Kilpatrick, 1982).

As implied above, how the academic librarian is involved in the educative mission of his or her institution was a fundamental consideration. It is, essentially, tautological that academic librarians are part of any institution’s educative mission (Hardesty, 1995; Owusu-Ansah, 2001). The role of the librarian in providing bibliographic instruction (classes on academic research), providing access to information through varied formats, selecting the appropriate materials that fill the library shelves, and mentoring and assisting faculty and students in mastering information literacy all point to the overt role of the academic librarian in support of any college’s or university’s educative mission (Leckie & Fullerton, 1999; MacAdam, 2000). Thus, the salient point of interest in this study was not the librarian’s involvement with the educative mission but the nature or level of their *perceived* involvement with that mission. Are there connections between a librarian’s involvement with the educative mission of his or her institution and organizational classification on the college or university campus? There is some existing literature on the topic of academic librarians and involvement in institutional educative mission (e.g. Badke, 2005; Bell, 2000; Farber, 1999; Guskin, et al., 1979/80; Leckie & Fullerton, 1999; Meringolo, 2006; Owusu-Ansah, 2001; Wilkinson, 2000) but little analysis of how this involvement correlates to organizational classification or career path to becoming academic librarians. The survey instrument in

this study examines USG librarians' organizational classification (and path to their present careers) as a function of involvement in their institutions' educative mission.

According to web-based faculty handbooks of the 35 institutions comprising the USG, 27 schools regard librarians as faculty (with at least some commensurate rights and privileges). The remaining eight schools do not regard librarians as faculty but as administrative staff (see Appendix A for table of data obtained through examination of web-based faculty/staff handbooks of the 35 institutions of the USG). With a near 75/25 split in the classification of USG librarians, it was interesting to discover and analyze the attitudes of these librarians regarding their status relative to both their sense of place and how they came to the career choice of librarianship. Dimmick (1990) writes, "as long as the academic library profession remains ambiguous with part of the profession pro, part con, and part undecided, the issue [faculty status] needs to be studied and written about" (p. 28).

Theoretical Framework

A useful and applicable theory that undergirds the research questions of this study is the motivation-hygiene theory of Frederick Herzberg. In his theory (often referred to as the "two-factor" theory), Herzberg contends that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not points on the same continuum but are distinct attitudinal entities brought about by different impetuses (Herzberg, 1966). The relevance of Herzberg's theory to the nature of academic librarians' job satisfaction or dissatisfaction will be more thoroughly scrutinized in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

Definitions of Terms

Several words or phrases have particular meaning in this dissertation. For the purpose of this study, the following issue-specific terms were defined as follows:

Academic librarian. An academic librarian is a librarian holding a Masters (or higher) degree in Library Science (or, possibly, Information Science, Information Studies, or Library and Information Science) working in a university or college affiliated library. Academic librarians are distinguished, professionally, from public librarians, school/media librarians, or corporate (special) librarians.

Academic faculty. Academic faculty is defined as regular, full-time personnel at college- or university-level institutions whose regular assignments include instruction, research, and public service as a principal activity, and who hold academic rank as professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor/lecturer at the institutions.

Academic status. Academic status is a relatively recent term describing a classificatory standing taxonomically equivalent to faculty but lacking in substantive worth. Biggs (1981) calls it a “purgatorial state” (p. 195) in which librarians are classified synonymously with faculty but lack titled rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, etc.). Because many of the emoluments of faculty status are linked to their ranked state, the librarian with academic status has the title of faculty without, necessarily, the equitable pay or benefits.

Organizational classification. How an institution taxonomically arranges its employees. For purposes of this study, the specific interest is how librarians are classified in the organizational chart in their institution. In some institutions, librarians are classified the same as teaching faculty. In other institutions, they are classified the same

as administrative staff. Still, other institutions may classify librarians under some other, unique, schema.

Educative Mission. The educative mission of any college or university is the composite of academic goals, objectives, purposes, and intentions the institution desires to bring to fruition. Though the locus for fulfillment of the educative mission traditionally resides in the classroom (or laboratory, studio, etc.), teaching faculty do not have exclusivity in this area. The academic library is, plainly, an intrinsic part of any well-constructed higher education mission, if not overtly, then implicitly (Velcoff & Ferrari, 2006). The educative mission of a college or university should present a clear, centralized strategic plan that prevents employees in the institution from developing competing or contrary missions (Emery, 1996). The educative mission of a college or university focuses the goals and objectives allowing shared involvement for all stakeholders (Emery; Sevier, n.d.). A good educative mission, thus, is a continual work in progress allowing for growth and contraction, evolution and devolution (Berg, et al., 2003).

The mission statements of several colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia typify qualities alluded to above. In particular, the mission statements of Kennesaw State University (2006) and the University of Georgia (2005) offer specific, coherent, and focused goals and objectives around which institutional departments can clearly and unambiguously coalesce.

Sense of Involvement with Institutional Educative Mission. How an employee, (for purposes of this study, an academic librarian), perceives his or her connection and contribution to the aspects of their library's and their institution's goals and objectives regarding the teaching, training, and mentoring of its students. This "sense of

involvement” is a personal observation or discernment that has both quantifiable and qualitative elements (Meringolo, 2006; Owusu-Ansah, 2001).

Job Satisfaction. The extent to which people like their jobs. This definition suggests job satisfaction is a general affective reaction individuals hold about their jobs. Traditional job satisfaction facets include relationships with supervisors and co-workers, pay and benefits, job conditions, level of responsibility, and the specific nature of the work (Williams, 2004). There are an abundance of psychological and sociological theories relating to job satisfaction. As mentioned above and, because of its overall relevance to this study, Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory will be discussed in some detail in the following chapter. Another prominent theory of note is Edwin Locke’s Range of Affect Theory in which Locke argues that job satisfaction is a determinant of the incongruity between what an employee wants in a given job and what the employee actually has in that job (McFarlin, Coster, Rice, & Cooper, 1995).

It has been argued that job satisfaction may also be an affect of emotions, moods, or personality traits (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Saari & Judge, 2004). Some research indicates that positive emotional experiences and generally good moods tend to increase job satisfaction while, perhaps intuitively, poor moods and repeated negative emotional experiences tend to inhibit job satisfaction (Fisher, 2000). Further, there is some evidence suggesting that job satisfaction is positively correlated with life satisfaction, specifically, the more one is satisfied with life generally, the greater the probability he or she will be satisfied with his or her job (Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991).

As related to librarians, specifically, research indicates that job satisfaction involves the opportunity to perform a variety of different tasks, making a difference in

the community (whether the community is the town in which a public librarian may work or the campus where an academic librarian may work), and autonomy in the performance of their duties (Lanier, 1997; Topper, 2008). An academic librarian's job satisfaction is often tied to the nature of involvement with the educative mission of his or her institution, specifically insofar as the librarian can help support curricular and instructional goals and objectives (Meringolo, 2006).

Motivation. Those processes that can (a) arouse and instigate behavior, (b) give direction or purpose to behavior, (c) continue to allow behavior to persist, and (d) lead to choosing or preferring a particular behavior (Wlodkowski, 1999). For librarians, motivation often includes a "passion" for his or her work (Bell, 2003) as well a continually interesting and challenging set of responsibilities (Hosoi, 2005). As will be more fully seen in the next chapter, motivation plays an intrinsic role in Herzberg's two-factor theory and is at the heart of what distinguishes job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers.

Sense of Place. A component of cultural identity. Sense of place is an intensely personal response to the environment, social and natural, which the individual experiences in daily life, and, at a broader level, it can be the individual's perception of the whole region, state or nation (Natural and Cultural Heritage Theme Report, 2001). For purposes of this study, the expression "sense of place" is specifically used as the sum of job satisfaction and level of motivation. There is precedent for this definition. The totality of exactly what space (where "space" signifies something nonphysical) is occupied when one is "at work" is greater than merely workspace (Foley, 2007). Sense of place is conceptual rather than strictly physical. It connotes a collection of, among other things, attitudinal motivators that include comfort with environmental surroundings,

comfort with the people in your proximate area, and satisfaction with your role in the occupied space (Foley; Miller, 2001).

Significance of the Study

Though much literature exists regarding the importance (or *non*-importance) of faculty status for librarians, most of this literature does little more than make implicit reference to whether classification impacts job satisfaction and motivation (i.e., sense of place). Similarly, the relation of classification to sense of involvement with the educational mission is infrequently discussed. Further, as mentioned above, there is a dearth of literature on academic librarians' career paths and relation to sense of place or role in the institutional educative mission. Additionally, how gender, age, career, longevity, and origin of interest in librarianship as a profession correlate (if, at all) to job satisfaction, motivation, and perceived involvement with the institution's educative mission are, likewise, seldom discussed. This study was primarily a descriptive inquiry presenting historical and relevant topical discourse regarding the four aforementioned variables, academic librarian classification, academic librarians' route to their present careers, academic librarians' sense of involvement with their institution's educative mission, and academic librarians' sense of place in the academic community. Beyond the descriptive nature of the study, though, it is hoped that library, college, and university administrators may glean useful and illuminating data from the research herein, perhaps leading to a reexamination of policies and attitudes regarding both organizational classification and the educative role of academic librarians on their campuses. Since the nature of academic librarians' work involves support for the curricular goals and

objectives of their institution (Leckie & Fullerton, 1999; Meringolo, 2006), it is imperative that assessment and reassessment of librarians' roles is regularly conducted.

Limitations of the Study

Though a thorough literature review will be provided, the specific methodological focus of the present study will be the 31 schools of the USG whose library directors offered permission to survey their librarians. All 35 schools, though, are presented in Appendix A with regard to their policy on librarian organizational classification. No definitive statistical conclusions can be drawn from this study other than as it pertains to these University System of Georgia schools. Though the colleges and universities of the USG may have classification policies for librarians similar or intrinsically comparable to other colleges and universities throughout the country, given the specific focus of the present research, limited generalized conclusions may be inferred. It is possible, for example, that policies beyond mere classification status of librarians have effects this study does not address.

Both internal and external validity are also possible methodological limitations of this study. Internal validity may be jeopardized by the self-developed design of the survey instrument and the respondent-reporting nature of the survey data (Onwuegbuzie, 2000). Further, the nonrandom, purposive sampling of a specific population may limit generalizability. External validity may be endangered by factors other than those identified in the survey affecting librarians' job satisfaction, motivation, and sense of involvement with these librarians' institutional educative mission. Other factors that may influence external validity include the number of librarians surveyed and the response rate achieved (Onwuegbuzie).

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is arranged in five chapters. The introductory chapter states the nature of the problems and issues to be examined and analyzed. The introduction also presents a brief historical review of the institutional classification of academic librarians. The second chapter provides a thorough review of the relevant literature pertaining to the topic. This review is both chronological as well as topical, including discussion of academic journal articles, books, studies, dissertations, and editorial pieces. The intention of this chapter is to provide a historical and analytical context for the present study. The third chapter presents and discusses the quantitative and qualitative methodologies that were employed in the dissertation including the specific research questions asked and the nature of the survey instrument utilized. The fourth chapter reports the results of the analyses. Statistical analyses employed provide both narrative and graphic exposition of the data. Finally, the fifth chapter offers elucidation and discussion of the results. Interpretations and conclusions were based on analysis of data, amplified by personal observations from twenty years of working in an academic library setting both as a faculty and non-faculty member.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Issues regarding classification status for academic librarians (and, concomitantly, the relation to such issues as sense of place and involvement with the institution's educative mission) have long been a staple topic for scholarly articles, books, and theses. While a quick glance through the literature reveals a decidedly higher percentage of authors favoring some form of faculty classification for academic librarians (with corresponding benefits), there are a number of alternative positions rationally and eloquently expressed in the myriad of topical journal articles as well. At the farther end of the spectrum are strong judgments expressed by some in the profession that faculty status is clearly counterintuitive, counterproductive, and ought to be particularly avoided at all academic institutions (Cronin, 2001; Kingma & McCombs, 1995). Some interesting studies and opinion pieces have been written on how personality traits coupled with status affect academic librarians' motivation and general job satisfaction (Hegg, 1985/1986; Leckie & Brett, 1997; Williamson, Pemberton, & Lounsbury, 2005).

As college and university attendance dramatically rose in the 1960s and early 1970s, the need for more librarians in these schools grew as well (DePew, 1983). The substantial increase in academic librarians joining the employ of many colleges and universities during this period led to revisions and innovations in the ways these librarians were classified. These revisions and innovations, in sometimes stark contrast to

the traditional classifying of academic librarians as administrative-level staff, led to a profusion of articles and other scholarly works on the subject – a profusion that continues to the present day (Bryan, 2007; Sewell, 1983). The subject of organizational classification for academic librarians remains a mainstay theme in many respected library journals.

There is significantly less literature on the subject of how present academic librarians found their way to that current career choice. Nevertheless, several excellent studies and investigations explore the phenomenon of academic librarianship as a first-, second-, or third-career choice (e.g., Bell, 2003; Tucker, 2008; Zemon, 2002).

History of the Classification Controversy

The debate regarding how librarians are (or should be) classified in the academic institution dates back well over a hundred years. The traditional academic librarian role as a technician and book-shelver was challenged as far back as the late 19th Century when Sawtelle (1878) wrote of the inspiring work librarians did in guiding college students in their reading and use of library resources. Famed Harvard librarian Justin Winsor spoke of the vital role the librarian and library play in the academic community: “To fulfill its rightful destiny, the library should become the central agency of our college methods, and not remain a subordinate one, which it is too often” (Circulars of Information, 1880, p.7). Nearly fifty years later, writing on the state of the academic librarian, Works (1927) echoed the same sentiments: “too many faculty members and administrative officers are prone to think of the library staff, aside from the titular librarian [director], as persons who are discharging responsibilities essentially clerical in nature” (p. 80).

The roots of ‘issues’ existing between librarians and teaching faculty – essentially, the roots of librarian dissatisfaction with their classification status – date back to the time when librarians were first granted licensure as professionals in their field (Marchant, 1969). It was the marked increase of enrolled students in higher education in the 1960s that saw the problem burst into greater prominence. McAnally (1971) discussed, in some detail, the problems academic librarians faced in trying to garner professional status, respect, and compensation in the community of teaching faculty. Some of the specific obstructions to professionalism McAnally cited included the generally low status of the library profession, the autocracy of many library directors, the many state boards of education (dating back to the 1940s) that opposed and refused recognition of librarians as faculty, the lack of support by the American Library Association, and the pervasive attitude of university faculty, dismissing librarians as merely academic support staff (pp. 20-23).

The enrollment explosion in the 1960s and early 1970s created a need for more academic librarians, and this became a confusing time regarding organizational classification. For many colleges and universities, the greater number of students meant a greater role for the librarian in helping to fulfill the educational missions of the institution (Guskin, et al., 1979/1980). A need for trained librarians coupled with the dynamic growth of many colleges and universities led to many institutions classifying librarians as academic faculty. Though this was, essentially, non-controversial at the time, by the late 1970s many academicians and university administrators began questioning whether such classification was appropriate for a class of employees who were skilled and valuable in the overall educative process of the institution but, clearly, not academic equals to

classroom faculty (Sewell, 1983; Wilson, 1979). Wilson writes, “undoubtedly, the organization[al] fiction that librarians are teachers has been used to buttress a claim to a higher status or a claim to more prestige” (p. 152). It is, thus, the period of the largest exponential growth in American higher education enrollment, 1965 through 1978, that directly links to the still-viable current issues; are academic librarians as “valuable” as faculty in the educative mission of the university? Further, what should be the classification status of academic librarians?

The 1980s saw a reversal in the enrollment boom of the previous fifteen years. As colleges and universities struggled with shrinking budgets and the need for organizational tightening, the role and place of the academic librarian became a much-debated point (DeBoer & Culotta, 1987; Hall & Byrd, 1990). Larger and more prestigious institutions (for example, all eight of the Ivy League schools) tended to modify (or maintain) librarian classification as quasi-faculty or administrative staff while smaller and less prestigious schools began more public debates on the issue (Bolger & Smith, 2006; Skiadas, 1999). As Bolger and Smith comment on the results of their study, “this survey indicates that the higher the tier (i.e., the better the overall quality of the liberal arts college as determined by *U.S. News and World Report*), the less likely librarians will have faculty status or rank . . . (p. 228). This fact has been echoed in several other articles or studies, most recently in a 2006 article by Renaud who stated, “faculty status [for librarians] is rare in the population of highly ranked private liberal arts colleges in which merged organizations primarily exist” (p. 68).

A number of surveys and studies were conducted in the 1980s and 1990s on the subject of academic librarian classification in the university organization. Some were

strictly descriptive pieces intent only on illuminating how different institutions were handling the issue (Gray & McReynolds, 1983; Koenig, et al., 1996; Sanders, 1989; Sharma, 1981). Others, though, were editorial or opinion pieces clearly taking a stand on the issue and inviting further debate and discussion on the subject (e.g., Hegg, 1985/1986; Spang & Kane, 1997; White, 1996).

A running theme in all studies, surveys, articles, and opinion pieces was that academic librarians were clearly a vital part of the educative mission of their institution. There was never any denigration or belittlement of the librarian role qua librarian. The focused question or concern was whether librarians were truly *academic faculty* and should be classified and remunerated accordingly. This quote from Biggs (1981) is telling:

Librarians and faculty members were once creatures of the same order, with similar educational preparation, interests, and understandings of what the library should do. Rather quickly they have evolved into quite different creatures, each insistent upon professional autonomy, stubbornly holding sometimes disparate visions of the library's mission and communicating very little with each other.

To the present day, this controversy remains. Not a year has passed between 1998 and 2008 without several articles appearing in respected academic journals on the subject of librarians' classification and place in the academic community. Part of the controversy is not so much disagreement as much as confusion or misunderstanding regarding roles and intents. Sanders (1989) writes, "the appropriate place of librarianship in the academic community is not fully understood" (p. 104). Yet, he still manages to add an editorial opinion: "the library practitioners must be willing to meet the same qualitative standards

or their equivalents as those which are expected of the faculty at large” (p. 104).

Academic librarian job satisfaction and levels of motivation often intersect in the literature with themes of organizational classification and librarians’ role in the educative mission. This intersection has been developed and extrapolated in an interesting article regarding job satisfaction and librarians by Mirfakhrai (1991) who, through questionnaire and interview, induced several intriguing conclusions regarding one’s job satisfaction vis à vis university size, the nature of one’s job, and the nature of one’s classification in his or her job.

Librarians as Respected Members of the Academic Community

Irrespective of the debate regarding organizational classification of the academic librarian, one issue that is salient and worth discussing explicitly is the nature of respect for academic librarians on college and university campuses, particularly as demonstrated by teaching faculty. Many articles discussing the controversy regarding classification imply teaching faculty have a collective lack of respect for the duties and role of the academic librarian which contribute towards lack of equal status for the librarians (Given & Julien, 2005; Kempcke, 2002). However, there is clear indication in the literature that, generally, academic faculty has great respect for their librarian colleagues (Feldman & Sciammarella, 2000; Leckie & Fullerton, 1999). Concurrently, there is little to indicate that academic librarians, collectively, are a class of underappreciated semiprofessionals. Despite underlying dissatisfaction and concern for what is perceived as inappropriate classification and status in their institutions, respect for the work that they do is *not* the paramount concern (DePew, 1983; Farber, 1999). On the contrary, librarians recognize

that they are respected for their contributions to the educative mission of their institutions (Meringolo, 2006; Williamson, et al., 2005).

The Path to Becoming an Academic Librarian

Many present academic librarians choose librarianship as a career path during traditional career-choosing years, their undergraduate college days (McClenney, 1989). Interestingly, though, a significant number of academic librarians come to this career by way of other original plans. In one study, Deeming and Chelin (2001) found that 20% of their surveyed sample had changed careers to librarianship for one of a number of reasons. The reasons for changing in mid-career included feeling “stuck in a rut,” or intense dislike for their present career, and uncertainty and difficulties with their previous environment (p. 8). In the Deeming and Chelin study, 85% of those who had switched careers to librarianship found themselves “satisfied” with the switch (p. 9). Though the crux of their study was to analyze the reasons for librarians switching careers in midlife, the 20% of those surveyed who switched to librarianship as a mid-career move is noteworthy and corroborated by Knowlton and Imamoto (2006) and Tucker (2008).

Librarianship as a ‘later’ career choice seems predominantly inspired by several common factors (Tucker, 2008). Several studies have identified recurring reasons why librarians have come to this profession as a second (or third) career: a sense of burnout in the original profession, a desire to try something new, different, and alternatively challenging, and economic troubles that have led to layoffs or dismissals from a present job (Deeming & Chelin, 2001; Knowlton & Imamoto, 2006). Of particular interest, relative to the objectives of this dissertation, is the finding that many librarians, both first-

and second-career, chose librarianship based on factors involving sense of place and sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission. Tucker (2008) speaks of the workplace environment, the institution's goals and beliefs, and the inherent happiness of the librarian as being keys to the selection of librarianship as a career. As will be seen when discussing the nature of job satisfaction, it is the intrinsic features, what Herzberg calls the motivation factors (Herzberg, 1966), that most influence future librarians (Smerek & Peterson, 2006).

Librarians who enter the profession by way of a midlife career change tend to adapt well and carry skills from their previous career into librarianship, particularly skills involving information literacy, technology, and public service (Fikar & Corral, 2001; Fox, 2007). Though some newly-minted librarians experience some regret or guilt for having given up their originally chosen profession, the overwhelming sense is that midlife librarians take up their new profession with enthusiasm and a passion for excellence (Deeming & Chelin, 2001; Fikar & Corral).

Alternately, there is some literature on the phenomenon of librarians making midlife career changes *out* of librarianship. Often, the reasons cited have nothing to do with the nature of the profession, per se, but extrinsic -- what Herzberg would call hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1966) -- issues such as poor salary, discomfort with the work environment, lack of support from campus administration, and poor relationships with colleagues and supervisors (Luzius & Ard, 2006). In a fascinating case study, Zemon (2002) traces the story of a librarian, first youthfully excited by the expectations of an information specialist career, and later developing disappointment and distaste for the profession. In this case, the librarian sought a different midlife career path away from

librarianship, but carried important aptitude and skills that would prove to be of value in many other professions. It is apparent that the professional training of a librarian is useful and valued in varied occupations from bookselling to library computer system programming to electronic journal editing (McKee, et al., 2008).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Job satisfaction plays a vitally important role in any employee's success in a profession. This is true of any professional, whether in academia or not. An interesting and applicable theory that helps undergird the research in this study is found in Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, sometimes referred to as his two-factor theory.

Adapting Maslow's theories of motivation and hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954), Herzberg theorized that job satisfaction is bimodal (Herzberg, 1966). An employee is not satisfied by fulfillment of lower-level needs (e.g., good salary, decent working conditions, and pleasant coworkers): meeting these needs merely decreases dissatisfaction. To truly satisfy employees, higher-level needs must be met. These higher-level needs include responsibility, recognition of achievement, and the nature of the work itself (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). What Herzberg (1966) posited was a theory where satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not points on the same line, but rather distinct attitudinal entities. A variable that tended to increase worker satisfaction did not, necessarily, decrease dissatisfaction. The presence of a variable that tended to increase a worker's dissatisfaction may have no effect on that same worker's satisfaction. A library-relevant example may help illuminate this. A librarian may be very happy (satisfied) with her chosen profession and enjoy the challenges and responsibilities of her job. If this librarian is paid a lower-than-expected salary, this would tend to increase the librarian's

dissatisfaction, but the librarian's overall satisfaction with her chosen profession would be unaffected (Iiacqua, et al., 1995). Herzberg labeled those factors that fulfilled higher-level needs as "motivation" attributes and those factors that related to lower-level need fulfillers as "hygiene" attributes (Herzberg, 1966). Attributes that raised or lowered worker satisfaction (higher-level need fulfillers), in theory, have no relevance to dissatisfiers, those attributes that only affected lower-level needs. A worker may have a great salary, great working conditions, and a fun-loving boss. This environment would have the affect of reducing the worker's dissatisfaction in employment, but the worker may still have a low level of satisfaction in the nature of the job itself insofar as higher-level needs are not being met (Gaziel, 2001). Satisfaction and dissatisfaction, thus, are not points on the same continuum but are on different planes entirely.

Based on this theory, if an employer wishes to promote satisfaction among employees, the employer should focus on methods to maximize self-realization or self-actualization of his or her employees (through, for example, increased responsibility, autonomy, and recognition of achievement). If the goal is to merely decrease unhappiness (dissatisfaction) among employees, the employer's concern would be to create a better working environment through, for example, better pay, benefits, and working conditions (Herzberg, 1966).

The two factors in Herzberg's theory, thus, are motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators include the challenge and nature of the job, the intrinsic pleasure one gets in performing it, and the self-realization that results from its successful performance. These factors give positive satisfaction. The hygiene factors would include salary, benefits, general working conditions, and status – all extrinsic aspects of employment. The

hygiene factors are considered maintenance attributes for avoiding dissatisfaction but, in and of themselves, do nothing to promote satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1959). It will be seen that the hygiene factor 'status' will have particular bearing on the study at hand.

Despite Herzberg's (1968) assertion that the research underlying his two-factor theory had been replicated 16 times, there has been criticism of his theory since its origin. In particular, some argue that the placing of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on separate conceptual planes is not accurate in light of greater attention paid to individualistic personality traits and the overt assumption in Herzberg's theory that satisfied workers make for more productive workers (King, 1970). Another criticism contends that it is, traditionally, conventional behavior for workers to blame extrinsic factors for their dissatisfaction and credit themselves for their satisfaction. This might lead to viewing the two-factor theory as somewhat a self-fulfilling prophecy (King).

Herzberg contended, through his research studies, that factors causing satisfaction and dissatisfaction in workers were dissimilar and, as such, the concepts of satisfaction and dissatisfaction cannot be functional opposites even though they are linguistic opposites (Herzberg, 1966). In regard to worker motivation, the opposite of 'satisfaction' is not 'dissatisfaction.' The opposite of satisfaction is *no satisfaction*. Correspondingly, the opposite of 'dissatisfaction' is not 'satisfaction' but *no dissatisfaction*.

Herzberg's two-factor theory is still a debated issue in organizational psychology. Nevertheless, its significance as a hallmark conception regarding occupational happiness and unhappiness remains and the motivation-hygiene model is invariably cited in analyses or studies of job satisfaction (Smerek & Peterson, 2006).

Academic Librarians' Job Satisfaction, Motivation, and Sense of Place

As has been seen, issues relating to librarian organizational classification, levels of job satisfaction, and role in the educative mission of their institution are still prominent topics in academic library literature. Academic librarians are a unique group of employees on a college or university campus. They are prominently involved in the educative mission of their institution (a theme to be discussed in detail below) but there is often a “disconnect” between their involvement in that mission and that of their teaching and research faculty colleagues (Christiansen, Stombler, & Thaxton, 2004). As technology has increased and changed, the role of the librarian, particularly the public-service reference librarian, has had to change to keep up with shifting student and teaching faculty needs. These changes can cause greater levels of stress and, concomitantly, lower levels of job satisfaction and motivation (Cardina & Wicks, 2004; Lynch & Verdin, 1983). Academic librarian job satisfaction and levels of motivation, in themselves, are a topic of many articles and studies through the boom and bust eras of the late 1960s to the 1990s. Generally, librarian satisfaction remains high (Lifer, 1994) and as management styles have changed with times to incorporate team-based approaches and participative interaction at all administrative and functional levels in the library organization, librarians' job satisfaction has risen accordingly (Bengston & Shields, 1985; Marchant, 1976; Marchant, 1982). Interestingly, given the historical reality of women predominating academic librarian positions since the term was first used in the early 1900s, one study (Rockman, 1984) indicated that women were more dissatisfied in librarianship as their profession than their male counterparts. The study showed that this dissatisfaction, though, was more working environment related than gender-related.

Self-image, as related to work environment, is another key indicator of job satisfaction, motivation, and sense of place. Librarians who feel respected and appreciated for what they do tend to have higher levels of satisfaction and motivation than those who feel belittled, minimized, or treated as unimportant, ancillary staff (Benedict, 1991; Buschman, 1989; Slagell, 2005). The minimalization of librarians' role in the overall mission of the university (most important, naturally, the *educative-related* mission) cycles back to the overarching concern of this study itself: what is the relationship between librarians having (or not having) faculty status and their level of job satisfaction, motivation, and sense of involvement with their institution's educative mission?

Hardesty (1995), writing about university culture and the disengagement between teaching faculty and librarians notes, "part of the problem of the acceptance of bibliographic instruction is that it comes from a group that many faculty do not view as peers – librarians" (p. 356). As a general rule, librarians tend to feel underappreciated in the scheme of the university. There tends to be little common ground between teaching faculty and librarians regarding the specific nature of job duties, nature of schedules, and often the nature of their egos (White, 1996). For example, academic librarians, usually, work 12-month contracts with little or no release time for professional development or research. Teaching faculty, as a rule, work 10-month contracts with sabbatical or other leave available for professional development, research, and publishing. This contractual difference often is a catalyst for disengagement between librarians and teaching faculty. Merely mirroring teaching faculty by attending professional meetings and serving on university committees often is not sufficient to overcome lingering stigmas. White writes,

“it’s simplistic for librarians to believe that faculty status or faculty equivalence also earns automatic collegial respect” (p. 39). Hauptman and Hill, two practicing academic librarians, make the point regarding intra-university respect rather pointedly, “academic pariahs whom legitimate faculty may denigrate or merely tolerate but do not generally completely embrace, librarians continue to wage an uphill battle for intellectual respect among colleagues in other departments” (as cited in Hall & Byrd, 1990, p. 93). The push for faculty status, often, becomes a last resort on the part of academic librarians to garner the respect, recognition, and privileges they feel they deserve yet do not receive (Weaver-Meyers, 2002). At one extreme, some librarians maintain a cowed, inhibited posture, performing their jobs acceptably (or admirably), but never actively seeking or believing justified the respect they properly deserve. At the other extreme, librarians maintain a posture of arrogance and standoffishness, refusing to be intimidated by the research or teaching faculty, and ready to fight for their rights and respect (Kempcke, 2002). It should be noted that most academic librarians fall comfortably between these extremes.

It is also important to recognize that satisfaction can be a nebulous concept, defined in different ways by different people, and quantitatively measuring satisfaction can be problematic (Plate & Stone, 1976). For many librarians, the mere pleasure garnered in executing their duties successfully is tantamount to being satisfied with their jobs. For others, hygiene factors such as salary, working conditions, and relations with administration weigh heavily on surveyed librarians’ satisfaction. This might seem counter to Herzbergian theory, but it falls back on how any given individual connotes the term “satisfaction” (Lahiri, 1988). However, in analyzing existing literature reviews on the broad subject of library job satisfaction, Van Reenen (1998) found more generalized

confirmation in Herzberg's theory insofar as the greatest "satisfiers" were supervisory autonomy, sense of responsibility, and commitment to the profession. The most frequent "dissatisfiers" were poor pay, poor working conditions, and a lack of opportunity to work in a public service area.

It would be appropriate to briefly compare and contrast the aforementioned nature of job satisfaction and motivation of academic librarians with that of teaching and research faculty generally. Most of the same motivators that provide increased satisfaction for academic librarians are also applicable to traditional teaching and research faculty. Several studies have concluded that responsibility, autonomy, and a collegial, friendly environment are keys to happy professors (Fogg, 2006; Hagedorn, 2000). In fact, survey results for job satisfaction among American college and university teaching and research faculty in southeastern schools were extremely similar to results found in the survey conducted for this study among USG academic librarians (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004). In general, teaching and research faculty were satisfied with their jobs irrespective of discipline or geographic region (Hagedorn; Terpstra & Honoree).

The Nature of Faculty Status

Obviously a central issue to the general debate concerning classification status for academic librarians is just what is meant by the phrase 'faculty status.' Peripheral to this question is whether academic librarians are qualified, based on definition, *to be* classified as faculty.

There is no single, universally established definition for the expression 'faculty status.' Rather, it is an amalgam of various elements including, but not necessarily limited to, the responsibility of teaching and/or conducting research, the opportunity for

tenure, the opportunity for academic freedom, the opportunity for promotion to higher academic rank, the opportunity to serve in college or university governance through Senate, committees, or appointments, eligibility for sabbatical and other leaves, and the access to research and professional development funds (Biggs, 1981; DePew, 1983; Hoggan, 2003).

There is clearly a culture of faculty status on university and college campuses and this culture can be exclusive, parochial, and off-putting (Kempcke, 2002). The culture of faculty status includes an accepted degree of professionalism, naturally, but also carries an inherent respect level that may or may not always be deserved by all members of the faculty corps (Malia, 1997).

Are academic librarians worthy of faculty status? This is an open-ended question with no overtly straightforward answer. Surely, librarians are involved in the educative mission of any college or university but do they “teach” and do “research” in the same sense as faculty in the arts, sciences, humanities, or education departments? Yes, in many instances they do, but not to the same degree qualitatively or quantitatively as their teacher/researcher colleagues. Their contributions to the academic grounding and preparation of students working on degrees is, arguably, as important as any single professor in any single class (Badke, 2005; Bell, 2000; Bryan, 2007; Guidelines for Academic Status, 2007). Because the definition of “faculty status,” itself, is somewhat imprecise and essentially ambiguous, classifying librarians as faculty becomes a situational issue on every campus of higher learning. This is seen in a study of southeastern U.S. colleges and universities where the confusion as to how faculty status is defined and the concern over the “prestige factor” in holding faculty status created an

awkward and uncomfortable setting on several polled academic campuses (Gray & McReynolds, 1983). An argument that appears frequently regarding the disparate roles of librarians and teaching faculty is that most teaching faculty must have terminal doctoral degrees as a requirement for their position. Academic librarians usually need only to have a terminal master's degree (some academic libraries require a second 'subject' masters) as an educational requirement for appointment to a librarian position. The additional years of preparatory work leading to the doctorate may explain why some teaching faculty undervalue or misconstrue the role or institutional importance of the academic librarian (Christiansen, et al., 2004).

The Case that Librarians Should Be Classified as Faculty

Obviously, a strong cadre of writers believes that faculty status is the appropriate academic organizational classification for academic librarians. Bryan (2007), arguing in support of faculty status for librarians writes, "academic librarians do participate in the educational mission of their institution, although this may be in a broad sense and not necessarily confined to traditional classroom instruction" (p. 785). The American Library Association (ALA), American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) have urged colleges and universities nationwide to proffer faculty status classification to academic librarians (Guideline for Appointment, 2005; Guidelines for Academic Status, 2007). Though more than half of America's colleges and universities do classify librarians as faculty (or some quasi-faculty arrangement), many larger and more prestigious schools do not (Cary, 2001). Though many authors argue directly for faculty status for egalitarianism and respect, as Cary writes, "regardless of the controversy over the role of librarians in the

academic community, it is clear that many librarians are receiving the rights and responsibilities of ‘faculty status’” (p. 520). It is exactly this desire for egalitarianism and respect that drives librarians and many library directors to argue for true faculty status. The concern of always being seen as “wannabes” and *quasi-faculty* is, for many librarians, sufficient grounds for pushing the issue. Kempcke (2002) notes, “we are always perceived as outsiders – pariahs in the ecosystem” (p. 531). Librarians on several campuses have formed lobbying groups to support the reclassification to faculty status. Though admitting to their being a different “class” than traditional faculty, the underlying nature of their responsibility matched the typical and established notions of what faculty are (Miller & Benefiel, 1998).

Perception is important to librarians. Students tend to perceive individuals with faculty status as more professional than ancillary or administrative staff (Riggs, 1999). Riggs contends, “. . . these librarians [those with faculty status and rank] tend to be better perceived by nonlibrarian faculty. Also, these librarians appear to have more intellectual vibrancy, owing I believe, to the research and publishing expectations” (p. 305). As was mentioned earlier, the operative disconnect that often exists between traditional teaching faculty and academic librarians can also stymie librarians from achieving equal status, both pragmatically and perceptively. A useful suggestion has been to ensure that the library mission statement is in concert with its university mission statement. An interrelated, consistent mission statement might help bridge misconceptions about just what role librarians have on an academic campus (Dimmick, 1990).

The Case that Librarians Should Not Be Classified as Faculty

There is a vocal minority in the literature expressing a clear and definitive position on the academic librarian-faculty status question: librarians should *not* be classified as faculty because academic librarians are, simply, not academic faculty. These writers may not number as many as those arguing for faculty classification, but their opinions are just as passionate. Some of this attitude arises not from a denigration of what librarians do, but more from their understanding of what librarians do *not* do; perform the same role as traditional teaching faculty (Biggs, 1981; Hoggan, 2003). Librarians clearly have academic responsibilities in finding, managing, teaching the use of, and staying current with a myriad of resources and providing guidance to students and faculty in resource use. The correlation between these responsibilities and the role traditional teaching faculty plays on campus is the point of contention when assessing how librarians ought to be classified.

One of the more famous editorial pieces supporting this position is Cronin (2001). Cronin argued that it is mythology that librarians are equivalent to teaching faculty and for them to fight for such status is a disservice to their profession. He writes, “tenure and the paraphernalia of the academic calling have nothing to do with the praxis of librarianship” (p. 144). Though not nearly as vitriolic as Cronin, a number of other librarians have, similarly, argued that librarians, despite all they do to support the educative mission of the university, are just not teaching faculty and ought not be classified as such. Merely doing “faculty stuff” such as occasionally writing articles or attending professional conferences does not make them faculty insofar as *true* faculty

teach, research, and publish regularly as an obligation and responsibility of their jobs (Biggs, 1995; Drucker, 1976).

The value of librarians and all they do for the campus community is not the issue in these points of view. It is an organizational and classificatory question and the argument here is that librarians, by the nature of their responsibilities and performance, do not fall into the organization schemata that allow them to be classified as faculty. Wilson (1979) writes, “academic librarians claim to be professors, members of a profession whose major occupational task is teaching. By the magic of words things that are one kind are made to seem to be of another” (p. 149). Teachers teach, they do research, publish, sit on committees, bring the benefits of the university to the local community, and always support the university mission. Librarians do most of these things, as well, though the nature of comparison (at least regarding teaching per se) creates disparity.

A running theme in many of the articles suggesting librarians should not be classified as teaching faculty is that respect and prestige must be earned in their own right and classificatory status is not the route to such earning. There is no disputing the value of the librarian’s work or institutional role; rather, it is a simple question of proper taxonomy and librarians should not be classed alongside traditional teaching faculty (Batt, 1985; White, 1996). Ultimately, though, many of these articles reduce librarians to whiny complainers unhappy with their secondhand status on campus and bogusly arguing for a position they do not rightly deserve. Again, perception outweighs reality. The disconnect between teaching faculty and librarians is a root cause for the notion of librarians being whiny complainers when, in reality, librarians are merely arguing for

equivalent treatment and status given the parallels of their responsibilities to their teacher colleagues (Biggs, 1995; Christiansen, et al., 2004).

Librarians differ from traditional teaching faculty in at least two significant ways. The vast majority of academic librarians work a 12-month contract versus the 10-month contract that is standard for most college and university faculty. Librarians, effectively, put in more hours of work per week physically at their jobs than most teaching faculty (Hoggan, 2003). The greater amount of time librarians have to *be librarians* affords them less time to research, write, publish, and present at conferences, all activities of traditional teaching faculty (Hoggan). One could argue that librarians should not be classified as faculty inasmuch as the mere nature of their schedule and responsibilities effectively likens them to other administrative members of the academic campus. Just as the Dean of Students, Director of Admissions, and University Ombudsman are indispensable members of most higher education campuses, they are (by tradition and by classification) *not* faculty members (Mitchell, 1989). Perhaps librarians fall into the same category.

Alternatives to Faculty Status for Academic Librarians

There are a number of articles in which authors try to strike a compromise in the academic librarian-faculty status debate. If academic librarians do not qualify on the definition or terms of what constitutes a teaching faculty member, then perhaps there ought to be an alternative classification, perhaps unique to librarians. Alternate classification schemes have existed since the mid-20th century (McAnally, 1971). There is a logic to alternative classification. Librarians are not the same as teaching faculty. Their training is different, their responsibilities and specific job duties are different, their

schedules and workloads are different, and the nature of their management, supervision, and evaluations are different. A taxonomy that reflects these differences but properly recognizes the academic worth of the librarian seems valid. Not everyone sees this validity. An example of *quasi-faculty* classification and concomitant attitude towards it is plainly expressed by Biggs (1981):

Some librarians call for faculty status *without* faculty rank, and the term ‘academic status’ is also used frequently, occasionally as a synonym for faculty status, but more often to designate a purgatorial state somewhere between the heaven of professorship and the hell of librarianship.

The essence of Biggs’s point is reiterated in a number of other articles and opinion pieces as well. Librarians are a unique entity on college and university campuses and their status should be equally unique (Bryan, 2007; DePew, 1983). On this premise, rank and titles used for university faculty should not be used for librarians, but tenurability, access to professional development funds, and opportunity for research sabbaticals ought to be available.

Part of the motivation for suggesting alternative classification for academic librarians harkens back to the confusion and ambiguity inherent in definitions of “faculty status.” Tradition notwithstanding, there is often a difficulty in effectively clarifying and systematizing terms such as “rank,” “status,” and “privilege” and this difficulty creates the need for an alternate taxonomy for librarians (Hill, 2005). Alternative strategies to classifying librarians exist in some colleges and universities at present. Such schools often have different paths to tenure for librarians based on the varied nature of their responsibilities and performance (Miller & Benefiel, 1998). These different

classifications and paths to tenure (and promotion) are accepted and approved by university administration and library administrators. What is lacking, though, is a nationalized standard for the handling of library classification, an American Library Association goal probably not to be seen for some time (Werrell & Sullivan, 1987).

Academic Librarians and Their Institutions' Educative Mission

It cannot be overstated that, whatever the classification schemata an academic library or institution uses in organizing their librarians, the role of those librarians in the educative mission of the institution is immense (Isaacson, 1990; Miller, 2007). The role and duties of the academic librarian in the educative mission of the university would include teaching classes on academic research, helping individuals with their information needs, purchasing books and journals on particular subjects, and contributing to the scholarship of their profession. Further duties would include providing access to information on a variety of formats, designing and managing library websites, incorporating new technologies into instruction and research, and working closely with academic departments throughout campus. What is arguable (and debated in the literature) is whether there is a correlation between an academic librarian's organizational classification and their perceived involvement in their institution's educative mission. As Bryan (2007) notes "the participation of librarians in the educational programme justifies their status as faculty" (p. 782).

Historically, the academic library's core role in the institution's educative mission has usually been well-respected (Circulars of Information, 1880; Farber, 1999; Meringolo, 2006). The last ten years of technological explosiveness, though, during which students are able access seemingly an infinite amount of information off the

Internet has given rise to contentions that the academic library and the academic librarians who administer it are becoming obsolete (Cardina & Wicks, 2004; Given & Julien, 2005). Though perhaps debatable at some level, the preponderance of data and opinion contends that not only is the academic library (and its corps of librarians) here to stay but its value is more important than ever (MacAdam, 2000; Renaud, 2006). Samson and Oelz (2005) write, “during the past five years [while] circulation and in-house reference queries have flattened, door counts, online access, and virtual reference have increased significantly. These data reflect trends in academic libraries nationwide” (p. 350). Beyond increased gate counts and more reference questions, though, the value of the library and librarian as evidenced by the above list of responsibilities clearly shows an involvement with the most intimate aspects of educating on campus.

In a landmark study, Hardesty (1995) examined the nature of faculty culture and how it pervades and influences the relationship(s) between teaching faculty and librarians in American colleges and universities. It was seen that bibliographic instruction (more often, presently, referred to as library instruction) is the key linking element between faculty and librarians. Faculty culture revolves around research, content, and specialization. Librarians are central to helping faculty excel in all these areas. Professional autonomy and academic freedom are also cited as keys to faculty culture. Here, again, librarians are crucial in helping promote and reinforce this autonomy and freedom. Hardesty writes, “continued initiatives by librarians to understand and to reach out to faculty are essential if academic librarians are to achieve their potential in contributing to the educational process” (p. 339). However, as Hardesty notes later in his study, many faculty members still refuse to recognize library instruction as an

instrumental component in the educative process because librarians are not recognized as teaching faculty by campus peers. Hardesty's research characterizes teaching and research faculty as essentially overworked, insufficiently self-critical prima donnas, obsessed with packing as much material into a course as possible, and unwilling to have the sanctity of their classroom violated. It is little wonder, argues Hardesty, that faculty regard librarians much the same as groundskeepers or secretaries – a necessary nuisance on campus – but a group that need not interfere with the faculty's hallowed classroom.

The faculty culture, contends Hardesty (1995), precludes allowing librarians to be “fully accepted members” (p. 356) of the sacred fold. Faculty members do not, generally, need librarians to offer advice on research or the use of library resources. A number of surveys that Hardesty cites indicate many college and university faculty as wanting their students to use and understand how to use the library; they just do not want the librarians to handle that job. This lack of peer respect for academic librarians extends to team-teaching, librarian help with curriculum development, or shared classroom time.

Beyond library instruction, a new catchphrase that permeates higher education campuses is “information literacy” which can be defined as the ability to locate, understand, evaluate, utilize, and convey information at home, at work, and in the community (Leckie & Fullerton, 1999). Naturally, academic librarians are at the forefront in pedagogically strengthening those skills for students and faculty (Given & Julien, 2005). Academic libraries are promoting information literacy as a matter of course in their mission statements and are working to intertwine information literacy and the role of the library itself into the fabric of their university mission statements as well (Riggs, 1987).

In these times of great technological change, accessibility is another area where the library's role in the institution's overall educative mission is growing; specifically, making the library resources (both tangible and personal) available to a wider audience who, through either geographical, physical or psychological impediments, have difficulty utilizing the "brick and mortar" library building (Seamans & Metz, 2002). Here, again, the library's work at partnering with the university as a whole (and teaching faculty in particular) is vital to overall success, best measured by student satisfaction and achievement (Skiadas, 1999).

There is a dearth of literature on the relationship between librarian job satisfaction and librarians' perceived role in the educative mission of their university. One study, though (Landry, 2000), found that librarians committed to the educative mission of their institutions had greater job and life satisfaction and greater job longevity than those without such commitment. Landry found a modest positive correlation between commitment to educative mission and job satisfaction. One reason, perhaps, for the lack of substantive literature on the relation between librarian job satisfaction and institutional mission is that many college's and university's educative mission statements are vague, nebulous, and lack specificity regarding the role of departments including the library (Berg, Csikszentmihalyi, & Nakamura, 2006). Some of the animosity previously cited that exists between teaching faculty and librarians at some institutions can be directly attributed to the "interdepartmental warfare and sabotage" (Berg, et al., p. 46-47) resulting from poorly defined institutional mission statements.

Clear, proactive, and achievable institutional mission statements can aid academic libraries and librarians greatly. Often, the library is subsumed in the usual platitudes and

hackneyed objectives of many institutions' mission statements, never getting a coherent and specific charge that they can use for their own complementary mission (Emery, 1996; Sevier, n.d.). Several mission statements from institutions within the University System of Georgia, however, exemplify the clarity, proactivity, and achievability that dovetail with the institution's library mission statement. A good example would be Clayton State University. Both Clayton State's institutional mission statement and library mission statement speak to curricular support, use of technological advancement to further research aims, and community significance (Clayton State University Mission Statement, n.d.; Clayton State University Library Mission Statement, 2000).

Summary

What has been seen is a persistent and consistent desire on the part of academic librarians to be classified appropriately, as they see it, for the job they do on college and university campuses. Faculty status is the holy grail (White, 1996) when it comes to many librarians' desire for respect and sense of place in their working environment. A number of these librarians' colleagues obviously disagree. There are a number of voices who maintain that such classification is inappropriate, illogical, and plainly wrong. Compromises and alternatives are regularly sought. What is unmistakable is that academic librarians fill an important and necessary place in the overall educative mission of any college or university irrespective of how they are classified organizationally. It is a question, though, whether these librarians' sense of place in their academic community or their sense of involvement in the institutional educative mission in the academic community are affected by the classification question.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine what role academic librarians' organizational classification had on their sense of place (defined as the sum of job satisfaction and motivational level in their current work environment) and their perception of involvement with their institution's educative mission. Additionally, any significant relationship existing between the path academic librarians took to reach their present professional position and the above affective factors of sense of place and sense of involvement with the institutional educative mission were examined.

Issues regarding organizational classification, specifically the lack of faculty status, have often been the bane of many academic librarians. Whether their classification affects their job satisfaction or level of motivation is a debatable question. Another area of exploration is whether an academic librarian's organizational classification influences that librarian's perception of involvement in the institution's educative mission.

In addition to the independent variable of how academic librarians are organizationally classified, a second independent variable examined in this study was the path by which current academic librarians arrived at that present career. The dependent variables were the librarians' sense of place and the librarians' perception of involvement with the educative mission of their institutions.

Research Questions

There were four specific research questions in this study. Additional statistically significant correlations discovered through an analysis of post-survey data are addressed briefly in the following chapter and more discursively in the concluding chapter of the dissertation. The study's research questions were:

1. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?
2. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one's sense of place?
3. How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?
4. How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to one's sense of place?

Research Design

The research employed in this study was mixed methods with a primarily quantitative component. A survey instrument was employed yielding data allowing quantitative and some qualitative analysis. Most of the data obtained through the survey were quantitative. Qualitative data were obtained through two open-ended survey questions, one in the demographic section of the survey and the other in the attitudinal section. The intent of the open-ended questions was to elicit richer detail regarding (a) how academic librarians came to that career choice, and (b) how academic librarians perceive their role in the educative mission of their institutions.

Though most of the analyses in this study were quantitative in nature, the qualitative data obtained allowed for fruitful supplementation of the numerical investigation. The qualitative component allowed for triangulation of data on select research questions and complementarity of mixed influences, namely forced Likert-style multiple choice answers and the opportunity for the respondent to discursively expand on specific points (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003).

Instrumentation

This study employed a 36-question descriptive survey instrument entitled Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place (see Appendix B). The purpose of descriptive surveys, according to Ezeani (1998), is to collect detailed and factual information that describes an existing phenomenon. The survey was self-designed with some questions adapted from Horenstein (1993), Benedict (1991), and Kilpatrick (1982).

The first section of the survey included 17 demographic or classification questions intended to solicit basic information including gender, age range, years of professional experience as a librarian, present classification status, and the path by which the respondent arrived at his or her career as an academic librarian. The second section of the survey included 19 multiple-choice (Likert-style) attitudinal questions with five responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. These questions attempted to solicit information regarding the respondents' level of present job satisfaction, thoughts regarding the importance of classification status, perceived involvement in their institution's educative mission, and importance of librarians' involvement in that educative mission.

The survey was intended to take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Two of the questions, one in the demographic component and one in the attitudinal component asked for discursive text on, respectively, how the respondent came to the present career of academic librarianship, and how the respondent felt about their involvement in the educative mission of his or her institution. The survey was administered online using the Survey Monkey™ program, ensuring anonymity of responses, both regarding individuals and institutions. Those emailed the invitation to participate in the survey had the opportunity to anonymously opt out.

The survey's validity was established through two means. Each member of the researcher's dissertation committee had the opportunity to comment and critique the original survey. This led to significant tightening and strengthening of the first survey draft. Secondly, the survey was piloted at the Odum Library of Valdosta State University. There, 18 librarians had the opportunity to take the survey and offer suggestions, comments, and criticism to the researcher. The comments, suggestions, and criticism presented allowed for further augmentation of the final survey instrument.

Participants

The target population of the study was Master's of Library Science (MLS or MLIS) degreed academic librarians in all 35 colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia. This was a purposively chosen population with the intent of attaining a broad swath of opinions from librarians at two-year colleges, small state colleges and universities, larger regional universities, and the largest research institutions in the state. Preliminary data collection through examination of web-based faculty handbooks (see Appendix A) determined that 27 of the 35 USG schools classify librarians as faculty and

8 schools do not classify librarians as faculty. All 35 library directors were contacted by email and permission was sought to survey their librarians. Permission was given by 31 directors. After attaining the permission, 372 librarians at the 31 colleges and universities were emailed a letter of invitation to participate in the survey. The email included a statement of informed consent per Institutional Review Board (IRB) policy and a web link to the survey.

Data Collection

Data collection was handled by way of Survey Monkey™, an Internet-based application. This software provided an adequate, accurate, convenient, and self-contained means of both administering the survey and collecting survey responses. It was, essentially, a straightforward process, then, of assessing percentage of participation and transposing the garnered data to a spreadsheet and on to SPSS™ for statistical analysis.

The use of an emailed survey for maximizing respondent participation is desirable and valid (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006). In a review of electronic response rates for surveys, Sheehan (2001) found that email response rates significantly depend on various factors including the length of the survey, pre-notification to the intended respondents, and the salience of the issues addressed in the survey. In the survey distributed for this study, the length was kept to a minimum, library directors had the opportunity to pre-notify their librarian staff about the impending survey, and the issues addressed were clearly salient to academic librarians and librarianship.

Ethical Considerations

An Institutional Review Board (IRB) application through Valdosta State University was completed and submitted prior to any dissemination of the survey.

Further, the survey was pilot-tested at the Odum Library at Valdosta State to ensure clarity, consistency, and completeness of the instrument. The pilot testing was useful as it revealed both structural errors (grammatical and syntactical) as well as substantive problems in some of the questions themselves. The completed survey, along with the IRB application, was submitted and a protocol exemption report was approved (see Appendix C). A permission letter was sent to all 35 USG library directors and permission was granted by 31 directors. The survey was then distributed to all librarians employed in those 31 schools.

Limitations

There are inherent limitations in the generalizing of findings from the survey instrument to populations beyond the academic librarians of the University System of Georgia. The nature of the survey and the phrasing of specific questions could have led to confusion or misunderstanding on the part of the respondent limiting both reliability and validity. Following up every submitted survey with personal interviewing or discussion was unrealistic and would have infringed on the intended anonymity of survey participation.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS™) software program was used in post-survey data analysis. The specific statistical procedures that were used for data analysis were chosen dependent on the nature of the data produced.

To construct the dependent variable “sense of involvement with the educative mission,” survey questions 32, 34, and 35 were summed. To construct the dependent variable “sense of place,” survey questions 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 30 were summed.

Internal consistency and reliability of these summed subscales were estimated using Cronbach's Alpha.

Univariate methods were employed to determine frequency distributions of all demographic and classification data (survey questions 1-17). A bivariate procedure, Pearson's product-moment correlation, was used for analyzing the four specific research questions in the study. Finally, a multivariate procedure, backward elimination regression modeling, was utilized to predict academic librarians' "sense of involvement with the educative mission" and "sense of place" with 15 demographic or classification variables from the survey. Table 1 summarizes the research questions, the survey items linked to the research questions, and the statistical methodology employed.

Customarily, an alpha level of .05 is sought for reporting statistically significant findings. In this study, any results at an alpha level of .10 were noted due to the exploratory nature of the study and to suggest possible avenues for further research.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis was performed on the survey's two open-ended discursive questions (survey questions 6 and 32) through coding of common themes. Points of similarity or dissimilarity between the qualitative data and the quantitative data were then scrutinized. Comparisons between common themes discursively presented and quantitative frequency distributions for the two specific survey questions were examined.

Table 1

Quantitative methodological approach to the study's four research questions

Research Question	Survey Questions	Methodology Employed
1. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?	#7, #8, #9, #32, #34, #35	Pearson product-moment correlation (#32, #34, and #35 were summed as the subscale "sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission" and tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's Alpha)
2. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one's sense of place	#7, #8, #9, #22, #23, #25, #26, #28, #29, #30	Pearson product-moment correlation (#22, #23, #25, #26, #27, #28, #29, and #30 were summed as the subscale "sense of place" and tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's Alpha)
3. How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?	#6, #32, #34, #35	Pearson product-moment correlation (#32, #34, and #35 were summed as the subscale "sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission" and tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's Alpha)
4. How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to one's sense of place	#6, #22, #23, #25, #26, #28, #29, #30	Pearson product-moment correlation (#22, #23, #25, #26, #27, #28, #29, and #30 were summed as the subscale "sense of place" and tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's Alpha)

Chapter IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine whether any statistically significant relationships existed in four cases: between academic librarians' organizational classification and sense of place; between academic librarians' organizational classification and their sense of involvement in their institution's educative mission; between academic librarians' career path and sense of place; and, between academic librarians' career path and their sense of involvement in their institution's educative mission. After attaining permission from library directors, a 36-question survey was distributed to 372 academic librarians at 31 University System of Georgia colleges and universities. Of these 372 surveys that were emailed, 256 librarians completed and returned the survey. Three of these completed surveys had numerous unanswered questions and were thus discarded from the pool of responses. Consequently, 253 surveys were ultimately analyzed. The overall response rate, therefore, was 68%.

Quantitative Data Analysis and Results

Table 2 displays the frequency counts for selected variables. About three-quarters of the respondents were female. Ages ranged from "under 30" to "56 or over" (*Mdn* = 48 years). The years as a professional librarian ranged from "0 to 3 years" to "more than 20 years" (*Mdn* = 15.5 years). The most commonly reported present jobs were "public services (39.5%)," "technical services (17.0%)," and "administration (13.8%)." In Survey Item7, librarians were asked whether they were classified as faculty with faculty

titles and 58.1% responded affirmatively. In Item 8, the librarians were asked whether they were classified as faculty with librarian titles, 43.9% responded affirmatively. Most librarians (89.3%) answered “yes” to either/both Items 7 and 8 (Table 2).

Table 2

Frequency Counts for Selected Variables (N = 253)

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	189	74.7
	Male	64	25.3
Age Range ^a	Under 30	20	7.9
	30-40	58	22.9
	41-55	109	43.1
	56 or over	66	26.1
Years as Professional Librarian ^b	0 to 3	44	17.4
	4 to 10	58	22.9
	11 to 20	73	28.9
	More than 20	78	30.8

^a Age: *Mdn* = 48 years.

^b Years: *Mdn* = 15.5 years.

Table 2 *Continued*

Table 2 *Continued*

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Present Job			
	Public services	100	39.5
	Public services manager	24	9.5
	Technical services	43	17.0
	Technical services manager	8	3.2
	Administration	35	13.8
	Automation	5	2.0
	Other	38	15.0
Classified as Faculty with Faculty Titles			
	No	106	41.9
	Yes	147	58.1
Classified as Faculty with Librarian Titles			
	No	142	56.1
	Yes	111	43.9
Classified as Faculty			
	No	27	10.7
	Yes	226	89.3

Table 3 displays the frequency counts for level of education sorted by the highest frequency. Most ($n = 241$, 84.6%) reported that they had an “MLS/MLIS degree.” Thirty-four percent reported that they had an additional master’s degree (Table 3).

Table 4 displays the frequency counts for their career choice of librarianship. The most common reasons were “[it] was something I came to based on experience working in a library” ($n = 105$, 41.5%), and “[it] was my primary career desire” ($n = 89$, 35.2%) (Table 4).

Table 5 displays the frequency counts for selected variables sorted by how often that respondent answered affirmatively to the question. Highest frequencies of affirmative responses were for Item 13, “Have the opportunity to serve on college/university committees” ($n = 249$, 98.4%), Item 12, “Have the opportunity to receive professional development money” ($n = 235$, 92.9%), Item 17, “Now or previously taught in the library (bibliographic) instruction program in your library” ($n = 201$, 79.4%), and Item 10, “Have the opportunity for promotion similar to the teaching/research faculty at your institution” ($n = 185$, 73.1%) (Table 5).

Table 6 displays the descriptive statistics for selected opinion items sorted by the highest mean rating. These items were rated using a five-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Highest ratings were for Item 30, “I am happy that I became an academic librarian” ($M = 4.47$), and Item 34, “Academic librarians help fulfill a vital role in the educational mission of my college or university” ($M = 4.47$).

Table 7 displays the psychometric characteristics for summated scale scores. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for sense of involvement ($r = .78$) and sense of place ($r = .77$) both had adequate levels of internal reliability (Table 7).

Table 3

Frequency Counts for Level of Education Sorted by Highest Frequency (N = 253)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
MLS/MLIS degree	214	84.6
Additional Master's degree	86	34.0
Additional Certification	18	7.1
Doctoral Degree	18	7.1

Note. Respondents were allowed to provide multiple responses so the totals equal more than 100%.

Table 4

Frequency Counts for Career Choice of Librarianship Sorted by Highest Frequency

(*N* = 253)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Was something I came to based on experience working in a library	105	41.5
Was my primary career desire	89	35.2
Was something I came to as a second (third?) career	50	19.8
Was something I came to after acquiring another graduate degree	26	10.3

Note. Respondents were allowed to provide multiple responses so the totals equal more than 100%.

Table 5

Frequency Counts for Selected Variables Sorted by the Frequency that Respondents

Answered Affirmatively (N = 253)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
13. Have the opportunity to serve on college/university committees	249	98.4
12. Have the opportunity to receive professional development money	235	92.9
17. Now or previously taught in the library (bibliographic) instruction program in your library	201	79.4
10. Have the opportunity for promotion similar to the teaching/research faculty at your institution	185	73.1
15. Required to publish, present, or otherwise demonstrate professional output in addition to "regular, in-house" duties	146	57.7
16. Now or previously taught a semester-length class on campus	91	36.0
11. Have the opportunity for tenure similar to the teaching/research faculty at your institution	64	25.3
14. Have the opportunity to apply for sabbatical leave similar to teaching/research faculty	57	22.5
9. Classified as administrative staff rather than faculty in your institution	42	16.6

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Selected Opinion Items Sorted by the Highest Mean Rating**(N = 253)*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
30. I am happy that I became an academic librarian.	4.47	0.69
34. Academic librarians help fulfill a vital role in the educational mission of my college or university.	4.47	0.74
28. I have a high level of initiative/motivation for my work.	4.31	0.69
32. I feel I have involvement with my school's educational mission.	4.27	0.77
35. Participating in the educational mission of my college or university is a fundamental component of my job.	4.26	0.78
22. I am satisfied with my present job.	4.19	0.84
31. I would rather be an academic librarian than be a member of the teaching/research faculty in another department.	4.17	0.89
20. Faculty status has the potential to enhance the career of an academic librarian.	4.12	0.92
23. I have a strong sense of commitment to my institution.	4.08	0.87
18. Faculty rank and status is the appropriate classification for academic librarians.	4.02	0.98

Note. Ratings used a five-point scale: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Table 6 *Continued*

Table 6 *Continued*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
19. Academic librarians should have the same tenure opportunities as teaching/research faculty.	3.68	1.02
33. Classroom teaching is the essence of my college's or university's educational mission.	3.68	0.96
29. I have no desire to seek employment elsewhere.	3.58	1.12
25. I feel I am an equal to teaching/research faculty at my college or university.	3.46	1.08
36. My motivation and initiative would increase if I felt I had a greater role in the educational mission of my institution.	3.26	0.87
24. There is a strong relationship between my job satisfaction level and my classification status.	3.06	1.01
27. My level of job satisfaction would change if I were classified differently at my college or university.	2.83	1.01
21. Having the institutional title of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, etc. is more important than being identified as a librarian.	2.82	1.02
26. I feel that teaching/research faculty perceive me as an equal at my college or university.	2.79	1.07

Note. Ratings used a five-point scale: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Table 7

Psychometric Characteristics for Summated Scale Scores (N = 253)

Scale	Number of Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Low	High	Alpha
Sense of Involvement	3	4.33	0.64	2.00	5.00	.78
Sense of Place	7	3.84	0.60	2.14	5.00	.77

Research Question One

Research Question One asked, “How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution’s educative mission?” To address this question, Table 8 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of involvement scale with the three faculty classification variables. None of the resulting three correlations was significant at the $p < .05$ level (Table 8).

Research Question Two

Research Question Two asked, “How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one’s sense of place?” To address this question, Table 8 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of place scale with the three faculty classification variables. None of the resulting three correlations was significant at the $p < .05$ level (Table 8).

Research Question Three

Research Question Three asked, “How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to sense of involvement in the institution’s educative mission?” To address this question, Table 8 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of involvement scale with the four career choice variables. None of the resulting four correlations was significant at the $p < .05$ level (Table 8).

Research Question Four

Research Question Four asked, “How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to one’s sense of place?” To address this question,

Table 8

*Correlations for Selected Variables with the Sense of Place and Sense of Involvement**Scales (N = 253)*

Variable	1	2
1. Sense of Involvement	1.00	
2. Sense of Place	.53****	1.00
Classified as faculty with faculty titles ^a	.05	-.02
Classified as faculty with library titles ^a	-.02	-.03
Classified as faculty either way ^a	.03	-.07
Primary career desire ^a	.07	.13*
Career choice based on work experience in a library ^a	.02	.08
Career choice after acquiring another graduate degree ^a	.05	-.03
Career choice as second or later career ^a	-.03	-.13*
Gender ^b	.02	.05
Age Range	.11	.23****
Years as Professional Librarian	.10	.19****

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .005$. **** $p < .001$.

^a Coding: 0 = No 1 = Yes.

^b Gender: 1 = Female 2 = Male.

Table 8 Continued

Table 8 *Continued*

Variable	1	2
MLS/MLIS degree ^a	-.05	-.04
Additional Master's degree ^a	-.02	-.02
Certification ^a	.04	.11
Doctoral Degree ^a	.16 **	.15 *
Happiness as an academic librarian ^c	.35 ****	.54 ****
Rather be an academic librarian than teaching/research faculty ^c	.15 *	.27 ****

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .005$. **** $p < .001$.

^a Coding: 0 = *No* 1 = *Yes*.

^c Coding: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Table 8 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of place scale with the four career choice variables. Sense of place was higher when it was the librarian's primary career choice ($r = .13, p < .05$) and was lower when librarianship was chosen as a second or later career choice ($r = -.13, p < .05$) (Table 8).

Additional Findings

Table 8 also displays correlations for the sense of involvement with the educative mission of the institution and sense of place scales with other variables. The librarian's scale scores for sense of involvement with educative mission and sense of place were positively correlated with each other ($r = .53, p < .001$).

The sense of involvement with the educative mission scale was also positively related to having a doctoral degree ($r = .16, p < .01$), their level of happiness being a librarian ($r = .35, p < .001$) and level of agreement that they would rather be a librarian than part of the teaching / research faculty ($r = .15, p < .05$). The sense of place scale was higher for older librarians ($r = .23, p < .001$), those with more years of professional experience ($r = .19, p < .005$), having a doctoral degree ($r = .15, p < .05$), their level of happiness being a librarian ($r = .54, p < .001$) and level of agreement that they would rather be a librarian than part of the teaching / research faculty ($r = .27, p < .001$) (Table 8).

Table 9 displays the results of the backward elimination regression model predicting the librarian's sense of involvement in the educative mission of his or her institution based on 15 candidate variables. The final three-variable model was significant ($p = .001$) and accounted for 15.3% of the variance in the dependent variable. Inspection of the beta weights found the librarian's sense of involvement in the educative

mission of his or her institution to be higher for older librarians ($\beta = .11, p = .06$), those with a doctoral degree ($\beta = .11, p = .06$), and those with greater happiness being a librarian ($\beta = .35, p = .001$) (Table 9).

Table 9

Backward Elimination Regression Model Predicting Sense of Involvement Based on Selected Variables (N = 253)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>
Intercept	2.64	0.28		.001
Age Range	0.08	0.04	.11	.06
Doctoral Degree ^a	0.28	0.15	.11	.06
Happy as an academic librarian ^b	0.32	0.05	.35	.001

Final Model: $F(3, 249) = 15.04, p = .001. R^2 = .153.$ Candidate variables = 15.

^a Coding: 0 = *No* 1 = *Yes*.

^b Coding: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Table 10 displays the results of the backward elimination regression model predicting the librarian's sense of place based on 15 candidate variables. The final five-variable model was significant ($p = .001$) and accounted for 39.1% of the variance in the dependent variable. Inspection of the beta weights found the librarian's sense of place to be higher for male librarians ($\beta = .09, p = .06$), older librarians ($\beta = .26, p = .001$), those with additional certification ($\beta = .10, p = .04$), those librarians who did not choose being a librarian as a second or later career ($\beta = -.15, p = .004$), and those with greater happiness being a librarian ($\beta = .55, p = .001$) (Table 10).

Table 10

Backward Elimination Regression Model Predicting Sense of Place Based on Selected

Variables (N = 253)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>
Intercept	1.07	0.24		.001
Gender ^a	0.13	0.07	.09	.06
Age Range	0.17	0.03	.26	.001
Certification ^b	0.23	0.12	.10	.04
Choice as Second or Later Career ^b	-0.22	0.07	-.15	.004
Happy as an academic librarian ^c	0.48	0.04	.55	.001

Final Model: $F(5, 247) = 31.73, p = .001. R^2 = .391.$ Candidate variables = 15.

^a Gender: 1 = *Female* 2 = *Male*.

^b Coding: 0 = *No* 1 = *Yes*.

^c Coding: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Qualitative Data Results

Of the 253 surveys analyzed in this study, 187 respondents wrote comments on the open-ended part of question #6, “Please describe your route into librarianship. How did you come to be an academic librarian?” Thus, 74% of all survey participants chose to add discursive remarks.

Of all the responses, 64 librarians claimed that their path to academic librarianship began with employment either as a student worker or a nonprofessional staff member in a library. Many of these respondents spoke of their experience working in a library as positive, enjoyable, rewarding, and fun. This recurring theme included comments such as “I needed to work to help pay for school and came to love the library” and “as I learned more about working in the library, the more I thought I might enjoy a library career.”

A second common theme running through many discursive comments was many academic librarians coming to their profession through the original pursuit of a different career path. There were 13 observations of librarians remarking how they started (or completed) degree programs, primarily in history, and drifted into librarianship often because of lack of interest in teaching. Music was another degree program mentioned several times as a route into librarianship.

A generalized love of libraries (or archives) was a third recurring theme in many of the respondent comments. Several comments began with the phrase, “always loved libraries” or “always loved books and reading.” This intrinsic love clearly led a number of future librarians down that career path. There were 17 responses indicating a fundamental love of libraries or archives.

Mid-life career changes accounted for 11 respondent comments. Assorted views were expressed regarding this theme. Downsizing, disappointment or dissatisfaction with chosen profession, and the need to find a more fulfilling long-term career were consistent comments. An example of such a view was “after working in the private sector in the advertising industry, I re-examined my goals to determine a career path that offered more soul-satisfying work.”

A final running theme appearing in 15 comments was that a friend, relative, or teacher (professor) recommended librarianship as a career choice. Several respondents pointed to a mother, father, or aunt who was a librarian and was convinced it would make for an excellent career choice for the respondent. Other comments mentioned friends’ or instructors’ suggestions – suggestions that were valued and, ultimately, heeded by the respondents. A sample, representative comment was “librarianship was recommended by a friend who worked in an academic library at a time when I was seriously considering a career change. After consulting with the director of one of the local professional programs, I liked what I had heard and enrolled.”

There were a number of other paths to librarianship mentioned in the comments. Those paths with at least three respondent comments included: the outcome of a personality/occupation test, teachers who lost the enjoyment of teaching (or were “burned out”) but still wanted to work with and help educate students, a backup degree/career perhaps someday leading to something else, and a late (first) career move after volunteering in a local library for a while.

It is clear that the common themes that run through these respondent comments are consistent with the literature on the subject of how academic librarians wend their way into the profession (Deeming & Chelin 2001; Tucker, 2008).

Of the 253 surveys analyzed in this study, 156 respondents wrote comments on the open-ended part of question #32, “Please describe what you see as your involvement in your institution’s educational mission?” Thus, 62% of all survey participants chose to add discursive remarks.

Two familiar themes dominated the comments. The librarian’s role in providing, teaching, and supporting the access to resources to aid research and scholarship was the most frequently mentioned contribution to the educative mission of the institution. There were 48 comments regarding promoting access to resources. A simple example of such a sentiment was “we are here to assist all patrons in accessing information and this access is provided in numerous ways. I find this quite rewarding.” Another sample response that was terse and to the point, “students need to know how to find, use, and evaluate information in order to get the most out of their academic study, and I help them do that.” Forty-one comments mentioned bibliographic or library instruction as a key means of involvement and support for the educative mission of the institution. One librarian wrote, “we have a strong focus on research and I teach database searching, article review, and evidence-based practice within numerous courses.” A richer response was, “the library’s role is to support student learning by instructing students to be effective information consumers. These skills may be taught formally in classroom settings, but also more frequently through reference and consultations.”

Serving on college or university committees, including the Faculty Senate, was the next most mentioned marker of involvement in the institution's educative mission. There were 19 comments articulating the impression that service on a campus-wide committee was of educational-mission value. One librarian wrote, "[I am] heavily involved with various campus committees, most of which are directly related to the institution's educational mission." Another particularly relevant comment was "library faculty are active members of faculty senate committees, faculty senate, university tenure & promotion committees, etc. We play a strong role in accreditation and program reviews and approvals. At our university, library faculty have the same involvement in the institution's educational mission as teaching/research faculty."

The support and promotion of information literacy was mentioned in 14 survey comments. As discussed in Chapter 2, information literacy is not merely a new buzzword on college and university campuses, but is part of a curriculum and instruction redirection that directly impacts on librarians' work. One librarian wrote, "information literacy (IL) is the portion of the curriculum that librarians have expertise to teach. IL is built into this university's learning outcomes. Unfortunately, few faculty are informed or invested in the university's learning outcomes, so it is an uphill battle, but we are moving forward." Another librarian saw information literacy as a means of helping fulfill the institution's educative mission and commented, "teaching information literacy skills in the classroom, at the desk, and via chat, whether the students (and, by extension, the faculty) realize they need them or not." IL skills are noted in this brief response, "promoting critical thinking and information literacy is relevant to both the university and library missions."

Collection development, a traditionally “back-room” department in academic libraries, was the most cited non-public-service unit as important to the educative mission of the institution. There were 14 comments expressing the belief that, as one respondent said, “I support our college’s educational mission with collection development. I purchase library materials to support our newest degree programs.” Traditionally, the public-service points in the library or classrooms would seem the obvious loci for librarians to have direct involvement with the educative mission of their institution. Thus, it is interesting to consider this comment: “Although I regularly teach semester-length courses and this means very much to me personally, I regard the work I do within the library in developing the collection as just as important for the institution’s educational mission.”

One interesting theme mentioned 14 times in the discursive comments was the respondent’s desire to help students become lifelong learners and how this desire instantiated the institution’s educative mission. This was seen in a music librarian’s comment, “teach them [students] to become life-long learners and provide them with the tools for finding information once they graduate and move on to their professional careers.” Another librarian commented, “our university’s mission promotes excellence in teaching research, and service to the people of community. As a librarian I work with students, faculty, staff, and community members to provide them with the information and materials they need to becoming [*sic*] functioning members of our community and lifelong learners.”

There were 12 comments from reference-desk librarians who claimed that the interaction between the librarian and the student or faculty member at the reference desk

was a vital component in supporting the educative mission of the institution. One librarian wrote, “daily reference work with individual student interaction places me as a librarian in the educational mission of my present college and of every other college or university where I have been employed.” This respondent contended that reference desk work may be more vital than classroom instruction, “from my perch at the reference desk, I have continuing opportunities to offer instruction to students in the use of the library’s resources, and am able to adapt to the information literacy status of the individual, which is often not available in a classroom setting.”

Other less-mentioned themes stressing avenues of involvement with the educative mission of the institution included the technical side of librarianship, in particular, the cataloging of the collection, the generic remark “supporting the teaching faculty,” and the “provision of library services that support the curricular goals of the university.” Each of these three themes had three or four comments from respondents.

Five respondents remarked that their library and librarians working there played little or no role in the educative mission of their college or university. These responses varied from straightforward and matter-of-fact to haughty and tinged with disdain. Comments included, “the library seems a little isolated from the rest of the campus community when it comes to involvement in the educational mission of the college” and “we have little or no involvement with the educational mission of our institution. The work we do as academic librarians is disconnected from the academic departments on campus to the point we are irrelevant to the educational mission of our institution.” A sincere, yet blunt assessment was offered by this respondent, “in general, the institution’s educational mission is not stated in such a way as to include the types of things we

(librarians/libraries) bring to campus.” Another respondent remarked, “I do serve on committees that are involved with issues that impact the schools [*sic*] educational mission but I feel as a librarian I am allowed very little impact over all.” Finally, one respondent offered a sharp criticism, “[the] library is run as a cost center, rather than as a critical unit that supports the academic mission of the university. There is a history here of lack of support of the library by university administration, and by the faculty. Some of that is because the library has not reached out proactively and effectively to its constituents.”

There were several comments that went beyond the specific question regarding involvement in the educative mission of the librarian’s college or university. A few respondents used the open-ended question box to express their thoughts regarding faculty status, tenure, and professionalism. It is worth noting several of the more candid, provocative, and incisive comments. One respondent discussed the nature of status and tenure thusly:

I should state here perhaps that I think professional librarians should have faculty status and continuing appointment (amounting to tenure), but I do not agree that we should have to submit our work to the same committees and/or largely-irrelevant standards that the teaching faculty do. I also see no particular virtue in librarians holding the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor, since it has been my observation that we are NEVER regarded in the same light as the teaching faculty by said faculty. Better to do what we do well, and just be proud of doing it while at the same time demanding a voice in academic affairs that is justified by the work we do at the level at which we do it.

Another respondent makes a similar, though less strident point:

I think that academic librarians who end up spending time in front of students doing any type of bibliographic instruction should be given some of the perks of tenure & promotion, and should work towards publishing their own research of trends and issues, but just how much tenure and spiffy job titles we should get will always be debatable.

It was apparent to several respondents that the issues promotion, tenure, and classification for librarians evoked some underlying personal feelings. The following illustrates one librarian's struggles with the issues.

Although I regularly teach semester-length courses and this means very much to me personally, I regard the work I do within the library in developing the collection and teaching library instruction classes as just as important for the institution's educational mission. I believe that librarians should have the same opportunity for job security as teaching faculty (something I do not have now), but I don't know that traditional tenure is the way to achieve this (hence my neither-agree-nor-disagree response to question 19). Tenure is granted to faculty at my institution largely in response to their publications (rather than their teaching or other service), and this would not be an appropriate model for most librarians. Although research and publishing can be an important part of a librarian's academic contribution, I would not want to see other even more important dimensions of our work diminished in an attempt to ape the faculty. The librarian's role is unique and deserves to be recognized and rewarded as such, though I don't expect to see that happen anytime soon, if ever.

On the other hand, here is an opinion offered by a ‘younger’ librarian regarding the nature of faculty rank for academic librarians.

I've always been rather bemused by older librarians who seem to feel the need to get respect by having faculty rank. I get respect by being a good librarian and striving to be great at my job; a title or tenure isn't going to do that and personally, most of the librarians who put a lot of stock in that sort of thing are pretty crappy librarians (have no interest in learning new resources/ideas/technologies, refuse to learn how to do simple things like unjam a printer, monitor our chat reference service, etc. etc.). Personal opinion of course.

Finally, a respondent offered an opinion similar to the one above but with a bit more vitriol and sarcasm. Though perhaps not indicative of the attitudes of most academic librarians surveyed, the remark goes to the heart of much of the debate regarding librarian classification and its associated trappings.

We support the teaching mission of the University. As for the faculty status and rank business: There is a big difference between having a masters and a PhD. I don't blame the teaching faculty for seeing a difference between Librarians and themselves. As long as this is the case, then calling librarians asst professors or something is meaningless. Frankly, much academic publishing is worthless, and I see no reason to make librarians publish more of these crap articles just so they can attain Faculty rank. Being called Faculty is nice, but the role of a librarian is very different from that of the teaching faculty no matter how the idiots in the librarian business spin it.

Summary

There were no statistically significant correlations to the first three research questions, (a) “How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution’s educative mission?” (b) “How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one’s sense of place?” or (c) “How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to sense of involvement in the institution’s educative mission?” The fourth research question, “How does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to one’s sense of place?” had a slightly significant positive correlation between the choice of librarianship as a first career and a sense of place in the librarian’s institution.

The two open-ended survey questions revealed that USG librarians, generally, chose their present careers as a first choice and most feel deeply involved with the educative mission of their institution.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND OBSERVATIONS

This study was designed to identify significant relationships that may exist between the organizational classification of academic librarians in University System of Georgia institutions and these librarians' sense of place and sense of involvement with their institutions' educative mission. Further, the study aimed to discover any significant relationships between these librarians' career paths and, again, their sense of place and sense of involvement with their institutions' educative mission.

Overview of the Study

The study involved four research questions built around two independent variables which were present classification status and path to present employment and two dependent variables which were sense of place and sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission. A 36-question survey instrument was employed including two open-ended questions allowing for discursive elaboration on the questions of (a) how the respondent found his or her way into his or her current academic librarianship career and (b) how the respondent saw his or her role in the educative mission of his or her college or university.

Surveys were sent to 372 librarians at 31 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. Responses were obtained from 253 librarians for a 68% response rate. Over 180 respondents added discursive comments to the open-ended

question regarding the path to their present employment and over 150 respondents added discursive comments to the question of how they viewed their involvement with their institution's educative mission.

Summary of Findings

The first research question was, "how does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?" The second research question was, "how does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one's sense of place?" The third research question was, "how does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to sense of involvement in the institution's educative mission?" There were no statistically significant correlations to these three research questions. The fourth research question was, "how does the nature of how librarianship was chosen as a profession relate to one's sense of place?" There was a slightly positive correlation between the choice of librarianship as a first career and a sense of place in the librarian's institution.

With regard to the two open-ended survey questions allowing for discursive comments, it was evident that many USG librarians are satisfied with their current job, feel strongly involved with their institution's educative mission and, through whatever means they came to be academic librarians, are happy with their present career choice.

Conclusions

Academic librarians have an intrinsic satisfaction in their work and this satisfaction is not contingent on organizational classification in their college or university. A large percentage of survey respondents (89%) have faculty status, yet overall satisfaction and motivation levels were high among all respondents, actually

higher in the 11% who claimed to be classified as administrative staff. This statistic and the wealth of respondents' discursive comments on their inherent or lifelong love of libraries and librarian's work, I believe, bear out Herzberg's (1966) theory insofar as the love of what one does is an intrinsic satisfier (a motivation factor) while the organizational classification status is merely extrinsic (a hygiene factor). Having faculty status may reduce dissatisfaction but it does not increase satisfaction, nor does the lack of faculty status decrease satisfaction. I would contend, though, that it is still an open question whether the lack of faculty status increases dissatisfaction.

Academic librarians have a strong sense of involvement with the educational mission of their institution and this sense of involvement, once again, is not contingent on organizational classification. That there was no statistically significant correlation between classification and sense of involvement in the educative mission coupled with the abundance of discursive comments on how these librarians felt involved confirm a similar conclusion to the one above. Librarians may be pleased or displeased with their classification status, but their status has no significant effect on whether they feel involved with their school's educative mission. All but three librarians who offered discursive comments felt a clear sense of involvement and cited numerous ways this involvement was accomplished through their job responsibilities.

The one correlation that showed statistical significance, albeit slight, was that academic librarians who chose their present career by way of previous experience working in a library have a greater sense of place than those who came to academic librarianship as a second or third career option. This was borne out in the discursive comments, as well, as the timbre of pleasure in one's work was clearly more evident in

those comments from librarians who were lifelong lovers of libraries, books, or the dissemination of information.

The backward regressive analysis, though not overtly part of the methodology in the study, showed some notable results. Older librarians and librarians with higher degrees (second masters or doctorates) exhibited greater sense of involvement with their institution's educative mission than younger librarians or those librarians only possessing a masters in library science. Male librarians had a slightly higher sense of place than female librarians.

This study did *not* attempt to answer the question of *how* academic librarians ought to be classified. The tacit belief expressed in the majority of the literature that faculty-classified librarians will be happier, more motivated librarians is *not* supported by this study. Though there was no statistically significant relationship between classification status and either sense of place or sense of involvement with the institution's educative mission, the conclusion cannot validly be drawn that faculty status is, or is not, the appropriate organizational classification for academic librarians.

The qualitative component of this study revealed some interesting findings. Regarding the path by which respondents came to be academic librarians, most chose their current career either as a primary choice through a lifelong love of books, libraries, or involvement with information dissemination. For others, a midlife change due to changes in economic circumstances, burnout, or a desire to switch to a more interesting and challenging career were frequently mentioned reasons for being a librarian. All those who took the time to discursively answer the question indicated happiness (at varying

levels) with their current career and those who made midlife career changes were clearly happy with their conversion to librarianship.

The discursive answers to the question, “Please describe what you see as your involvement in your institution’s educational mission?” yielded a range of answers, most centered on promoting access to resources, teaching library instruction classes, participating in collection development, and helping to provide library services supporting the curricular goals of the institution. All but five responses indicated a clear sense of involvement with the educative mission. The five respondents that did not feel involved with their institution’s educative mission cited either a lack of teaching faculty and administrative support or an unclear or nonspecific institution mission statement making librarian participation difficult or underappreciated.

Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

This study was limited to academic librarians at 31 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. Though the results are interesting and, in many cases, in agreement with contemporary literature on the subject, it is clear that for greater significance to be warranted a wider sample must be surveyed. Replication of this study could be done in several ways.

The study, as presented, could be repeated with a different group of schools. It would be interesting, for example, to see if the librarians working at private colleges and universities have similar attitudes to USG librarians regarding classification, sense of place, and their role in the educative mission of their institution. Alternatively, this study could be replicated at a system of 2-year junior colleges to gauge the classification schemata of librarians and assess their attitudes regarding sense of place and sense of

involvement in their school's educative mission. The nature of this study allows itself to be replicated at any college or university or any collection of colleges and universities. This method of "horizontal" replication would help establish greater validity and reliability for the survey instrument. Further, the study is not limited higher education. It might prove interesting to see if the organizational classification of school librarians and media specialists (in either public or private schools) significantly correlates with their sense of place or sense of involvement with the educative mission of their respective institutions. With some modification, the survey instrument in this study could be adapted to assess primary, middle, or secondary school librarians and media specialists.

The flexibility of the survey allows for other modification if desired. More questions could have an open-ended, discursive component added which would provide greater qualitative data. On the other hand, the qualitative component could be removed entirely allowing for a speedier methodology (in execution, response, and analysis) if all that were desired was a quantitative look at the research questions studied herein.

A more significant emendation of the study would be to follow up, specifically, on one or both of the qualitative points discussed. This "vertical" approach to replication would allow a deeper qualitative methodology. The themes, for example, of job satisfaction, attitudes regarding classification, and sense of involvement in the institutional educative mission could be fleshed out in much greater depth using interviews, focus groups, and participatory observation as methodological tools.

Discussion and Personal Observations

I have worked in an academic library for the last 20 years. For 15 of those 20 years I have worked under the organizational status of classified staff, while the last five

years I have been classified as a faculty member. My classification has never had an effect on my motivation, commitment to my job, or general satisfaction. I love being a librarian, enjoy my job enormously, and have always felt devoted to what I do. Moving from classified staff to faculty has resulted in greater campus involvement through the Faculty Senate and a greater opportunity to serve on statewide committees and task forces. I have welcomed these opportunities but, again, the ‘faculty status’ aspect was secondary; I was intrinsically happy to be able to partake in university governance by virtue of being a librarian, not necessarily by virtue of being a faculty member.

Similarly, while working in the library either as a staff member or librarian/faculty member, I have always felt committed to the educative mission of my university and felt that I always had a contribution to make to that educative mission. Again, reclassification to faculty did not provide me greater satisfaction, only a relief from the dissatisfaction of feeling as though I was inappropriately classified and deserved to be on the same level as my librarian colleagues (and, I should note, my use of the terms “satisfaction’ and dissatisfaction’ in this sentence are clearly Herzbergian). No doubt, the debate regarding how academic librarians ought to be organizationally classified at colleges and universities will continue. The essence of the controversy will carry on over both philosophical as well as pragmatic matters. What this study has added to the debate is that the work satisfaction of a collection of academic librarians in small, medium, and large public colleges and universities is not dependent on classification. They are satisfied and motivated, productive and committed, independent of their title or rank.

Thus, a key personal inference I draw regarding a main theme of this study would be: Faculty status is important but only as a secondary factor in an academic librarian's employment. Though I will argue below that academic librarians ought to be classified the same as teaching or research faculty and that such classification is appropriate, I would contend that such classification is of lesser importance than other more intrinsically valuable attributes. I believe this study was confirming of Herzberg's two-factor theory insofar as classification status was clearly an extrinsic (hygiene) factor for most librarians. What provided librarians the most happiness or satisfaction was responsibility, the pleasure in performing a desired job with reasonable autonomy, and the intrinsic contentment in being an academic librarian. Faculty classification, like pay, benefits, relationships with colleagues, and general working conditions, was important but secondary; a factor that, if present, helped ease dissatisfaction but, in itself, did not augment satisfaction.

Given that 89% of the survey respondents were classified as faculty it may be tempting to conjecture that many of these librarians could "afford" to claim how satisfied they were independent of faculty status since they had it anyway. I would contend this hypothesis to be fallacious. From personal history and anecdotal evidence obtained through 15 years of conference attendance and interaction with many academic librarians (many classified as faculty and many not), I believe that the academic librarians' claims of satisfaction are sincere. Further, the survey data revealed that the 11% of respondents classified as administrative staff actually had higher sense of place levels than that of their faculty-classified colleagues.

I would contend that academic librarians ought to be classified as faculty on college and university campuses. This classification need not carry the titular professorial rank (instructor, assistant, associate, or full), but should allow full participation in rights, privileges, responsibilities, and benefits of teaching or research faculty. I would contend, as argued by Cary (2001) and Hill (1994) that academic librarians are unique on campuses with regard to their academic involvement, but faculty status would be the appropriate classification, if only insofar as faculty status best approximates the uniqueness of librarians' contributions. I would argue, in concert with DePew (1983) and Bryan (2007) that an alternative classification schema for librarians may be fitting. Librarians could be eligible for promotion and tenure, partake in matters of shared institutional governance, and recompensed commensurate with their teaching and research faculty colleagues. The criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases would have to be customized to the unique contributions and responsibilities of academic librarians. This would not be dissimilar to the adapted tenure and promotion guidelines seen in university departments such as art, music, theater, and communication arts. The traditional publication and conference presentation route is inapplicable in these departments, and comparable adaptations could be developed for librarians, as well.

The findings in this study are not specifically a rejection of the literature on the subject. As noted earlier, the vast preponderance of articles and other studies written on the subject of academic librarian classification argue strongly for faculty status. Most of these articles are editorial-type pieces with few offering substantive quantitative (or qualitative) methodology to support the expository nature of the commentaries. Further, most of the literature fails to study the links, if any, between classificatory status and

sense of place or sense of involvement with the institutional educative mission, focusing instead on simply 'inherent' reasons why academic librarians ought or deserve to be classified the same as teaching or research faculty. What was implied in several articles (for example, Benedict, 1991; Mirfakhari, 1991; Williamson, et al., 2005) was that librarian satisfaction and sense of involvement with the institutional educative mission would, naturally, increase if librarians were classified as faculty. This study demonstrated that this implication is erroneous. Satisfaction of librarians and a firm sense of involvement with the institutional educative mission were not correlated to classification status. These findings, though, do not refute the editorially-based suppositions on the part of various authors that librarians ought to be classified as faculty, merely that linking the classification to happier, more involved librarians is fallacious. The conclusion neither deductively nor inductively follows from the premises.

The results of this study confirmed the personal preconceptions I had entering this project. Though I support a modified form of faculty status (and equitable pay and benefits) for academic librarians, I have always felt strongly that the nature of librarians and librarianship was such that the intrinsic satisfaction of helping to facilitate learning and knowledge was paramount, often despite inappropriate status or compensation. This is not to imply that status and material reward are unimportant. Librarians deserve and are entitled to appropriate classification and recompense. The results of this study confirm my suppositions, though, that academic librarians, generally, love what they do and are a responsible, committed group of employees on a college or university campus. Their involvement with the educative mission of their institution is an obligation they

take seriously and quite willingly. Status and classification are not determiners of this commitment and desire.

REFERENCES

- Badke, W. (2005). Can't get no respect: Helping faculty to understand the educational power of information literacy. In S. Kraat (Ed.), *Relationships between teaching faculty and teaching librarians* (pp. 63-80). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
- Batt, F. (1985). Faculty status for academic librarians: Justified or just a farce? In P. Spyers-Duran & T. Mann (Eds.), *Issues in academic librarianship* (pp. 115-128). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bell, S. (2000). Creating learning libraries in support of seamless learning cultures. *College and Undergraduate Libraries*, 6, 45-58.
- Bell, S. (2003). A passion for academic librarianship: Find it, keep it, sustain it – a reflective inquiry. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3, 633-642.
- Benedict, M. (1991). Librarians' satisfaction with faculty status. *College & Research Libraries*, 52, 538-548.
- Bengston, D., & Shields, D. (1985). A test of Marchant's predictive formulas involving job satisfaction. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 11, 88-92.
- Berg, G., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & J. Nakamura. (2003). Mission possible? Enabling good work in higher education. *Change*, 35(5), 41-47.
- Biggs, M. (1981). Sources of tension and conflict between librarians and faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 52, 182-201.
- Biggs, M. (1995). Librarians as educators: Assessing our self-image. *Public and Access Services Quarterly*, 1, 41-50.

- Bolger, D., & Smith, E. (2006). Faculty status and rank at liberal arts colleges: an investigation into the correlation among faculty status, professional rights and responsibilities, and overall institutional quality. *College & Research Libraries*, 67, 217-229.
- Bryan, J. (2007). The question of faculty status for academic librarians. *Library Review*, 56, 781-787.
- Buschman, J. (1989). The flip side of faculty status. *College & Research Libraries News*, 50, 972-976.
- Cardina, C., & Wicks, D. (2004). The changing roles of academic reference librarians over a ten-year period. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 44, 133-141.
- Cary, S. (2001). Faculty rank, status, and tenure for librarians. *College & Research Libraries News*, 62, 510-512, 520.
- Christiansen, L., Stompler, M., & Thaxton, L. (2004). A report on librarian-faculty relations from a sociological perspective. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30, 116-121.
- Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education. (1880). *College libraries as aids to instruction* (No. 1-1880). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Clayton State University Mission Statement. (n.d.). Retrieved August 12, 2009, from <http://about.clayton.edu/mission.htm>
- Clayton State University Library Mission Statement. (2000). Retrieved August 12, 2009, from <http://adminservices.clayton.edu/library/about/mission.htm>
- Cronin, B. (2001). The mother of all myths. *Library Journal*, 126, 144.

- DeBoer, K., & Culotta, W. (1987). The academic librarian and faculty status in the 1980s: A survey of the literature. *College & Research Libraries, 48*, 215-222.
- Deeming, C., & Chelin, J. (2001). Make your own luck: A study of people changing career into librarianship. *New Library World, 102*, 13-26.
- DePew, J. (1983). The ACRL standards for faculty status: Panacea or placebo. *College & Research Libraries, 44*, 407-413.
- Dimmick, J. (1990). *The status of faculty status in Ohio academic libraries*, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED339392)
- Drucker, P. (1976). Managing the public service institution. *College & Research Libraries, 37*, 4-14.
- Emery, M. (1996). Mission control. *Training and Development, 50*, 51-53.
- English, T. (1983). Librarian status in the eighty-nine U.S. academic institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982. *College & Research Libraries, 44*, 199-211.
- Ezeani, S. (1998). *Research methods: A realistic approach*. Ibadan: Elohim.
- Farber, E. (1999). College libraries and the teaching/learning process: A 25-year reflection. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 25*, 171-177.
- Feldman, D., & Sciammarella, S. (2000). Both sides of the looking glass: Librarian and teaching faculty perceptions of librarianship at six community colleges. *College & Research Libraries, 61*, 491-498.
- Fikar, C., & Corral, O. (2001). Non-librarian health professionals becoming librarians and information specialists: Results of an internet survey. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, 89*, 59-67.

- Fisher, D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 185-202.
- Fogg, P. (2006). Young Ph.D's say collegiality matters more than salary. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(6), 1.
- Foley, S. (2007). Understanding a sense of place in collaborative environments. In M. J. Smith & G. Salvendy (Eds.), *Human interface, Part II, HCII 2007*, (pp. 863-872). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Fox, D. (2007). A demographic and career profile of Canadian research university librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33, 540-550.
- Gaziel, H. (2001). Correlates of job satisfaction: A study of the two factor theory in an educational setting. *Journal of Psychology*, 120, 613-626.
- Given, L., & Julien, H. (2005). Finding common ground: An analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes towards faculty. *Reference Librarian*, 89/90, 25-38.
- Gray, B., & McReynolds, R. (1983). A comparison of academic librarians with and without faculty status in the southeast. *College & Research Libraries*, 44, 283-287.
- Guideline for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of academic librarians. (2005). *College & Research Libraries News*, 66, 668-676.
- Guidelines for academic status for college and university librarians. (2007). *College & Research Libraries News*, 68, 378.
- Guskin, A., Stoffle, C., & Boisse, J. (1979/1980). The academic library as a teaching library: a role for the 1980s. *Library Trends*, 28, 281-296.

- Hagedorn, L. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 5-20.
- Hall, H.P., & Byrd, C. (1990). *The librarian in the university: Essays on membership in the academic community*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
- Hardesty, L. (1995). Faculty culture and bibliographic instruction: An exploratory analysis. *Library Trends*, 44, 339-367.
- Hegg, J. (1985/1986). Faculty status: Some expected and some not-so-expected findings. *Journal of Library Administration*, 6, 67-79.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 53-62.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hill, J. (1994). Wearing our own clothes: Librarians as faculty. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 20, 71-76.
- Hill, J. (2005). Constant vigilance, babelfish, and foot surgery: Perspectives on faculty status and tenure for academic librarians. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5, 7-22.
- Hoggan, D. (2003). Faculty status for librarians in higher education. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3, 431-445.
- Horenstein, B. (1993). Job satisfaction of academic librarians: An examination of the relationships between satisfaction, faculty status, and participation. *College & Research Libraries*, 54, 255-269.

- Hosoi, M. (2005). Motivating employees in academic libraries in tough times. *ACRL Twelfth National Conference*. Retrieved February 13, 2009, from http://www.library.cornell.edu/pdc/reports/conferences/ACRL05_Hosoi_Motivating%20Employees.pdf
- Iacqua, J., Schumacher, P., & Li, H. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education, 116*, 51-61.
- Isaacson, D. (1990). An educationally and professionally appropriate service. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 16*, 80-81.
- Julien, H., & Given, L. (2002/2003). Faculty-librarian relationships in the information literacy context: A content analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes and experiences. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science, 27*, 65-87.
- Kempcke, K. (2002). The art of war for librarians: Academic culture, curriculum reform, and wisdom from Sun Tzu. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 2*, 529-551.
- Kennesaw State University Mission Statement. (2006). Retrieved August 2, 2009, from <http://www.kennesaw.edu/mission.shtml>
- Kilpatrick, T. (1982). *A survey of academic librarians' perceptions of faculty status and selected criteria for promotion in rank in Illinois state supported university libraries*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
- King, N. (1970). Clarification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Psychological Bulletin, 74*, 18-31.
- Kingma, B., & McCombs, G. (1995). The opportunity costs of faculty status for academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries, 56*, 258-264.

- Knowlton, S., & Imamoto, B. (2006). Recruiting non-MLIS graduate students to academic librarianship. *College and Research Libraries*, 67, 561-570.
- Koenig, M., Morrison, R., & Roberts, L. (1996). Faculty status for library professionals: Its effect on job turnover and job satisfaction among university research library directors. *College & Research Libraries*, 57, 295-299.
- Lahiri, R. (1988). The human side of the library: A profile of Manipur. *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 35, 84-92.
- Landry, M. (2000). The effects of life satisfaction and job satisfaction on reference librarians and their work. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 40, 166-177.
- Lanier, P., Carson, P., Carson, K., & Phillips, J. (1997). What keeps academic librarians in the books? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 23, 191-197.
- Leckie, G., & Brett, J. (1997). Job satisfaction of Canadian university librarians: A national survey. *College & research Libraries*, 58, 31-47.
- Leckie, G., & Fullerton, A. (1999, April 8-11). The roles of academic librarians in fostering a pedagogy for information literacy. *ACRL Ninth National Conference*. Retrieved February 25, 2008, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlevents/leckie99.pdf>
- Lifer, E. (1994). Are you happy in your job? LJ's exclusive report. *Library Journal*, 119(18), 44-45.
- Luzius, J., & Ard, A. (2006). Leaving the academic library. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32, 593-598.

- Lynch, B., & Verdin, J. (1983). Job satisfaction in libraries: Relationships of the work force itself, age, sex, occupational group, tenure, supervisory level, career commitment, and library department. *Library Quarterly*, 53, 434-447.
- MacAdam, B. (2000). From the other side of the river: Re-conceptualizing the educational mission of libraries. In A. Bahr (Ed.), *Future teaching roles for academic librarians* (pp. 77-93). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
- Malia, E. (1997). Professional is an attitude. *Library Mosaics*, 8, 12-13.
- Marchant, M. (1969). Faculty-librarian conflict. *Library Journal*, 94, 2886-2889.
- Marchant, M. (1976). *Participative management in academic libraries*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Marchant, M. (1982). Participative management, job satisfaction, and service. *Library Journal*, 94, 782-784.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.
- McAnally, A. (1971). Status of the university librarian in the academic community. In J. Orne (Ed.), *Research librarianship: Essays in honor of Robert Downs* (pp. 19-50). New York: R. R. Bowker.
- McClenney, G. (1989). *Why students choose careers in information and library science: Factors that affect the decision-making process*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- McFarlin, D., Coster, E., Rice, R., & Cooper, A. (1995). Facet importance and job satisfaction: Another look at the range-of-affect hypothesis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 489-502.

- McGowan, J., & Dow, E. (1995). Faculty status and academic librarianship: Transformation to a clinical model. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 21, 345-350.
- McKee, A., Geer, B., Markwith, M., Oberg, S., Schatz, B., & Stamison, C. (2008). Hitting the trifecta: Alternate career paths for those with an MLIS. *Serials Librarian*, 54, 179-192.
- Meringolo, T. (2006). Supporting the institutional mission: Libraries lead the way. *College & Research Libraries News*, 67, 544-546.
- Miller, J., & Benefiel, C. (1998). Academic librarians and the pursuit of tenure: The support group as a strategy for success. *College & Research Libraries*, 59, 260-265.
- Miller, N. (2001). Sense of place in the workplace. *Journal of Interior Design*, 27, 35-44.
- Miller, R. (2007). What difference do we make? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33, 1-2.
- Mirfakhrai, M. (1991). Correlates of job satisfaction among academic librarians in the United States. *Journal of Library Administration*, 14, 117-131.
- Mitchell, W. (1989). Faculty status for academic librarians: Compliance with standards, opinions of university administrators, and a comparison of tenure-success records of librarians and instructional faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, Bozeman.
- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.

- Natural and Cultural Heritage Theme Report (2001). Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.environment.gov.au/soe/2001/publications/theme-reports/heritage/glossary.html>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. (2000). Expanding the framework of internal and external validity in quantitative research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Educational Research, Ponte Vedra, FL, November, 2000. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448205)
- Onwuegbuzie, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed-methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Owusu-Ansah, E. (2001). The academic library in the enterprise of colleges and universities: Toward a new paradigm. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27, 282-294.
- Pergander, M. (2006). Working knowledge: Calling all transplanted librarians. *American Libraries*, 37, 65.
- Plate, K., & Stone, E. (1976). Factors affecting librarians' job satisfaction. In R. Shimmon & C. London (Eds.), *A reader in library management* (pp. 146-160). North Haven, CT: Shoe String Press.
- Rain, J.S., Lane, I.M., & Steiner, D.D. (1991) A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. *Human Relations*, 44, 287-307.

- Renaud, R. (2006). Shaping a new profession: The role of librarians when the library and computer center merge. *Library Administration and Management*, 20, 65-71, 74.
- Riggs, D. (1987). Networking and institutional planning. *Journal of Library Administration*, 8, 59-67.
- Riggs, D. (1999). Faculty status for librarians: Force-fitting into an inappropriate mold or not? *College & Research Libraries*, 60, 305-306.
- Rockman, I. (1984). Job satisfaction among faculty and librarians: A study of gender, autonomy, and decision making opportunities. *Journal of Library Administration*, 5, 43-56.
- Samson, S., & Oelz, E. (2005). The academic library as a full-service information center. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31, 347-351.
- Sanders, L. (1989). *Faculty status of academic librarians in eight four-year state-supported colleges and universities in Mississippi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Sawtelle, H. (1878). The college librarianship. *Library Journal*, 3, 162.
- Seamans, N., & Metz, P. (2002). Virginia Tech's innovative college librarian program. *College & Research Libraries*, 63, 324-332.
- Sevier, R. (n.d.). Fine-tuning your mission. Retrieved January 10, 2009, from <http://itis-sps.ad.uab.edu/complianceaudit/assessment/Assessment%20Library/FineTuningMissionStatements.pdf>
- Sewell, R. (1983). Faculty status and librarians: The rationale and the case of Illinois. *College & Research Libraries*, 44, 212-222.

- 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 & Research Libraries*, 42, 561-570.
- Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html>
- Skiadas, C. (1999). *The role of libraries in a changing academic environment*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED433837)
- Slagell, J. (2005). Talk about images and issues of professional librarianship: Professional reflections in turbulent waters. *The Serials Librarian*, 48, 229-234.
- Smerek, R., & Peterson, M. (2006). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48, 229-250.
- Spang, L., & Kane, W. (1997). Who speaks for academic librarians? Status and satisfaction comparisons between unaffiliated and unionized librarians on scholarship and governance issues. *College & Research Libraries*, 58, 446-462.
- Terpstra, D., & Honoree, A. (2004). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education*, 124, 528-539.
- Topper, E. (2008). Job satisfaction in libraries: Love it or leave it. *New Library World*, 109, 287.
- Tucker, C. (2008). Development of midcareer librarians. *Journal of Business and Finance Librarianship*, 13, 241-248.

- University of Georgia Mission Statement. (2005). Retrieved August 2, 2009, from <http://www.uga.edu/profile/mission.html>
- Van Reenan, J. (1998). Librarians at work: Are we as satisfied as other workers? *Information Outlook*, 2, 23-26, 28.
- Van Selm, M., & Jankowski, N. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality and Quantity*, 40, 435-456.
- Velcoff, J., & Ferrari, J. (2006). Perceptions of university mission statement by senior administrators: Relating to faculty engagement. *Christian Higher Education*, 5, 329-339.
- Weaver-Meyers, P. (2002). Conflict resolution: A case study about academic librarians and faculty status. *College & Research Libraries*, 63, 25-34.
- Welch, J., & Mozenter, F. (2006). Loosening the ties that bind: Academic librarians and tenure. *College & Research Libraries*, 67, 164-176.
- Werrell, E., & Sullivan, L. (1987). Faculty status for academic librarians: A review of the literature. *College & Research Libraries*, 48, 95-103.
- White, H. (1996). Faculty status for academic librarians: The search for the Holy Grail. *Library Journal*, 121(19), 39-40.
- Wilkinson, J. (2000). From transmission to research: Librarians at the heart of the campus. In A. Bahr (Ed.), *Future teaching roles for academic librarians* (pp. 25-40). Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
- Williams, J. (2004). *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment, a Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry*. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=244&area=academics

Williamson, J., Pemberton, A., & Lounsbury, J. (2005). An investigation of career and job satisfaction in relation to personality traits of information professionals.

Library Quarterly, 75, 122-141.

Wilson, P. (1979). Librarians as teachers: The study of an organization fiction. *Library*

Quarterly, 49, 146-162.

Wlodkowski, R. (1999). *Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn*. San Francisco: Jossey-

Bass.

Works, G. (1927). *College and university library problems*. Chicago: American Library

Association.

Zemon, C. (2002). Midlife career choices: How are they different from other career

choices? *Library Trends*, 50, 665-672.

APPENDIX A

USG Librarian Classification Web Sites

USG Institution	Librarians Classified as Faculty?	Web Address
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	Yes	http://www.abac.edu/FacultySenate/
Albany State University	No	http://asu-sacs.asurams.edu/ComplianceDoc/ComplianceDoc_section3.7.5.pdf
Armstrong Atlantic State University	Yes	http://vpres.armstrong.edu/pdfs/Faculty_Handbook.pdf
Atlanta Metropolitan College	No	http://www.atlm.edu/pdf/facultyhandbookmarch701.pdf
Augusta State University	Yes	http://www.aug.edu/faculty_secretary/facman.pdf
Bainbridge College	No	http://www.bainbridge.edu/facustaff/_fac_han/fh_sec1.htm
Clayton State University	Yes	http://74.125.47.132/custom?q=cache:uJWY2FqyPEYJ:adminservices.clayton.edu/provost/Faculty/FacultyHandbookOct2006.doc+%22faculty+handbook%22&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=4&gl=us&client=google-coop-np
College of Coastal Georgia	Yes	http://www.ccca.edu/about/Files/StrategicPlan2008-2009.pdf
Columbus State University	Yes	http://faculty.colstate.edu/handbooks/FTfac/
Dalton State College	Yes	http://www.daltonstate.edu/hndbkpdf/statutes/STATUTES.pdf
Darton College	No	http://www.darton.edu/Documentation/faculty_handbk.pdf
East Georgia College	No	http://www.ega.edu/HR/Handbook/FacultyHandbookSpring06.pdf
Fort Valley State University	No	http://fvsu.edu/academics/academic-affairs
Georgia College and State University	Yes	http://www.gcsu.edu/index.html
Georgia Gwinnett College	Yes	http://www.ggc.usg.edu/index.php/Faculty-and-Staff-Landing-Page.html
Gainesville State College	Yes	http://www.gsc.edu/academics/acadaffairs/Pages/default.aspx

Georgia Highlands College	Yes	http://www.highlands.edu/hr/employee_handbook.htm
Georgia Institute of Technology	Yes	http://www.academic.gatech.edu/handbook/Georgia_Institute_of_Technology_-_Faculty_Handbook_Sep2008.pdf
Georgia Perimeter College	Yes	http://facstaff.gpc.edu/~apierc2/mcse/MCSEHandbookupdate.pdf
Georgia Southern University	Yes	http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/academics/provost/handbook/306.html
Georgia Southwestern University	Yes	http://www.gsw.edu/~aaf/handbook/faculty_handbook.htm
Georgia State University	Yes	http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwfhh/fhb.html
Gordon College	Yes	http://www.gdn.edu/departments/resources/statutes.asp
Kennesaw State University	Yes	http://www.kennesaw.edu/academicaffairs/acadpubs/facultyhandbook/
Macon State College	No	http://www.maconstate.edu/facultystaff/
Medical College of Georgia	Yes	http://www.mcg.edu/faculty/fachbook/contents.html
Middle Georgia College	Yes	http://www.mgc.edu/academic/
North Georgia College and State University	Yes	http://www.ngcsu.edu/vpaa/Manual/Manual/Handbooks/AA%20Administrative%20&%20Faculty%20Handbook/Word_Formatting_AA_Admin_html/New%20Index.htm
Savannah State University	Yes	http://www.savannahstate.edu/human_resources/empl_handbook.htm
South Georgia College	No	http://www.sgc.edu/faculty_staff/documents/facultyhandbook.pdf
Southern Polytechnic State University	Yes	http://www.spsu.edu/arts/handbook.html
University of Georgia	Yes	http://www.libs.uga.edu/staff/facprom.html#criteriaapp
University of West Georgia	Yes	http://www.westga.edu/~vpaa/handrev/
Valdosta State University	Yes	http://www.valdosta.edu/facsen/handbook/
Waycross College	Yes	http://www.waycross.edu/faculty_files/policies_procedures_manual/

APPENDIX B

Library Classification, Educative Mission and Sense of Place Survey for Librarians

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

Demographic and Classification Information

1. Gender:

- Female
- Male

2. Age range:

- Under 30
- 30-40
- 41-55
- 56 or over

3. Years as professional librarian:

- 0-3
- 4-10
- 11-20
- More than 20

4. Present job (choose that which best applies):

- Public Services (Circulation, Reference, Media Services, Archives)
- Public Services Department Manager
- Technical Services (Cataloging, Serials, Acquisitions, Collection Development)
- Technical Services Department Manager
- Administration
- Automation
- Other (please specify)

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

5. Level of your education (choose all that apply).

- MLS/MLIS degree
- Additional Master's degree
- Certification (e.g., School Library Media, Archives, Medical Library Association)
- Doctoral Degree

Other (please specify)

6. Career choice of librarianship (choose all that apply)

- Was my primary career desire
- Was something I came to based on experience working in a library
- Was something I came to after acquiring another graduate degree
- Was something I came to as a second (third?) career

Please describe your route into librarianship. How did you come to be an academic librarian?

7. Are you classified as faculty at your institution with titles identical to other faculty (e.g., Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

8. Are you classified as faculty in your institution with titles specific to librarians (e.g., Librarian I, Librarian II, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

9. Are you classified as administrative staff rather than faculty in your institution?

Yes

No

10. Do you have the opportunity for promotion similar to the teaching/research faculty at your institution?

Yes

No

11. Do you have the opportunity for tenure similar to the teaching/research faculty at your institution?

Yes

No

12. Do you have the opportunity to receive professional development money (to help fund travel or research, for example)?

Yes

No

13. Do you have the opportunity to serve on college/university committees (e.g., Faculty Senate)?

Yes

No

14. Do you have the opportunity to apply for sabbatical leave similar to teaching/research faculty?

Yes

No

15. Are you required to publish, present, or otherwise demonstrate professional output in addition to "regular, in-house" duties?

Yes

No

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

16. Do you now, or have you in the past, taught a semester-length class on campus?

Yes

No

17. Do you now, or have you in the past, taught in the library (bibliographic) instruction program in your library?

Yes

No

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

Attitudinal Information

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

18. Faculty rank and status is the appropriate classification for academic librarians.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. Academic librarians should have the same tenure opportunities as teaching/research faculty.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

20. Faculty status has the potential to enhance the career of an academic librarian.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

21. Having the institutional title of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, etc. is more important than being identified as a librarian.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

22. I am satisfied with my present job.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

23. I have a strong sense of commitment to my institution.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

24. There is a strong relationship between my job satisfaction level and my classification status.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

25. I feel I am an equal to teaching/research faculty at my college or university.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

26. I feel that teaching/research faculty perceive me as an equal at my college or university.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

27. My level of job satisfaction would change if I were classified differently at my college or university.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

28. I have a high level of initiative/motivation for my work.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

29. I have no desire to seek employment elsewhere.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

30. I am happy that I became an academic librarian.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

31. I would rather be an academic librarian than be a member of the teaching/research faculty in another department.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

32. I feel I have involvement with my school's educational mission.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Please describe what you see as your involvement in your institution's educational mission.

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

33. Classroom teaching is the essence of my college's or university's educational mission.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

34. Academic librarians help fulfill a vital role in the educational mission of my college or university.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

35. Participating in the educational mission of my college or university is a fundamental component of my job.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

36. My motivation and initiative would increase if I felt I had a greater role in the educational mission of my institution.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX C

Institutional Review Board Protocol Exemption Report



***Institutional Review Board (IRB)
for the Protection of Human Research Participants***

PROTOCOL EXEMPTION REPORT

PROTOCOL NUMBER: IRB-02375-2009

INVESTIGATOR: Alan Bernstein

PROJECT TITLE: The Nether World of Academic Librarians: Issues of Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

DETERMINATION:

- This research protocol is exempt from Institutional Review Board oversight under Exemption Category 2. You may begin your study immediately. If the nature of the research project changes such that exemption criteria may no longer apply, please consult with the IRB Administrator (irb@valdosta.edu) before continuing your research.

 - Exemption of this research protocol from Institutional Review Board oversight is pending. You may **not** begin your research until you have addressed the following concerns/questions and the IRB has formally notified you of exemption. You may send your responses to irb@valdosta.edu.
-

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Although not a requirement for exemption, the following suggestions are offered by the IRB Administrator to enhance the protection of participants and/or strengthen the research proposal:

There is a difference between protocol exemption and protocol approval. Exemption authority has been delegated to the IRB Administrator, so no voting IRB member sees exempted protocols. On the other hand, non-exempt protocols are either approved by an expediting team of two voting members or by the entire committee in a convened meeting. Your informed consent statement that will precede the survey is written correctly. However, the letter to head librarians should not say that the IRB has approved the study. Would you please replace that sentence with the same two sentences you used in the consent statement (“This study has been exempted....The IRB, a university committee...”) ? This will make the letter technically correct.

If you make any of these suggested changes to your protocol, please submit revisions so that IRB has a complete protocol on file.