

Who Speaks for Academic Librarians? Status and Satisfaction Comparisons between Unaffiliated and Unionized Librarians on Scholarship and Governance Issues

Lothar Spang and William P. Kane

Scholarship and governance have emerged as the two most problematic aspects of faculty status for academic librarians. A comparative survey of 201 librarians, 126 unaffiliated and 75 unionized, revealed wide disparities, according to librarian status/title designations, in the opportunities afforded librarians to meet these requirements. The 34-item questionnaire focused on librarians' status/title characteristics, representation means, and institutional support for professional development, sabbaticals/leaves, travel, tuition, and participatory management. Salary information, as a measure of librarian equality to teaching faculty, also was solicited. The survey results confirm that the absence of uniform representation on these status issues has profound implications for the future of the faculty status model as a standard for academic librarianship.



The representation of librarian interests promises to be a crucial concern in academic librarianship in the twenty-first century. Status as faculty, centered on a “three-tiered structure requiring performance in teaching (professional practice), scholarship, and service,”¹ was formally adopted by the ALA in 1971 as the definitive answer to the century-long debate over what constitutes the professional identity of academic librarians. But in the ensuing twenty-five years, faculty

status, with its emphasis on research, publication, and participatory management, has proved to be a less than uniformly applied model for librarians.

By 1986, two researchers, Fred E. Hill and Robert Hauptman, had concluded that “If it is in the best interests of the organization for librarians to have faculty status then they will—provided . . . they earn it.”² By 1992, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) had stated: “Faculty status for librarians is likely to be influenced more by attitudes and per-

Lothar Spang is a Reference Librarian in the Shiffman Medical Library at Wayne State University; e-mail: lspang@cms.cc.wayne.edu. William P. Kane is Associate Dean for Public Services in McNichols Library at the University of Detroit-Mercy; e-mail: kanewp@udmercy.edu.

spectives of local . . . administrators and faculty than by demands of librarians or any standards set by national library organizations."³

Other researchers cite a weak research base, librarianship itself, as the prime reason for the lack of scholarship.¹⁵

Current estimates are that 67 percent of higher education institutions grant such status to their librarians.⁴ Most compliance is found in larger public institutions.⁵ In general, faculty status as a standard is reported to be "holding its own and making small gains."⁶ Prospects for the future of academic librarians as equals to teaching faculty, however, appear uncertain. The reasons are the unresolved practical issues relating to librarians' ability to meet professional status standards and the continuing absence of uniform representation of librarian interests on these concerns.

Scholarship and Governance: Ongoing Problems for Academic Librarians

During the past ten years, as demonstrated by increasing coverage in the professional literature, scholarship and governance have emerged as the two most troublesome aspects of faculty status for librarians. Both have had a profound impact on work schedules, workloads, and responsibilities. Both have altered the criteria for promotions, employment security, and compensation. Each has generated mixed opinions from faculty and administrators on the role of librarians as professionals, and each has inspired increasing calls within the profession for librarians to redefine faculty standards to allow librarians to wear "their own clothes."⁷

In 1987, Robert Boice, Jordan M. Scepaniski, and Wayne Wilson emphasized librarians' ongoing "lack of com-

mitment to research and publication."⁸ Since then, Michael Koenig, Ronald Morrison, and Linda Roberts; Richard M. Dougherty; Shelley Arlen and Nedria A. Santizo; and Kee DeBoer and Wendy Culotta,⁹ among others, have each concluded that the release time necessary to fulfill this requirement has proved to be nearly insurmountable in that librarianship, unlike teaching, is based on service rather than scholarship. For William K. Black and Joan M. Leysen, "The structure of librarians' work environment and the way institutions and librarians perceive scholarship are the major obstacles."¹⁰ The expense is the problem, according to Richard W. Meyer, who calculates that librarian scholarship requirements impose a 9 percent cost in teaching faculty research production, in terms of librarian time lost to service.¹¹ Other researchers cite a weak research base, librarianship itself, as the prime reason for the lack of scholarship.¹² Still others fault library schools that do not teach research methods.¹³

Governance has presented as equally formidable a dilemma as scholarship. A premier obstacle has been administrator attitudes in a profession in which, unlike teaching, management traditionally has been hierarchical rather than collegial. Lynne E. Gamble notes the perception that managers often see participatory management as "anti-authoritarian."¹⁴ Morris A. Hounion, Belle Zeller, Lothar Spang, and Gloriana St. Clair and Irene B. Hoadley¹⁵ each document administrator efforts to either eliminate or limit faculty status at their respective institutions. By 1995, an ARL appraisal of governance practices indicated that, although slightly more managers than in a previous survey relied on committee advice on various issues, 7 percent fewer library faculties met to discuss policies and procedures in advisory capacities.¹⁶ Current estimates are that 60 percent of library directors think faculty status is of no benefit to their staffs.¹⁷

The Unresolved Practical Aspects of Faculty Status

After twenty-five years of striving to meld librarianship requirements with teaching faculty standards, academic librarians are still regarded by faculty, and, in turn, by administrators, as service providers rather than scholarly colleagues. Such attitudes are reflected in the benefit levels afforded to librarians. Faculty librarians earn significantly less than academic faculty of the same rank.¹⁸ Even library directors ultimately do not benefit from faculty status in that their experience as supervisory professionals does not translate into promotions to the upper echelons of institution administration.¹⁹ As for time allotments for scholarship and governance responsibilities: Workweeks are still forty hours concentrated on library service. Professional leaves often are shorter than those of faculty. And work schedules for most librarians remain based on an eleven-month year in contrast to the nine-month schedules of teaching faculty. For librarians, therefore, the practical incentives for meeting faculty status requirements remain major issues.

The Quest for Faculty Status: The Current Dilemma

Despite the ongoing difficulties, in at least one study 64 percent of librarians are reported to want faculty status.²⁰ The positive relationship between such status and librarian job satisfaction has been emphasized in recent studies by Koenig, Morrison, and Roberts, by Bonnie Horenstein, and by Rodney M. Hershberger.²¹ Conversely, the benefits of such status for institutions, primarily in a better qualified staff, also have been noted by Marjorie A. Benedict, by Elizabeth Park and Robert Riggs, and by Faculty Status: 2001, a 1992 Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) collegium charged with establishing future goals for the profession.²²

On librarians' quest for parity with faculty, the ARL has advised that: "Con-

ditions on any one campus may warrant an effort . . . by librarians to seek the same kind of protection afforded faculty in order to assure the presence of skilled staff necessary to provide effective service" (the authors' emphasis).²³ But how this effort by librarians is to be made in their respective institutions remains an open question. It also is a key consideration in defining the future identity of academic librarianship.

Librarian Interest Representation Past and Present

Academic librarians traditionally have had their interests represented through one or more means from among four choices: acting singly in negotiating their own interests with administrators; relying on the judgment and goodwill of supervisors to promote librarian interests; participating in collaborative ventures with their fellow librarians to enhance professional interests; and/or, if available, joining a union, most often a large teacher collective, for formal negotiations. ALA, an advisory body representing libraries and library interests, of which librarians are only one element, has a long-standing policy of neutrality on collective action.²⁴ Thus, of these four means, unionization, as the most extreme, has been the most problematic for librarians, pitting professional ideals against practical realities.

Interest in unionization also has been cyclic, reflective of prevailing economic and social conditions. The first academic librarian collective bargaining contracts were signed in 1946, at Howard University and at Yale University, at the beginning of the nation's postwar economic resurgence.²⁵ Because of McCarthyism strictures in U. S. colleges and universities during the 1950s and early 1960s, it was not until 1965, when University of California-Berkeley librarians during the social unrest of the Vietnam era formed a librarians' union, that collective action by librarians promised to become a force on American campuses.²⁶

By 1976, the National Education Association (NEA) represented faculty, among them librarians, at 181 higher education institutions; the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), at 138; and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), at forty-three.²⁷ By 1981, because academic librarians were represented by various unions, often with other types of employees, no reliable statistics were available on unionized academic librarians nationwide.²⁸ Currently, because of recent amalgamations in various union locals, data on AFT and NEA representation are not available; the AAUP, however, is bargaining agent for at least ninety institutions.²⁹

But, judging by the altered focus on union issues in the library literature of the past fifteen years, librarians' interest in union activism has waned considerably. In the 1980s, many discussions centered on the bargaining of single issues. So far in the 1990s, concentration has been more on the theoretical aspects of unionism. This focus change parallels an increase in the economic stringencies experienced by higher education institutions and commensurate worries by librarians over their employability amid staff downsizings in the same period. In 1997, as in 1981, however, definitive numbers on unionized and unaffiliated librarians have remained unavailable.

Assessing Academic Librarians' Future Status Prospects: The Questions

Academic librarianship, therefore, currently includes a wide range of librarians: from those who have minimal professional status and little or no representative voice, to those who have full faculty status and national union representation. This representation diversity has meant a wide disparity in the strength of librarian interest advocacy and, in turn, institution adherence to the faculty status model. It also has

imposed a large responsibility on librarians to represent effectively their own professional interests within their respective institutions.

Unaffiliated or unionized, academic librarians who seek to meet the standards set for their profession have a common interest in scholarship and governance issues and accompanying concerns: release time, promotion and job security basis, professional development opportunities, management apportionment, and the tangible measure of their efforts—remuneration. How these issues are resolved in any given institution defines whether its librarians have, or can expect to have, faculty status according to ACRL standards.

No investigations have focused on librarians' own assessments of their current abilities to meet scholarship and governance requirements in light of their interest representation.

Seventy-five percent of the research on such status topics has been compiled through surveys of library directors.³⁰ No investigations have focused on librarians' own assessments of their current abilities to meet scholarship and governance requirements in light of their interest representation. Yet a sampling of such views can provide a useful perspective on five questions in the status debate: (1) How do academic librarians perceive their present status? (2) What importance do librarians place on these issues? (3) How important is the role of administrators in the recognition of faculty status for librarians? (4) Do librarians think that, realistically, given their current working conditions, they have the opportunity to maintain, or achieve, faculty status? (5) Is collective action a constructive method of maintaining or achieving such status?

The Survey Questionnaire

These five questions served as a frame-

work for a thirty-four-item questionnaire devised to garner librarians' perceptions of, and satisfaction with, their present scholarship and governance opportunities as defined by their professional status characteristics and their interest representation. Queries about status description were adapted from the 1990 ACRL standards which require, for librarians, certain rights and responsibilities in professional duties, governance, compensation, tenure, promotions, leaves, research and development funds, and academic freedom that are comparable to faculty.³¹

Accordingly, survey questions focused on status and title designations; salary, employment security, and promotion basis; and participatory management, leaves, and professional development descriptions. Status satisfaction, defined as the assessment of the practical application of status standards, was gleaned through questions on aspects of professional development support, governance, pay scale comparison to teaching faculty, and salary increases of the past two years. Representation questions focused on how librarian interests on status issues were conveyed to administrators. Included were queries on the presence of, and descriptions of, any informal or ad hoc committees or organizations; nonunion collective formal organizations, such as a Librarians Assembly; and any union affiliation. For identification, respondents were asked only to list their institution's name. Confidentiality was assured. (Copies of the questionnaire are available from the first author.)

The Contact Means

Because no definitive lists of unionized and unaffiliated institutions are available, librarians were contacted through two sources: listserv postings and lists of unaffiliated and unionized institutions compiled by the Wayne State University (WSU) local of the AAUP. Questionnaires were posted to four listserv sources: LIBPER, a library personnel issues list;

COLLBARG, aimed at reference librarians involved with, or interested in, academic librarian collective bargaining issues; MEDLIB, focused on issues of interest to university medical librarians; and LAWLIB, geared to university law library professionals. At the same time, questionnaires, directed to "Reference Librarian," also were sent randomly by U. S. mail to ninety libraries from the WSU/AAUP-supplied lists: Seventy of these libraries were cited as unionized and twenty as unaffiliated. "Reference Librarian" was chosen as the designee to encourage anonymous responses from "line" librarians rather than administrators.

The Respondents

Completed surveys were returned by 201 librarians: 126 unaffiliated and 75 unionized. Included were respondents from 67 private institutions (15 unionized, 52 unaffiliated) and 134 public institutions (60 unionized, 74 unaffiliated). The majority of responses came from librarians in midsize four-year colleges and universities. The unions represented included the AAUP, thirty-six respondents; AFT, eighteen; NEA, five; AFL-CIO, four; and various other union amalgamations and regional collectives, twelve.

A cross section of four status/title categories was encompassed, three almost evenly represented: Faculty status with faculty title (faculty/faculty) had fifty-seven respondents; faculty status with librarian title (faculty/librarian), sixty; and respondents in institutions where librarians were classified as professional/administrative staff (professional/administrative), fifty-seven. The fourth status category, Other, which included those librarians in institutions where librarians were termed academic staff or had multitrack options, had twenty-seven respondents (see table 1). Combined, these four categories, and the attendant representation indicated for each, provided a basis for gauging the current scholarship and governance applications of the faculty

Table 1
Description of Respondents

Total Number of Librarians	201
Types of Institutions/Libraries	
4-year colleges/universities	145
2-year colleges	16
University medical libraries	19
University law libraries	21
Enrollment Size of Institutions	
Over 20,000	27
10,000 – 20,000	52
1,000 – 9,999	109
Under 1,000	13
Financial Support of Institutions	
Public	134
Private	67
Librarian Status/Titles	
Faculty status with faculty title	57
Faculty status with librarian title	60
Professional/Administrative staff	57
Other, including academic staff and librarians with multi-track options	27
Librarian Representation	
Unaffiliated (74 public institutions, 52 private)	126
Union (60 public institutions, 15 private)	75

Note: Replies were received from librarians in 183 institutions: 15 institutions had 2 replies; 2 had 3; and 1 had 4.

status standards and, in turn, the future prospects for the faculty status model.

Librarian Status/Title Designations

In the faculty/librarian category, unionized respondents outnumbered the unaffiliated librarians by only four. But in the faculty/faculty, professional/administrative, and Other categories (by seventeen, twenty-seven, and eleven, respectively), unaffiliated librarians outnumbered the unionized respondents. Unique to each of the four categories, however, was the descriptions of their respective institutions (see table 2).

Of the fifty-seven faculty/faculty librarians, forty-one came from public institutions; twenty-five of these institutions were unaffiliated, most in the over

10,000 enrollment range. Forty-two of the fifty-seven professional/administrative (P/A) librarians came from unaffiliated institutions, twenty-one public, twenty-one private; the majority of these institutions had enrollments of under 10,000. The twenty-seven librarians in the Other category were mainly from unaffiliated public institutions of mid and larger size. But, of the sixty faculty/librarian respondents, twenty-eight were from unaffiliated institutions of varying size that were almost evenly divided between private (fifteen) and public (thirteen); the thirty-two unionized faculty/librarian respondents were mainly from public institutions that were predominately in the mid- and large-size ranges. Generally, the public institutions of 10,000 or more enrollment were those that afforded faculty/faculty, faculty/librarian, or Other status/title designations; smaller institutions, of under 10,000 enrollment, the professional/administrative designation. Of the four categories, faculty/librarian respondents were the most apt to be unionized.

Status Characteristics: Tenure, Promotions, and Related Peer Review

All twenty unionized faculty/faculty librarians were eligible for tenure which was equal to that of teaching faculty (i.e., not a continuing service contract or other tenure variation), as were thirty-one of the thirty-seven unaffiliated faculty/faculty librarians. For faculty/faculty respondents, the findings on promotion criteria equal to teaching faculty proved to be nearly identical to those findings on tenure: Nineteen of the twenty unionized and thirty-three of the thirty-seven unaffiliated librarians had comparable promotion standards. Similarly, nineteen unionized and thirty-four unaffiliated faculty/faculty respondents participated in tenure and promotion decisions (see table 3).

and tenure decisions. Of the twenty-eight unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents, however, only eight had the tenure option, fourteen had comparable promotion criteria, and sixteen had peer review responsibilities. Librarians in the Other category showed a similar pattern to faculty/librarian respondents: They were likely to have comparable tenure, promotion, and related peer review input only if unionized. Professional/administrative librarians, whether unionized or not, had little access to such privileges: Few had tenure or comparable promotion criteria; only 23 percent (nine unaffiliated, four unionized) participated in promotion decisions.

For faculty/librarian and Other respondents, unionization,

therefore, correlated significantly with opportunities to meet faculty status standards on tenure, promotion, and related peer review issues at nearly the same levels as unaffiliated and unionized faculty/faculty librarians. But, for professional/administrative librarians, unionization had little impact on these issues.

Status Characteristics: Salaries, Budgets, and Related Governance

For unaffiliated and unionized librarians

TABLE 2
Status/Title Categories of Librarians by Representation and Type/Size of Institution (N = 201)

Type/Size of Institution	Fac/Fac (n = 57)		Fac/Lib (n = 60)		P/A (n = 57)		Other (n = 27)	
	Unaf. (n = 37)	Union (n = 20)	Unaf. (n = 28)	Union (n = 32)	Unaf. (n = 42)	Union (n = 15)	Unaf. (n = 19)	Union (n = 8)
Private								
Under 1,000	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1
1,000 – 9,999	11	3	11	3	18	2	4	0
10,000 – 20,000	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0
Over 20,000	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	4	15	5	21	5	4	1
Public								
Under 1,000	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
1,000 – 9,999	5	10	7	11	11	5	4	4
10,000 – 20,000	13	4	1	11	4	4	7	2
Over 20,000	6	2	3	5	4	1	4	1
Total	25	16	13	27	21	10	15	7

Note: Fac/Fac = Faculty status with faculty title (Assistant Professor, etc.), Fac/Lib = Faculty status with librarian title (Librarian I, etc.), P/A = Professional/Administrative staff, Other = Academic staff or librarians in institutions having multi-track systems for librarians, Unaf = Unaffiliated with a union, Union = Unionized.

But, in contrast to faculty/faculty librarians who, whether unionized or not, tended to have tenure, promotion, and related peer review privileges that were like those of teaching faculty, the faculty/librarian respondents were more apt to have such privileges only if unionized: Of the thirty-two unionized faculty/librarian respondents, twenty-two had tenure, nineteen had tenure equal to faculty, twenty-four had promotion criteria equal to faculty, and twenty-eight participated in promotion

TABLE 3
Tenure, Promotions, and Related Governance:
Status by Representation Comparisons (N = 201)

	Fac/Fac (n = 57)		Fac/Lib (n = 60)		P/A (n = 57)		Other (n = 27)	
	Unaf.	Union	Unaf.	Union	Unaf.	Union	Unaf.	Union
Do you have . . . (n = 37)	(n = 20)	(n = 17)	(n = 28)	(n = 32)	(n = 42)	(n = 15)	(n = 19)	(n = 8)
Tenure eligibility?*								
Yes	31	20	8	22	3	2	8	6
No	4	0	16	7	35	11	4	2
Other	2	0	4	2	4	2	7	0
Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Tenure equal to faculty?***								
Yes	31	20	10	19	0	2	7	4
No	6	0	17	10	39	12	12	4
Other	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Don't know	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0
Promotion criteria equal to faculty?								
Yes	33	19	14	24	6	3	8	6
No	2	0	9	7	27	8	9	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Don't know	2	1	5	1	9	2	2	0
Promotion and tenure decision participation?								
Yes	34	19	16	28	9	4	13	6
No	3	1	11	3	32	10	6	2
Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
No response	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Note: See Table 2 footnote for abbreviations key.
 *Eight institutions were reported by respondents to have recently ended the tenure provision for new hires: 6 unaffiliated and 2 unionized.
 **Tenure equal to faculty = True tenure, not a continuing service contract or other variation of tenure. Tabulations in this category reflect the factor explained in footnote* (above): New hires in 8 institutions were no longer offered the tenure track, but already tenured librarians retained tenure comparable to faculty.

alike, in all four categories, a merit and across-the-board combination was the most common salary basis (see table 4). The most startling finding, however, was that, unionized or not, faculty/faculty librarians, in higher numbers as compared to faculty/librarian respondents, had little role in the review process: Fifty percent (nineteen of thirty-seven) of the unaffiliated faculty/faculty librarians reported no role in salary review. The unionized faculty/faculty librarians showed a similar pattern: Forty-five percent (nine of twenty) had no such voice,

either. By contrast, 53 percent (seventeen of thirty-two) of the unionized faculty/librarian respondents participated in such reviews. Unionized librarians in the Other category were nearly comparable to unionized faculty/librarian respondents: Of the eight unionized Other librarians, five participated in salary decisions. But professional/administrative librarians, unionized or not, had almost no say in such decisions. Participation in unit budget preparation was highest for unionized librarians in the faculty/faculty, faculty/librarian,

TABLE 4
Economic Issues and Related Governance:
Status by Representation Comparisons (N = 201)

Do you have . . .	Fac/Fac (n = 57)		Fac/Lib (n = 60)		P/A (n = 57)		Other (n = 27)	
	Unaf. (n = 37)	Union (n = 20)	Unaf. (n = 28)	Union (n = 32)	Unaf. (n = 42)	Union (n = 15)	Unaf. (n = 19)	Union (n = 8)
(as) salary basis								
Merit?	8	3	8	2	3	0	3	0
AcB?	7	9	4	13	14	4	3	6
Both?	15	7	15	10	22	9	8	2
Other?	7	1	1	7	3	2	5	0
Peer salary decision participation?								
Yes	16	11	7	17	3	1	6	5
No	19	9	18	11	36	14	12	3
Don't know	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	0
No response	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0
Unit budget decision participation?								
Yes	19	10	11	22	19	2	6	4
No	15	9	14	10	20	13	13	4
Don't know	3	1	3	0	3	0	0	0

Note: See Table 2 footnote for complete abbreviations key. AcB = Across the board.

and Other categories: The faculty/librarian respondents, with 69 percent (twenty-two of thirty-two) reporting participation, had the most involvement. Fifty percent (ten of twenty) of the faculty/faculty librarians, and 50 percent (four of eight) of the Other respondents also were involved. Unaffiliated professional/administrative librarians, however, had more budget responsibilities than did their unionized counterparts: Forty-five percent of the unaffiliated professional/administrative librarians had such involvement, as contrasted to only

13 percent of the unionized professional/administrative respondents.

Thus unionization, especially for faculty/librarian and Other librarians, correlated strongly with participation in salary and budget decisions. By contrast, whether unionized or not, faculty/faculty librarians, the group that would have been expected to have the most participation, as patterned after teaching faculty management practices, had comparatively less involvement. Professional/administrative librarians, unionized or unaffiliated, had little role in peer

salary reviews. But, surprisingly, if unaffiliated, professional/administrative respondents reported considerable participation in the budget process.

Status Characteristics: Governance Forums

Of the 201 respondents, thirty-one unaffiliated librarians had no collective representation means on campus: Twenty-four of these thirty-one respondents were in the professional/administrative category; the remaining seven included four librarians with faculty/librarian status and three in the Other category. In no instance did a respondent have faculty status with a faculty title without at least one form of collegial representation on campus (see table 5).

Whether librarians were unionized or unaffiliated, across all four categories, the Academic Senate was the most common forum for librarian interest representation. One hundred and fifty-one respondents, eighty-nine unaffiliated and sixty-two unionized, reported that librarians at their institutions were eligible for elected Senate representation. All fifty-seven faculty/faculty librarians had such voice, as did fifty-four of the sixty faculty/librarian respondents and twenty of the twenty-seven Other category librarians. But sixty-five percent (thirty-seven) of the fifty-seven professional/ administrative librarians reported no such eligibility. Proportionately, unionized faculty/librarian, professional/administrative, and Other respondents had slightly more access to an elected Senate than did their unaffiliated counterparts.

A Librarians Assembly presence was reported by only forty-two respondents: twenty-five unaffiliated and seventeen unionized. Seventy-eight percent indicated that the Assembly was a representation means available to them in addition to the Senate. Unionized Other and professional/ administrative librarians reported the most Assembly access, while

TABLE 5
Collective Representation Options for Four Status/Title Categories of Academic Librarians (N = 201)

Options**	Unaffiliated Librarians* (N = 126 Respondents)			Unionized Librarians (N = 75 Respondents)		
	Fac/Fac (n = 37)	Fac/Lib (n = 28)	P/A (n = 42)	Fac/Fac (n = 20)	Fac/Lib (n = 32)	Other (n = 8)
Academic Senate	37	24	14	20	30	6
Librarians Assembly	8	6	6	1	8	5
Ad hoc Committee	1	4	4	4	2	2

Note: See Table 2 footnote for abbreviations key.
*Thirty-one unaffiliated librarians had no collective representation: Fac/Lib = 4; P/A = 24; Other = 3.
**Don't know/no response answers were, respectively: Academic Senate, 7/2; Librarians Assembly, 6/2; Ad hoc Committee, 13/8.

unionized faculty/librarian and unaffiliated faculty/faculty respondents reported proportionately less.

An ad hoc committee was a minor presence as a means of librarian interest representation. Only twenty-three librarians, thirteen unaffiliated and ten unionized, divided almost equally among the four categories of respondents, cited such access.

TABLE 6
Satisfaction Rankings on Professional Opportunity, Participatory Management, and Economic Concerns,
Most (1) to Least (7): Status by Representation Comparisons (N = 201)

Are you satisfied with your . . .	Fac/Fac (n = 57)		Fac/Lib (n = 60)		P/A (n = 57)		Other (n = 27)		Totals
	Unaf. (n=37)	Union (n=20)	Unaf. (n=28)	Union (n=32)	Unaf. (n=42)	Union (n=15)	Unaf. (n=19)	Union (n=8)	
1. Tuition reimbursement?									
Yes	26	11	17	19	25	12	10	4	124
No	8	7	8	10	10	3	7	4	57
Don't know	3	2	3	3	7	0	2	0	20
2. Professional development opportunities?									
Yes	24	16	20	19	21	7	10	4	121
No	10	3	7	13	17	7	9	4	70
Don't know	3	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	9
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
3. Participatory management opportunities?									
Yes	28	16	16	22	15	3	8	2	110
No	4	3	7	8	22	11	9	4	68
Don't know	5	1	4	2	5	1	2	2	22
No response	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
4. Sabbatical and professional leave opportunities?									
Yes	24	17	18	20	7	4	9	4	103
No	9	2	9	10	31	9	10	4	84
Don't know	4	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	13
No response	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

5. Travel support?	21	12	19	16	20	2	9	1	100
Yes	15	7	9	16	22	6	10	6	91
No	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	9
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
No response									
6. Salary increases of the past two years?	21	15	13	17	11	2	5	3	87
Yes	11	4	12	12	27	11	14	5	96
No	5	1	2	3	4	2	0	0	17
Don't know	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
No response									
7. Pay scale as compared to teaching faculty?	20	14	6	19	7	4	6	3	79
Yes	14	6	18	10	31	10	13	4	106
No	3	0	4	3	4	1	0	1	16
Don't know									

Note: See Table 2 footnote for Abbreviations key.

Whether unionized or not, 170 respondents in this survey had at least one means of collegial representation. Faculty/faculty librarians, unaffiliated or unionized, had the most Senate access. But union-represented librarians in the faculty/librarian and Other categories had access to the Senate almost comparable to faculty/faculty librarians. Of the four categories, however, faculty/librarian respondents had the most total means of representation.

Unionization, therefore, assured librarians the most collegial representation through a combination of union and Senate activity. But the majority of unaffiliated librarians also had representation available, most often the Senate. As indicated by a review of academic librarians' assessments of their respective professional situations, however, collective representation, regardless of status/title category, did not uniformly assure conditions conducive for meeting current scholarships and governance standards.

Satisfaction Assessments: Professional Opportunities, Governance, and Economic Issues

Status satisfaction questions centered on librarians' views of their overall opportunities to meet scholarship and governance obligations as required by ACRL standards, and the measure of such parity with teaching faculty—salaries. Included in scholarship support were tuition reimbursement, professional development opportunities, sabbaticals/professional leaves, and travel support. Overall satisfaction with governance issues was addressed by a question on participatory management opportunities (see table 6).

Sixty-two percent (124) of the 201 respondents, unionized or not, reported satisfaction with their tuition reimbursement opportunities. Unaffiliated librarians in the faculty/faculty, faculty/librarian, and Other categories were more satisfied than their unionized counterparts. Of the faculty/faculty librarians, 72 per-

cent (twenty-six) of the unaffiliated, as compared to 55 percent (eleven) of the unionized, respondents were pleased with tuition benefits. By a slight margin, unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents, at 61 percent (seventeen), were more satisfied than unionized faculty/librarian respondents (59 percent, nineteen). Similarly, unaffiliated librarians in the Other category, at 52 percent (ten), were slightly more pleased than their unionized counterparts (50 percent, four). But the opposite pattern was true for professional/administrative librarians: Eighty percent (twelve) of the unionized, as opposed to 59 percent (twenty-five) of the unaffiliated, professional/administrative respondents expressed approval.

Slightly more than 60 percent (121) of the 201 librarians reported satisfaction with professional development opportunities. Eighty percent (sixteen) of the unionized faculty/faculty librarians reported satisfaction with such support. But unaffiliated faculty/librarian, professional/administrative, and Other respondents reported slightly more opportunities than did their unionized counterparts.

As for sabbatical and professional leave support, of the four categories unionized faculty/faculty librarians reported the most satisfaction: Eighty-five percent (seventeen) of the unionized faculty/faculty respondents, as compared to 65 percent (twenty-four) of the unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents, were pleased. A reverse pattern was true for faculty/librarian respondents, of whom 64 percent (eighteen) of the unaffiliated and 62 percent (twenty) of the unionized librarians were satisfied. Unionized or not, 48 percent (thirteen) of the Other librarians who had access to such support were pleased. Only 19 percent (eleven) of the professional/administrative group expressed approval.

Travel support was satisfactory for only 49 percent (100) of reporting librarians: Fifty-six percent (twenty-one) of the

unaffiliated and 60 percent (twelve) of the unionized faculty/faculty librarians were satisfied. But, in contrast, 67 percent (nineteen) of the unaffiliated and 50 percent (sixteen) of the unionized faculty/librarian respondents approved of their support. Professional/administrative and Other librarians, unaffiliated or unionized, each reported a less than 50 percent satisfaction rate on this issue. Thus unionization, especially for faculty/faculty librarians, correlated significantly with satisfactory travel support.

Participatory management opportunities received mixed reviews. Faculty/faculty librarians reported the most satisfaction. Seventy-seven percent (forty-four) of these librarians reported satisfactory governance responsibilities. Included were 78 percent (twenty) of the unaffiliated, and 80 percent (sixteen) of the unionized librarians; thus satisfaction levels were nearly identical for unaffiliated and unionized faculty/faculty respondents. Sixty-three percent (thirty-eight) of all the faculty/librarian respondents also reported satisfactory participation: 69 percent (twenty-two) unionized, and 57 percent (sixteen) unaffiliated. But only 36 percent (ten) of the Other category librarians, most of them unaffiliated, and 31 percent (eighteen) of the professional/administrative respondents, most of them unaffiliated, reported such satisfaction. Therefore, for faculty/librarian respondents, as compared to the other three categories, unionization assured the most satisfactory overall governance participation.

Salary increase satisfaction was highest for unionized faculty/faculty librarians: Seventy-five percent (fifteen) received salary increases satisfactory to them within the past two years. But only 57 percent (twenty-one) of the unaffiliated faculty/faculty respondents reported such satisfaction. Of the faculty/librarian respondents, 46 percent (thirteen) of the unaffiliated and 53 percent (seventeen) of the unionized

librarians were pleased with their salary increases. Less than 30 percent of the respondents in both the Other and professional/administrative categories reported such satisfaction. For faculty/faculty and faculty/librarian respondents, therefore, unionization played a significant role in the negotiation of satisfactory pay raises.

Similarly, approval of their pay scale as compared to that of teaching faculty was highest for unionized faculty/faculty and faculty/librarian respondents. Seventy percent (fourteen) of the unionized faculty/faculty and 59 percent (nineteen) of the unionized faculty/librarian respondents reported satisfaction on this issue. Only 54 percent (twenty) of the unrepresented faculty/faculty and 21 percent (six) of the unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents expressed such satisfaction. As for professional/administrative and Other librarians, when these two groups were combined, whether unionized or not, only 23 percent (twenty) were pleased with the comparison at their institutions.

Salary increase satisfaction was highest for unionized faculty/faculty librarians.

Despite variations among the status/title categories, the total positive (satisfied) responses to the questions documented in table 6 were 724: 436 for the 126 unaffiliated librarians (average positive response/librarian = 3.4); 288 for the seventy-five unionized respondents (3.8). Proportionately, therefore, by only .4 did unionized librarians outscore unaffiliated librarians on satisfaction assessments. The negative (dissatisfied) responses in table 6 totaled 572: 373 for the unaffiliated (2.96 each); 199 for the unionized respondents (2.6). Thus, proportionately, unaffiliated respondents outscored unionized respondents by only .36 on negative assessments.

Scholarship and Governance: Where Academic Librarians Are Now

The foregoing survey of librarians was random. Yet respondents divided into four diverse groups, three of them almost evenly: faculty/faculty (fifty-seven), faculty/librarian (sixty), professional/administrative (fifty-seven) librarians; and a fourth, Other (twenty-seven). Unaffiliated or unionized, none of these four groups uniformly reported adequate scholarship and governance support according to current standards.

Unaffiliated faculty/faculty librarians, compared to their unionized faculty/faculty counterparts, had better tuition reimbursement opportunities. But on tenure, promotions, related peer review, Senate eligibility, and overall participatory management responsibilities, unaffiliated and unionized faculty/faculty librarians were nearly equal. Only on professional development, sabbaticals/leaves, travel, salary, and pay scale opportunities did unionized faculty/faculty librarians score better than their unaffiliated faculty/faculty counterparts. Unionized or not, faculty/faculty librarians, as a group, reported proportionately less peer salary review or unit budget input than did the faculty/librarian respondents.

More than librarians in any of the three other categories, faculty/librarian respondents benefited from unionization. Unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents were consistently outscored by their unionized counterparts on tenure, promotions, and related peer review responsibilities, salary peer review, unit budget input, Senate eligibility, participatory management, and salary and pay scale issues. Only on tuition reimbursement did unaffiliated faculty/librarian respondents do better than unionized faculty/librarian personnel. Professional development opportunities was the only area in which unaffiliated and unionized faculty/librarian respondents were nearly equal.

Unionized librarians in the Other category were second to unionized faculty/librarian respondents in their assessments of their situations. In only two categories, tuition and professional development support, did unaffiliated Other librarians do better than their unionized counterparts. On tenure, promotions, and related peer review, salary and budget input, and Senate eligibility, unionized Other librarians consistently outscored their unaffiliated Other counterparts. Only on positive assessments of sabbaticals/leaves support were unaffiliated and unionized Other librarians equal. But negative assessments of their travel, overall governance responsibilities, salary and pay scale opportunities were equal for unaffiliated and unionized Other librarians alike.

Of the four groups of respondents, professional/administrative librarians, unionized or unaffiliated, had the least means of meeting professional standards. Unionized professional/administrative respondents had more Senate eligibility and tuition reimbursement opportunities than did their unaffiliated professional/administrative counterparts. But on unit budget participation and professional development opportunities, the unaffiliated professional/administrative librarians fared better than unionized professional/administrative personnel. Unionized or unaffiliated professional/administrative respondents were equal, however, on their negative assessments of their tenure, promotion, peer review opportunities, sabbaticals/leaves, travel, governance, and salary and pay scale opportunities.

The New Questions for Academic Librarianship

Scholarship and governance are the two key elements of the faculty status model. If librarians do not have the necessary support to fulfill these requirements, they cannot be comparable to teaching faculty. As exemplified in the preceding survey,

a large proportion of librarians, according to their own assessments, do not have the opportunities required to meet these criteria. Not even the unionized librarians in this sample had optimum support. The question, then, is: Who effectively speaks for academic librarians on such issues?

Professional development opportunities was the only area in which unaffiliated and unionized faculty/librarian respondents were nearly equal.

In 1916, John Dewey became Cardholder #1 in the national AFT,³² a collective dedicated to teacher interest advancement. Academic librarians have never had a comparable activist of his stature. The ALA, since its inception in 1876, has been a professional association dedicated to libraries. In 1980, during the height of union activity, ALA, rather than becoming an activist organization, elected to remain a professional association only.³³ In essence, ALA ceded librarian interest representation to local administrators, and any larger collective action was left to assorted unions. One effort was made in 1982, led by the Hospital, Library, and Public Employees Union in Massachusetts, to form a National Federation of Librarians to promote librarian interests.³⁴ This effort failed. Consequently, academic librarians have relied on representation of their professional interests as available within their own institutions, primarily through administrators, secondarily through Senates. Larger collective representation has been assumed by default, mostly by teacher unions, of which librarians in any given bargaining unit constitute only an estimated 4 to 10 percent of the total membership.³⁵

But an intriguing finding in the present study was that, when queried on how many librarians in their institutions were active in union activities, forty-one

of the seventy-five unionized librarians responded only "a few" and nine said "none." Reasons for this general inactivity were not solicited, but a surmise is that librarians are uninterested in collective representation or are frustrated by the whole bargaining process. Or, more possibly, given the discrepancies between profession standards and the support to meet them, as reported in the present study by four categories of academic librarians, unaffiliated and unionized alike: Many academic librarians are simply "confused about what their profession and their institutions [expect] of them."³⁶ At least two studies³⁷ have emphasized that the standards for academic librarians have been in place for years, yet the ACRL, even though inviting reports of "allegations of violations of these standards,"³⁸ does not enforce the prescribed sanctions against institutions that

do not adhere to them. Academic librarianship thus remains the only profession in memory that allows the application of its standards to be decided by institution administrators.

Perhaps, then, the relevant questions for academic librarianship today are: How do academic librarians themselves (nonadministrators), unaffiliated or unionized, see their present situation? What are they, as a professional group, willing to do to improve it? How will library and institution management view such efforts? And, in turn, will professional organizations then be able to define and enforce reasonably attainable standards for all academic librarians? Constructive resolution of these questions can help to shape the identity of academic librarianship in the next century. Until then, who speaks for academic librarians? Administrators do.

Notes

1. William K. Black and Joan M. Leysen, "Scholarship and the Academic Librarian," *College and Research Libraries* 55 (May 1994): 229.
2. Fred E. Hill and Robert Hauptman, "A New Perspective on Faculty Status," *College and Research Libraries* 47 (Mar. 1986): 159.
3. Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, "Academic Status for Librarians in ARL Libraries," *SPEC Flyer* 182 (Mar. 1992): 2.
4. Charles B. Lowry, "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty-Year Perspective," *College and Research Libraries* 54 (Mar. 1993): 163.
5. Janet Krompart and Clara L. DiFelice, "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971-1984," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 13 (Mar. 1987): 16.
6. Lowry, "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," 163.
7. Janet S. Hill, "Wearing Our Own Clothes: Librarians As Faculty," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20 (May 1994): 71.
8. Robert Boice, Jordan M. Scepaniski, and Wayne Wilson, "Librarians and Faculty Members: Coping with Pressures to Publish," *College and Research Libraries* 48 (Nov. 1987): 494-503.
9. Michael Koenig, Ronald Morrison, and Linda Roberts, "Faculty Status for Library Professionals: Its Effect on Job Turnover and Job Satisfaction among University Research Library Directors," *College and Research Libraries* 57 (May 1996): 299; Richard M. Dougherty, "Faculty Status: Playing on a Tilted Field," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19 (May 1993): 67; Shelley Arlen and Nedria A. Santizo, "Administrative Support for Research: A Survey of Library faculty," *Library and Administrative Management* 4 (fall 1990): 208-12; Kee DeBoer and Wendy Culotta, "The Academic Librarian and Faculty Status in the 1980s: A Survey of the Literature," *College and Research Libraries* 48 (May 1987): 218.
10. Black and Leyson, "Scholarship and the Academic Librarian," 230.
11. Richard W. Meyer, "Earnings Gains through the Institutionalized Standard of Faculty Status," *Library Administration and Management* 4 (fall 1990): 192.
12. Richard M. Dougherty, "Editorial: Library Education: The 1990s," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 17 (July 1991): 138, as quoted in Charles E. Slattery, "Faculty Status: Another 100 Years of Dialogue? Lessons from the Library School Closings," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20 (Sept. 1994): 195.
13. David G. Anderson and Christina Landram, "Resolved: Library Schools Do Not Meet Their

Goals and Objectives in Training Academic Librarians to Perform Research," paper prepared for the 4th National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Baltimore, Apr. 9-12, 1986.

14. Anonymous librarian quoted in Lynne E. Gamble, "University Service, New Implications for Academic Librarians," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 14 (Jan. 1989): 346.

15. Morris A. Hounion, "LACUNY and I: Experiences, Changes and Prospects," *Urban Academic Librarian* 7 (1990): 30-33; Belle Zeller, "The Status of CUNY Librarians," *Urban Academic Librarian* 7 (1990): 34-39; Lothar Spang, "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Status: A Twenty-Year Case Study of Wayne State University Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 54 (May 1993): 241-53; Gloriana St. Clair and Irene B. Hoadley, "The Challenge to Faculty Status: A Call to Militancy," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 63 (Dec. 1988): 23-24+.

16. Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, "Faculty Organizations in ARL Libraries: Activities and Documents," *SPEC Flyer* 206 (Jan. 1995): 1.

17. Thomas G. English, "Administrators' Views of Library Personnel Status," *College and Research Libraries* 45 (May 1984): 189-95, quoted in Rachel Applegate, "Deconstructing Faculty Status: Research and Assumptions," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19 (July 1993): 161.

18. Marie E. Zeglen and Edward J. Schmidt, "Academic and Librarian Faculty: Birds of a Different Feather in Compensation Policy," paper presented at the 32nd Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta, May 10-13, 1992.

19. Edward D. Garten, "Observations on Why So Few Chief Library Officers Move into Senior Academic Administration," *Library Administration and Management* 2 (Mar. 1988): 95-98, as mentioned in Koenig, Morrison, and Roberts, "Faculty Status for Library Professionals," 295.

20. Judith A. Dimmick, "The Status of Faculty Status in Ohio Academic Libraries," master's research paper, Kent State University, 1990 (abstract).

21. Koenig, Morrison, and Roberts, "Faculty Status for Library Professionals," 295-300; Bonnie Horenstein, "Job Satisfaction of Academic Librarians: An Examination of the Relationships between Satisfaction, Faculty Status, and Participation," *College and Research Libraries* 54 (May 1993): 255-69; Rodney M. Herscherberger, "The Challenges of Leading and Managing Faculty Status Librarians," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 14 (Jan. 1989): 361-65.

22. Marjorie A. Benedict, "Librarians' Satisfaction with Faculty Status," *College and Research Libraries* 52 (Nov. 1991): 538-48; Elizabeth Park and Robert Riggs, "Tenure and Promotion: A Study of Practices by Institutional Type," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19 (May 1993): 72-77; Irene B. Hoadley, "Faculty Status: 2001," *College and Research Libraries News* 54 (June 1993): 338-39.

23. ARL, "Academic Status for Librarians in ARL Libraries," 2.

24. Nancy E. Peace, "Personnel and Employment: Collective Bargaining," in *American Library Association Yearbook, 1981* (Chicago: ALA, 1982), 219.

25. Herbert Biblo, "Librarians and Trade Unionism: A Prologue," *Library Trends* 25 (Oct. 1976): 427.

26. Marilyn Oberg, Mary Blackburn, and Joan Dible, "Unionization: Costs and Benefits to the Individual and the Library," *Library Trends* 25 (Oct. 1976): 437.

27. "Unions Add 60 Campuses in 1976 Academic Year," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 12 (May 1976): 5.

28. Peace, "Personnel and Employment," 219.

29. Information supplied by J. Thompson, executive secretary, Wayne State University/American Association of University Professors, Detroit, Nov. 1996.

30. Krompart and DiFelice, "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971-1984," 16, mentioned in Horenstein, "Job Satisfaction of Academic Librarians," 256.

31. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," *College and Research Libraries News* 5 (May 1992): 317-18.

32. Dennis Chamot, "The Effect of Collective Bargaining on the Employee-Management Relationship," *Library Trends* 25 (Oct. 1976): 494.

33. Peace, "Personnel and Employment," 219.

34. John J. Keefe, "Collective Bargaining and the Librarian," *Bookmark* 40 (summer 1982): 211.

35. John W. Weatherford, *Collective Bargaining and the Academic Librarian* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1976), 112.

36. Krompart and DiFelice, "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971-1984," 17.

37. Catherine T. Brody, "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: The Dream and the Reality," *Bookmark* 45 (fall 1986): 46; John N. DePew, "The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status: Panacea or Placebo," *College and Research Libraries* 44 (Nov. 1983): 407-13.

38. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," *College and Research Libraries News* 5 (May 1992): 318.