

# A Survey of Academic Librarians and Their Opinions Related to Nine-Month Contracts and Academic Status Configurations in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi

*This study reports the findings of a survey of 267 academic librarians conducted in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi. Demographic and institutional characteristics and opinions of librarians with and without faculty status were studied. Publication, research, and proposal development activities and their relationship to the promotion of academic librarians was examined. Opinions on nine-month contracts, faculty status, and a comparable system that recognizes the unique nature of responsibilities of librarians were sought. The majority of the academic librarians, including those with faculty status, agreed with the statement that a comparable system would be a preferable mode of advancement.*

## INTRODUCTION

Academic status for librarians is of intense interest in the South as in other parts of the country. However, except for a study conducted in Kentucky,<sup>1</sup> very limited information on the attitudes of librarians in the South is available. The issue of faculty status and the benefits and responsibilities (equal and unequal) it bestows upon librarians has been widely discussed in the literature. In the seventies, new configurations and fresh approaches to academic status, such as the effects of collective bargaining on faculty

status, were explored.<sup>2</sup> However, the question most basic to the issue still needs clarification: the acceptance of the uniqueness of academic librarianship as a profession within the framework of higher education.

For librarians working in universities and colleges, the question of academic status is an important one. The development of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) guidelines in 1972 reflected the profession's concern about this issue.<sup>3</sup>

Several surveys to collect data on professional librarians and gather information about their attitudes toward faculty status have been conducted in different parts of the country.<sup>4</sup> The questions of salary,<sup>5,6</sup> length of contract,<sup>7</sup> peer review,<sup>8</sup> and library education<sup>9</sup> have been discussed. Systems parallel to "faculty status" have been effectively developed and reported.<sup>10</sup> The survey reported below was an attempt to gauge the characteristics and opinions of academic librarians in the tri-state area of Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi.

---

*Prabha Sharma is assistant professor of bibliography and subject specialist for history and political science, University of Alabama Library, Huntsville. The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Gerald C. Wheelock, professor of rural sociology, Alabama A&M University, in the use of the SPSS, in the statistical analysis of the data, and for his encouragement throughout the course of this study. Computer analysis expenditures were provided by the library at the University of Alabama in Huntsville.*

## THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In May 1980, letters were sent to directors of forty-four academic libraries in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi, requesting the names of librarians (those with a MLS) at their institutions. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for their responses. The institutions were selected from the *American Library Directory (ALD) 1980* and included all four-year institutions. The home institution of the author was excluded from the survey. Responses were received from thirty-two directors. Written reminders were mailed to twelve directors, which yielded the names of professional librarians at eight more institutions. One director wanted a clarification of the term "academic librarian." That was provided, but no names were forwarded. In addition, one large private and two large public universities in the tri-state area did not supply the names of their librarians. After the written reminder, a phone call was made to the private university and the response received stated that "a heavy work load and intensive planning period" prohibited the participation of its librarians in such a survey. The reply also stated that its librarians had neither faculty status nor tenure but were undergoing review of their classification scheme. However, documents pertaining to librarians were provided. At one of the two public institutions, the written reminder and follow-up phone call elicited the response that it was not its policy to disclose the names of its librarians. However, since both the above-mentioned institutions and their librarians were listed in the *ALD*, the *ALD* was used as the source for names of the academic librarians. Lack of response to the written and phone queries and no listing in the *ALD* for individual librarians precluded the librarians at the second public institution from participation in the survey.

The survey instrument was mailed to the 416 identified librarians in June of 1980. Again, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was included. Of the 416 questionnaires, 178 were mailed in Alabama, 157 to Georgia, and 81 to Mississippi. A total of 271 (55 percent) of the questionnaires were returned. Four were unusable.

On receipt of the 267 questionnaires, a

manual search was conducted in order to peruse the written comments and to categorize the areas of specialization pursued by these librarians at the graduate level. The questionnaire was exploratory in design. No assumptions were made with regard to the relative importance of the independent variables (demographic characters) in responding to the opinion questions (dependent variables).

## FINDINGS

*Frequency Analysis*

*Demographic and Institutional Characteristics.* The typical academic librarian in the tri-state area is female, forty-two years old, married, and the remuneration derived from her work is her household's main income. She holds the MLS degree with no additional graduate-level training. Typically, she is a member of the state and Southeastern Library Association, has one or more supervisors between her and the director, has a twelve-month contract, and works on a different and/or more flexible schedule than 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. to accommodate night and weekend work (table 1).

Table 1 summarizes the generalized frequencies of such characteristics. Among the respondents, 33.7 percent were male. Nearly all respondents were more than twenty-five years old and most were between twenty-five and thirty-four. A fairly large proportion (41.6 percent) were single. For 28.1 percent of the respondents, their salary is their supplemental income. Approximately 13 percent of the professional librarians working within the tri-state area do not have the MLS and nearly 36 percent have either M.A., M.S., sixth-year or a doctoral degree. Ten percent of the academic librarians in this region hold a doctoral degree. During graduate work, only 25 percent had written a thesis. Over one-half of the respondents did not write a thesis or report during their graduate studies, or, if they did, they failed to respond accordingly. Compared with 33 percent ALA membership reported in a Southern California study in 1973,<sup>11</sup> 45.3 percent of the tri-state academic librarians were members of ALA. Thirty-three percent of the respondents also belonged to other state, regional, or national library organizations.<sup>12</sup> These included membership in professional organizations in their subject of specializa-

TABLE 1  
 DEMOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS  
 OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS IN ALABAMA, GEORGIA,  
 AND MISSISSIPPI (N = 267)

Demographic Characteristics	Percent	Demographic Characteristics	Percent
<i>Respondents by state</i>			
Alabama	46.3	Thesis (cont.):	
Georgia	33.7	Neither	26.6
Mississippi	20.0	No answer	25.5
<i>Public/Private</i>			
Public institutions	86.1	<i>Memberships</i>	
Private institutions	13.9	<i>(% of total/category)</i>	
<i>Personal</i>			
<i>Sex:</i>			
Male	33.7	Amer. Lib. Assn.	45.3
Female	66.3	Southeast. Lib. Assn.	59.2
<i>Age:</i>			
Under 25	1.1	State Lib. Assn.	78.3
25-34	33.4	Other (professional)	33.7
35-44	25.9	<i>Occupational</i>	
44-55	20.7	<i>Work type:</i>	
55 or older	18.1	Technical service	32.6
No response	0.8	Public service	45.3
<i>Marital:</i>			
Married	57.7	Administrative service	15.7
Single	41.5	Delineation difficult	6.4
No response	0.8	<i>Position:</i>	
<i>Salary(ies):</i>			
Main income	68.9	Director	11.6
Supplemental	28.1	Report directly to director	34.1
Half and half	1.9	Supervisor(s) between director	53.9
No response	1.1	No response	0.4
<i>Educational</i>			
<i>MLS:</i>			
Yes	87.3	<i>Contract type:</i>	
None/no answer	12.7	Twelve-month	91.8
<i>Other degrees*:</i>			
None/no answer	64.0	Nine-month	3.0
MA	6.9	Other	4.9
MS	17.0	No response	0.3
Sixth-year	2.3	<i>Work hours:</i>	
Ph.D.	9.8	8 to 5	46.8
<i>Thesis:</i>			
Thesis	25.1	Different, flexible	51.3
Report	22.8	No response	1.9
		<i>Institution size:</i>	
		Up to 5,000 students	35.6
		5,000 to 10,000 students	18.0
		Over 10,000 students	44.9
		No response	1.5
		<i>No. of Librarians:</i>	
		0 to 5	15.7
		6 to 10	25.5
		11 to 20	25.5
		21 or more	31.8
		No response	1.5

\*See table 2 for information related to specialization.

tion or specialized library organizations.

The largest percentage (45.3 percent) of the respondents were public service librarians; these were followed by technical service librarians (32.6 percent). Fifteen percent of the respondents were administrators, of which 11.6 percent identified themselves as directors of libraries. One third of the librarians reported to the director, while more than half were stratified under one or more supervisors, who in turn reported to the director. Only 3 percent of librarians indicated that they had a nine-month contract<sup>13</sup> while almost 5 percent had contract configurations

other than nine- or twelve-month duration. Nearly 47 percent worked on a standard 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. schedule, while most had a more flexible schedule to accommodate night and weekend work.

The largest percentage (44.9 percent) of those surveyed worked on campuses with FTE of 10,000 or more and 31.8 percent had twenty-one or more professional colleagues. Almost 40 percent of the librarians worked in academic libraries that are staffed with ten or fewer professional librarians.

*Areas of Specialization.* Respondents who have pursued graduate work other than or in

addition to the MLS indicated their subject specialization. Such responses were manually recorded and grouped into eight broad disciplines. The results obtained are presented in table 2. In decreasing order, the largest number of specialists were trained in education, followed by literature and languages, humanities (history, music), life sciences, and library science (at sixth-year or Ph.D. level). Three respondents (1.1 percent) indicated their specialization as social sciences, law, and public administration, respectively. Only one (0.4 percent) of the 267 respondents specialized in a physical science.

*Characterization of Faculty Status and Its Perceived Benefits.* Respondents included librarians with and without faculty status. In addition, many of the respondents were at institutions where the question of faculty status for librarians is being studied for change. Several librarians in this state of uncertainty apparently decided to shelve the questionnaire rather than respond to it. Interestingly, there were some institutions from which "no return" occurred. This probably was a factor in the less than expected rate of response, which could not be remedied by providing a self-addressed, stamped envelope to facilitate dispatch.

The question "Do professional librarians have faculty status at your institution?" was one of the most crucial questions asked. It forced an important dichotomy on numerous questions that followed. Of the respondents, 82.4 percent answered yes to this question while 17.6 percent gave a negative answer (table 3). The latter was a much smaller group but it provided a unique opportunity to study their perception of faculty status.

TABLE 2

SPECIALIZATIONS OF ACADEMIC  
LIBRARIANS IN ALABAMA,  
GEORGIA, AND MISSISSIPPI AT  
MA, MS, SIXTH-YEAR, OR  
DOCTORAL DEGREE LEVEL (N = 267)

Area of Specialization	Percent
MLS, no other degrees	64.0
Education	9.4
Literature and languages	7.5
Humanities (history, music)	6.4
Life sciences	5.6
Library science	4.5
Social sciences	1.1
Law, public administration	1.1
Physical sciences	0.4

Table 3 summarizes the responses of both groups—those librarians with faculty status and those without faculty status.

Seventy-six percent of academic librarians with faculty status held the rank of assistant professor or had a lower rank. Only 5 percent of librarians with faculty status did not respond to the question asking them to state their rank. Among librarians without faculty status, 34 percent did not respond to the question concerning their rank. Of the remainder, 25.5 percent were in the ranks of Librarians III and IV.

Librarians with and without faculty status have differing perceptions of benefits derived from their respective systems. A large percentage of librarians with faculty status preferred tenure and salary as their most important benefits. Librarians without faculty status perceived salary as the main benefit of their system. Apparently, tenure without faculty status is perceived to be almost unattainable. Annual leave was also identified by 17 percent of the librarians without faculty status as an important benefit derived from the system while 9.5 percent of the librarians with faculty status identified sabbatical leave as the first-ranked benefit derived from their system.

The results of this questionnaire clearly document the enormous ambiguity that exists in the perception of librarians with regard to the relationship between publications and promotion. Parallel questions were asked of both groups of librarians about the number of publications required for promotion from one rank to the other. An overwhelming 95 percent or more respondents with and without faculty status gave no responses when asked if one to three, four to six, or a greater number of publications was needed for promotion. Many indicated that publication was not a definite requirement for promotion, while several commented that the actual number of publications needed for promotion was not known. This raises numerous questions concerning the relationship between promotion and publication: are there real publication requirements for academic librarians in the tri-state area? If there are, are they so ambiguous with so many exceptions that a specific publication requirement is not an applied rule? Is the publication requirement a mere hollow stick attached to a

TABLE 3  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM INSTITUTIONS WHERE LIBRARIANS  
HAVE AND DO NOT HAVE FACULTY STATUS (%)

Item	Responses from Institutions with Faculty Status (N = 220)	Responses from Institutions without Faculty Status (N = 47)
1. <i>Do professional librarians have faculty status at your institution?</i> <sup>2</sup> (N = 267)		
Yes	82.4	No 17.6
2. <i>Your rank?</i>		
Professor	5.0	Librarians I 17.0
Assoc. prof.	14.0	Librarian II 23.4
Assist. prof.	42.3	Librarian III 14.9
Instructor	33.2	Librarian IV 10.6
No response	5.5	No response 34.1
3. <i>In your opinion, rank the benefits derived by librarians in your system?</i> <sup>3</sup> *		
Tenure	39.1	Tenure 2.1
Salary	37.3	Salary 38.3
Sabbatical leave	9.5	Sabbatical leave 2.1
Annual leave	5.5	Annual leave 17.0
No response	8.6	No response 40.5
4. <i>Does your system offer the possibility of tenure for librarians?</i>		
		Yes 29.8
		No 42.6
		No response 27.6
5. <i>Number of publications required for promotion to the next rank?</i>		
1-3 for promotion to next rank	< 5	1-3 publication to next rank 2
No response/none	95	None/no response 98
6. <i>Is research publication necessary for promotion/tenure for librarians?</i>		
Yes	18.6	
No	75.9	
No response	5.5	
7. <i>Are promotion criteria for librarians same as for other faculty members?</i>		
Yes	36.4	
No	36.3	
Promotion criteria unknown	27.3	
8. <i>Rank the factors taken into consideration for promotion*</i>		
		Peer evaluation 38.3
		Service to univ. 8.5
		Service to comm. 4.3
		Publications and research 2.1
		No response 46.8
9. <i>Are salaries for librarians same as for other faculty members?</i>		
Comparable	23.6	
At least less by \$1,000	64.1	
At least more by \$1,000	6.8	
No response	5.5	

\*Only the frequencies of respondents ranking each of the categories as their first choice are reported here.

promotion carrot that for all practical purposes is not utilized? If true faculty status with equal rights and, more importantly, equal professional responsibilities is to be realized by the academic librarians, considerable clarification and enforcement of the publication requirements merit further scrutiny and discussion. Other publication and proposal development activities of the librarians in the tri-state area are presented in the next section.

Of the librarians without faculty status, 90 percent did not respond to the number of years one must be in a certain rank before

being promoted. Within the same group 38.3 percent of the respondents ranked peer evaluation as the most important factor in promotion consideration, and 8.5 percent listed service to the university as the next factor taken into consideration. The possibility of achieving tenure was responded to affirmatively by 30 percent of the non-faculty status respondents (table 3, item 4), but only one respondent (2.1 percent) perceived it to be a clear benefit of her/his system (table 3, item 3). Could this imply that although tenure is offered under these circumstances, it is rarely possible to attain? Or as stated earlier, is sal-

ary the prime benefit derived from a non-faculty status position? Of the librarians without faculty status, 47 percent indicated that faculty status was rescinded within the last ten years.

Of the librarians with faculty status, 64 percent either responded negatively to the query as to whether promotion criteria were the same for them and teaching faculty, or indicated that promotion criteria used were not known. Only 18.6 percent of the librarians responded in the affirmative to whether research and publication were necessary for promotion and tenure. The question of publication is discussed in greater detail in the next section. Finally, 64.1 percent of the academic librarians responded that, in their opinion, librarians with rank similar to classroom faculty received pay lower by at least \$1,000 or more per year than did their classroom faculty counterparts.

*Research and Publication Activities.* Several questions were included in the questionnaire to obtain an insight into the "scholarly" activities of professional librarians in the tri-state area. The results obtained are summarized in table 4 and offer an interesting insight into the working sphere of the academic librarian. Using bivariate analysis, it was found that 22 percent of the librarians were involved in one or more types of measurable scholarly publication activity (called "some pub" in table 4). Of these, the most common activity undertaken was "research" publication followed by publication of book reviews.

It was interesting to note that during the last year (the year before the questionnaire was administered) nearly 20 percent of the

respondents participated in the development of research proposal(s). Forty-two percent indicated that such proposals were funded. This nearly two-to-one success rate in funding would be regarded as quite a good track record among experienced academic grant seekers. If this finding comes close to reflecting the actual grant-seeking prowess of the academic librarian, it should serve as a statement of encouragement for the 80 percent who indicated that they did not undertake any such proposal development activity.

On the other hand, it was disturbing to note that less than 15 percent of the librarians are given any release time for either proposal development or for research and publication. This inequitable situation (as compared to that of teaching faculty) underscores the problem of publishing for academic librarians perhaps more clearly than any other reason.

Responses to publication requirements and proposal development were subjected to bivariate analysis by classifying them according to the position and rank held. These responses were subdivided into two groups: respondents with and without faculty rank (data not presented in tabular form). Rank played a significant role in the affirmative responses to questions relative to the numbers of papers presented, and numbers of proposals developed and funded. According to the "position" variable, directors engaged in a significantly higher proportion of such activity than did librarians in the other two categories (table 4).

A greater number of interactions were noted when publication and proposal devel-

TABLE 4  
RESEARCH, PUBLICATION, AND PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY  
AMONG ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS IN ALABAMA, GEORGIA, AND  
MISSISSIPPI DURING 1979-80 ACADEMIC YEAR (N = 267)\*

Item	Type of Activity	Percent
1.	Books published (up to 2)†	3.4
2.	Book reviews published (up to 8)†	7.5
3.	Literature review or bibliography published	4.1
4.	Research publications (up to 7)†	15.3
5.	At least one publication in items 1 to 4 (some pub)	22.9
6.	Presentations at professional meetings (up to 5)†	12.0
7.	Research proposals developed (up to four)†	19.5
8.	Research proposals funded (up to four)†	8.3
9.	Release time available for:	
	a. Proposal development:	12.0
	b. Research and publication:	14.2

\*Only affirmative responses for each type of activity are presented here.

†Generally, 70 percent of the responses for each of the categories above had one such item published, presented, or developed.

opment activities were divided according to academic rank among those with faculty status. As expected, the higher the academic rank, the greater the affirmative response to publication and proposal development activity. To obtain an overview, all of the responses to publication-related activities (number of books, book reviews, research papers, literature reviews, and bibliographies published) were pooled, and a new category called "some pub" was created to obtain the total number of people who engaged in at least one such activity. For "some pub," significant positive associations with rank were noted. Among librarians without faculty status, no significant differences were noted for any of the publications and proposal development activities. This clearly indicated that either such research-related endeavors were not a definite requirement or that such activities were equally carried out among all of the ranks.

### The Key Opinion Questions

Toward the end of the questionnaire three key questions/statements were asked to assess the opinions of academic librarians on these

issues. These questions are numbered statements 1, 2, and 3, respectively, and are shown verbatim. The overall frequency responses are summarized in table 5.

Nearly 63 percent of the librarians responded affirmatively to the question as to whether "a nine month contract for librarians would better enable them to pursue research interests" (statement 1). Approximately half of the respondents agreed with the statement that "faculty status with its requirement for research and publications places unrealistic demands on librarians for their advancement" (statement 2). "A comparable system which recognizes the nature of the work for librarians and offers them benefits of job security" (statement 3) was considered preferable by 64.4 percent of the librarians for their advancement. Only 14.6 percent of the librarians surveyed disagreed with statement 3. Others were either undecided (15.4 percent) or chose not to respond (5.6 percent). As is evident, a "comparable" system was the clear choice of most librarians.

Interestingly, over 64 percent of the librarians with faculty status agreed with the use of

TABLE 5A  
RESPONSES TO KEY QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS RELATED TO  
LENGTH OF CONTRACT AND FACULTY STATUS (N = 267)

Statements	Responses			
Statement 1. "Do you think a nine-month contract would better enable librarians to pursue research interest?"	Yes (62.9);	No (26.2);	No response (10.9)	
Statement 2. "Faculty status/rank with its requirement for research and publication for promotion places unrealistic demands on librarians for their advancement."	Agree (49.4);	Disagree (24.0);	Undecided (21.0);	No response (5.6)
Statement 3. "A comparable system which recognizes the nature of the work and responsibilities for librarians and offers them benefits of job security and advancement is preferable for librarians."	Agree (64.4);	Disagree (14.6);	Undecided (15.4);	No response (5.6)

TABLE 5B  
CROSS TABULATION OF RESPONSES BETWEEN  
STATEMENT 2 AND STATEMENT 3 (% RESPONSES)

	Statement 3		Row Total (%)
	Agree	Disagree or Undecided	
Statement 2			
Agree	86.3	13.7	53.0
Disagree or undecided	46.6	53.4	47.0
Column Total	67.6	32.4	100.0*

\*N = 247. Excludes 20 who failed to respond to either or both statements (2 and 3).

Chi-square = 42.5; df = 1; significance = 0.000; gamma = 0.76.

a comparable system. An analysis of their attitudes and opinions regarding their preference for such a system would be quite revealing. It is believed that publication requirements for promotion and the recognition of the uniqueness of the academic librarian's job responsibility would play a major role in such a preference.

Statements 2, and 3 were the two most important opinion questions. A cross tabulation of responses (table 5, part B) exhibited that 86.3 percent of respondents who agreed with statement 2 also agreed with statement 3. Statistically, such commonality of response was very highly significant and had a very high magnitude of association.

Numerous bivariate analyses were conducted to identify particular demographic and institutional parameters (independent variables) that prompted agreement or disagreement with the three statements (dependent variables) (table 5). The significant interactions among the variables are summarized in table 6. The size of the student body and the number of librarians in a given academic library exerted the most significant influence on the preference for a nine-month contract. Generally, librarians at smaller institutions preferred such a contract more than those at larger institutions.<sup>13</sup>

Statement 2 received significantly greater agreement among librarians without faculty status. In addition, thesis, position, and academic rank also had a significant effect on the response to this statement. Librarians with faculty status at lower levels of rank agreed more with statement 2. The higher the rank, the less was the agreement with statement 2. In the "some pub" category, the synthetic variable showed very highly significant association with statements 2 and 3 and in this study became a very important independent variable. A greater number of librarians with no publications agreed with both of these statements and showed one of the highest magnitudes of association.

#### *The Attitude Index*

Further scrutiny of the data prompted compression of the two major dependant variables, statements 2 and 3, into one. This synthetic variable was called Attitude Index (AI). Justification for such data reduction was based on two observations: the very high

association between statements 2 and 3 (table 5, part B); and the significant effect of faculty status (an independent variable) on statements 2 and 3. It was therefore logical to expect that if faculty status could be used to control the other demographic and institutional variables in a bivariate analysis, it could reveal previously hidden relationships within the faculty status subsample.

An agreement category with the Attitude Index was computed by pooling the responses that agreed with both statements 2 and 3. A disagreement category was computed by pooling those responses that agreed with only one or neither of the two statements. This resulted in the agreement of 110 respondents and the disagreement of 130 respondents with the AI.

A significantly higher percentage of librarians with faculty status in the lower positions, working in public institutions and on large campuses (over 5,000 FTE) with large professional staffs, agreed more with the AI. A significantly larger number of librarians with one or more publications (some pub variable) disagreed with AI. Among librarians without faculty status, position was the only variable that significantly affected the AI (table 7).

#### SUMMARY

This survey has presented the personal, educational, and occupational characteristics of academic librarians in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi. More women than men work in the academic library profession and provide the main income for their households. Membership in state and regional library organizations is common. A twelve-month contract is prevalent. Tenure and salary are perceived as the top-ranked benefits. Two areas of ambiguity are the relationship of the number of publications linked to promotion and the length of service required for promotion. A majority of those responding indicated a preference for a comparable system of academic status different from the traditional faculty status structure, but also one that offers the benefits of job security and advancement. Faculty status, rank, and publication activity exerted significant influence upon the agreement or disagreement with this statement.



TABLE 6  
 PERCENT AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES TO THE FACULTY STATUS  
 STATEMENTS BY SIGNIFICANTLY ASSOCIATED INSTITUTIONAL  
 AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS\*

Independent Variables	Statement 1	Dependent Variables Statement 2	Statement 3
<b>1. Faculty Status</b>			
With (N = 220)		50.0	67.6
Without (N = 47)		67.6	86.1
No answer (N = 0)			
		Chi-square = 5.46; df = 2	Chi-square = 6.57; df = 2
		Gamma = -0.35	Gamma = -0.52
<b>2. Student Body</b>			
Under 5,000 (N = 95)	78.8		
Over 5,000 (N = 168)	66.4		
No answer (N = 4)			
	Chi-square = 3.44; df = 1		
	Gamma = -0.30		
<b>3. Thesis</b>			
Thesis (N = 67)		52.3	
Report (N = 61)		67.2	
Neither (N = 71)		45.7	
No Answer (N = 68)			
		Chi-square = 11.0; df = 3	
		Gamma = -0.10	
<b>4. Number of Librarians</b>			
0 to 5 (N = 42)	77.5		
6 to 10 (N = 68)	78.6		
11 to 20 (N = 68)	75.8		
21+ (N = 85)	59.2		
No answer (N = 4)			
	Chi-square = 8.25; df = 3		
	Gamma = -0.27		
<b>5. Position</b>			
Director (N = 31)		37.9	
Report to dir. (N = 91)		57.5	
1+ Supv. to dir. (N = 144)		52.2	
No answer (N = 1)			
		Chi-square = 11.34; df = 3	
		Gamma = -0.11	
<b>6. Rank</b>			
Instructor (N = 73)		58.3	93.2
Assist. prof. (N = 93)		52.1	64.0
Assoc. prof. (N = 31)		36.7	53.0
Professor (N = 11)		27.3	30.0
No answer (N = 59)			
		Chi-square = 15.93; df = 4	Chi-square = 26.83; df = 4
		Gamma = -0.26	Gamma = -0.32
<b>7. Some Publication</b>			
No publication (N = 182)		59.3	72.4
1+ publications (N = 58)		30.0	55.0
No answer (N = 27)			
		Chi-square = 14.65; df = 1	Chi-square = 5.6; df = 1
		Gamma = -0.54	Gamma = -0.36

\*Only the percent responding yes to each of the responses is tabulated.

TABLE 7  
 PERCENT AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES FOR THE SIGNIFICANT DEMOGRAPHIC  
 CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING ATTITUDE INDEX (AI)\*  
 BY FACULTY STATUS (TRIVARIATE ANALYSIS)

Demographic Characteristics	Affirmative Responses (Agree) for AI†	
	With Fac. Status	Without Fac. Status
<b>1. Student Body</b>		
Under 5,000	32.9 (N = 70)	32.4 (N = 17)
Over 5,000	48.1 (N = 131)	47.4 (N = 19)
	Chi-square = 3.72; df = 1 Gamma = -0.31; Sig. = <u>0.05</u>	Chi-square = 3.36; df = 1 Gamma = -0.67; Sig. = 0.06
<b>2. Type of Institution</b>		
Public	45.8 (N = 177)	55.2 (N = 29)
Private	22.2 (N = 27)	100.0 (N = 7)
	Chi-square = 4.39; df = 1 Gamma = -0.49; Sig. = <u>0.04</u>	Chi-square = 3.16; df = 1 Gamma = -1.0; Sig. = 0.07
<b>3. Number of Librarians</b>		
0 to 5	18.5 (N = 27)	100.0 (N = 8)
5 to 10	42.3 (N = 52)	54.5 (N = 11)
11 to 20	45.0 (N = 60)	50.0 (N = 4)
21 +	50.8 (N = 63)	53.8 (N = 13)
	Chi-square = 8.27; df = 3 Gamma = -0.26; Sig. = <u>0.04</u>	Chi-square = 5.84; df = 3 Gamma = -0.47; Sig. = 0.12
<b>4. Position</b>		
Director	34.6 (N = 26)	100.0 (N = 2)
Report to director	38.8 (N = 67)	81.3 (N = 16)
1+ Supv. to director	46.8 (N = 111)	44.4 (N = 18)
	Chi-square = 1.89; df = 2 Gamma = -0.17; Sig. = <u>0.38</u>	Chi-square = 6.17; df = 2 Gamma = -0.73; Sig. = <u>0.04</u>
<b>5. Some Publication</b>		
No publication	47.1 (N = 155)	74.1 (N = 27)
1+ publication	28.6 (N = 49)	33.3 (N = 9)
	Chi-square = 4.5; df = 1 Gamma = -0.38; Sig. = <u>0.03</u>	Chi-square = 3.25; df = 1 Gamma = -0.70; Sig. = 0.07

\*Agreement with AI was computed by pooling agree responses to both statements (2 and 3, table 5). Disagreement was computed by pooling agree responses with one or neither of the statements.

†Significant relationships (sig. at 0.05 level) are underlined.

## REFERENCES

- Alice Manchikes and George Crabb, "A Survey of Faculty Status Policies for Librarians in Kentucky and Surrounding States," *Southeastern Librarian* 26:219-25 (Winter 1976).
- John W. Weatherford, *Collective Bargaining and the Academic Librarian* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Pr., 1976).
- "Joint Statement on Faculty Status on College and University Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 33:172 (Sept. 1972).
- Anita Schiller, *Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries*, Research Series no.16 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969).
- Virgil F. Massman, *Faculty Status for Librarians* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Pr., 1972).
- Raj Madan and others, "The Status of Librarians in Four-year State Colleges and Universities," *College & Research Libraries* 29:381-86 (Sept. 1968).
- Ronald F. Dow, "Academic Librarians: A Survey of Benefits and Responsibilities," *College & Research Libraries* 38:218-20 (May 1977).
- Ruth Hyman and Gail Schlachter, "Academic Status: Who Wants It?" *College & Research Libraries* 34:472-78 (Nov. 1973).
- Nancy Davey and Theodora Andrews, "Implications of Faculty Status for University Librarians, with Special Attention to Tenure," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4:71-74 (May 1978).
- Frederick Duda, "Columbia's Two-Track System," *College & Research Libraries* 41:295-304 (July 1980).
- Hyman and Schlachter, "Academic Status," p.473.
- Approximately the same proportions were reported in the Schiller study: three-fifths belong to state and regional associations; 50 percent to A.L.A. (p.53).
- Dow reported 3.6 percent of surveyed librarians had nine-month contracts. (p.219).
- E. J. Josey, "Full Faculty Status This Century," *Library Journal* 97:984-89 (March 15, 1972), p.987; Hyman and Schlachter, "Academic Status," p.477.