

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 354

LI 002 146

AUTHOR Heim, Peggy; Cameron, Ronald F.
TITLE The Economics of Librarianship in College and University Libraries, 1969-70. A Sample Survey of Compensations.
INSTITUTION Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 70
NOTE 21p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.15
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries, *Faculty, *Librarians, Professional Personnel, Professional Recognition, *Salary Differentials, *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

The library profession in colleges and universities is faced with three critical problems: (1) too few high-paying positions relative to the total number of practitioners to make the profession financially attractive, (2) the highest level positions to which the majority of career librarians may aspire offer dim prospect of an adequately compensated career, and (3) an imbalance between the compensations of faculty and librarians may well be symptomatic of two equally serious problems--minimization of the role and organizational requirements of this important facet of our educational-research program and the possibility of exploitation. Table I indicates that less than 20% of the faculty are at the lowest rank of instructor while 50% of the librarians are classified in the basic rank. Many librarians will never advance beyond this position and most of those who do will go no higher than department head or branch librarian. On the other hand, approximately 50% of the faculty hold the two highest ranks--professor and associate professor. Three factors seem to exert a strong effect on librarians' compensation: (1) predominance of women in the profession, (2) large number of routine and clerical tasks performed, and (3) prevailing departmental organization which acts as a barrier to nonadministrative librarians. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY

EDO 43354

COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES, INC.

THE ECONOMICS OF LIBRARIANSHIP IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, 1969-70

A Sample Survey of Companations

LZ 002 146

Peggy Helm
Director of the Planning Center for
the South Carolina Independent Colleges,
Former Staff Economist, AAUP

Donald F. Cameron
Librarian Emeritus, Rutgers--
the State University

July, 1970

+6

EDO 43354

I. INTRODUCTION

A concern about the economic welfare of the library profession was the original stimulus for the study. An awareness of the changing nature of library operations and a realization that these changes would inevitably demand more highly trained recruits also played a part.

The nature of the statistics dealing with the present economic state of the profession and the lack of up-to-date reliable facts concerning salaries and compensations of all kinds indicate that there should be prompt, reliable, and reasonably complete data on hand from year to year. This survey of 249 academic libraries represents an exploratory effort to meet this need.

The survey has two main thrusts--a comparison with the compensations of faculty members and information on the distribution of the rewards among librarians. That we compare the compensations of professorial staff and academic librarians does not mean we suggest that all librarians be paid at the same rate as the faculty. The comparison with faculty remuneration has been made because it is one of the related professions for which detailed statistics are available and because the direct association of college and university librarians with faculty makes a comparison of economic returns inevitable.

Another problem which has required considerable thought is the statistical handling of two customarily different work-years. Instead of trying to arrive at a formula which would take into consideration the difference between the work-years of faculty and of librarians, it was decided to regard as standard the normal library year of eleven months and one month of vacation for librarians, and the so-called academic year for the faculty. This resolution of the problem is not entirely satisfactory. On the other hand, any artificial formula would also have its drawbacks.

We should also point out that our first study has not yet generated a satisfactory technique for identifying competing groups of institutions or patterns of organization among libraries.¹ We thought this might be handled most readily by separating out libraries with a small number of professionals, say less than ten. While this approach probably works better than

¹ Compensations in institutions that consider themselves competitive are affected by those paid in the other institutions. This force may operate in two ways. First, the influence may be psychological; the college may want to have its compensations in line with those institutions with which it identifies. Second, the influence may be pragmatic; the institution may modify compensations in order to compete in recruiting staff or retaining its own members. The group with which they compare may not be the group with which they compete. The manner in which functions are organized may also affect salary structures. For example, the position "Head of Cataloging" is different in a large university where the department head may have fifty professionals and clericals under his direction from the "Head of Cataloging" in a small college where he may be assisted by one or two others.

no distinction at all, there are still important differences between a library with, say, thirty professionals and one with over a hundred. It has been suggested that three separate groupings—universities, emergent or small universities, and colleges—might also be helpful. It is likely we shall discover that there is no wholly satisfactory system of classification.

As to the representativeness of the sample, for purposes of comparing the compensation of librarians with that of their academic colleagues, the library sample is fairly representative with respect to institutional sub-groups, such as private universities or private liberal arts colleges. It is less representative of *all institutions* taken as a group, in large part because church-related colleges, which tend to be relatively low-paying, are under-represented in the library sample. Thus, in the category "all colleges and emergent universities" our statistics probably overstate the average compensation. This would indicate that the economic status of the overall profession is worse than the present figures show.

The following tables derived from the responses to the questionnaire are susceptible of many interpretations. As we have said, they are not meant to suggest that, because remuneration of librarians is compared with that of faculty, all librarians should be paid at similar rates. Nor do we take a position concerning forms of organization, but the profession could reexamine with profit organizational structures which impede the economic advance of its members.

The study would seem to point out three factors exerting a strong restraining effect upon compensations of librarians. First, the predominance in the profession of women has in the past facilitated retention of salary structures which would be unacceptable to a largely male profession. Second, the large number of routine and clerical tasks performed by a substantial percentage of professional librarians has tended to perpetuate low financial rewards. Third, the prevailing departmental organization seems to stand as a barrier to higher rewards for those librarians who are not working in an administrative capacity.

It is important to bear in mind that the statistics used represent figures for 1969-70 only. They are not more than a glimpse of a rapidly changing picture. Only a series of statistical surveys over several years would reveal the rate of speed of the changes and shifts in organizational patterns. These changes and shifts we know are taking place; the following tables could be regarded as a start in recording the pace of the changes and the directions in which they lead us.

II. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The library profession in colleges and universities is faced with three critical problems: (1) the profession boasts too few high paying positions relative to the total number of practitioners to make the profession financially attractive; (2) the highest level positions to which the majority of career librarians may aspire—those of department head and branch librarian—offer dim prospect of an adequately compensated career; and (3) an imbalance between the compensations of faculty and librarians may well be symptomatic of two equally serious problems: minimization of the role and organizational requirements of this important facet of our educational-research program, and the possibility of exploitation.

1. Differences in Personnel Structures: Libraries and Faculties

A major difference between librarians and faculty members occurs in the distribution of career ranks. As Table I indicates, less than 20 percent of the faculty are at the lowest rank of instructor. Moreover, with some exceptions, they occupy this status for only a brief period, and for most even the next higher rank of assistant professor is left behind before they are forty. In the academic market as organized today, most fully expect—though perhaps unrealistically—to achieve the rank of professor, or not less than associate professor. On the other hand, in the library profession roughly 50 percent of the librarians are classified in the basic rank. Many of them will never advance beyond this position and of those who do most will go no higher than department head or branch librarian. Together these three categories account for 80 percent or more (87 percent in university libraries) of the professional library personnel.

At the other end of the scale approximately 50 percent of the faculty hold the two highest ranks—professor and associate professor. In combination, directors, associate and assistant directors of libraries make up about 10 percent of the total.¹ It is a profession in which there is relatively little opportunity to achieve a high career position. Let us now see how well or how poorly these positions pay.

¹ The figures are 15 percent in college and emergent university libraries and 6 percent in university libraries.

Table 1
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY AND OF LIBRARY
 PERSONNEL AND THEIR AVERAGE COMPENSATION**

Weighted Average Compensation of Full-Time Personnel in the
 Library Survey Sample, by Academic Rank or Staff Position and
 by Type of Institution and Control, 1969-70¹

(Standard year of 9 months for faculty; 11 months for librarians)

LIBRARY PERSONNEL

Position Title (1)	Universities			Colleges and Emergent Universities		
	Percent of Staff (2)	Public (3)	Private (4)	Percent of Staff (5)	Public (6)	Private (7)
Library Director	2%	\$25,000	\$25,820	8%	\$19,570	\$16,710
Assoc. & Asst. Dir.	5	18,000	18,270	7	15,010	12,870
Curator-Specialist	7	12,840	12,487	5	11,000	11,230
Department & Branch Heads	26	13,120	12,520	36	12,060	11,090
Other Professionals						
With 5 years of service	60 }	10,990	11,050	44 }	11,390	9,800
With less than 5 years		9,640	9,410		9,930	9,280

FACULTY

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Professors	32%	\$19,800	\$22,940	23%	\$18,750	\$18,420
Associate Professors	25	14,930	15,620	24	14,770	13,970
Assistant Professors	31	12,330	12,450	35	12,210	11,440
Instructors	12	9,510	9,790	18	9,540	9,170

¹ Compensation represents salary actually paid plus the following countable fringe benefits: FICA (4.8% of the first \$7,800), Retirement to the extent that the institution's contribution is vested in the staff member by the end of his 5th year of service, Medical Insurance, Permanent Disability Income Protection (average payment), and Life Insurance. The weighted average uses number of people in each position (or each academic rank) as weights. Thus a large state college library with five times as many professionals as a small college would have five times as much influence on the average compensation as its small counterpart.

² These figures represent the distribution of full-time library staff (or of faculty) in public and private institutions combined.

Table 2
**Comparison of the Number and Percentage Distribution
 of Faculty Members and of Library Personnel in the
 Library Survey Sample of Institutions, 1969-70**

UNIVERSITIES

Faculty Members			Library Personnel		
Rank	Number	Percent Distribution	Position	Number	Percent Distribution
Professor	20,874	31.9%	Librarian	75	1.7%
Assoc. Prof.	16,251	24.8	Assoc. & Asst. Lib.	205	4.6
Asst. Prof.	20,471	31.3	Curator-Specialist	310	6.9
Instructor	7,844	12.0	Dept. & Branch Heads	1,188	26.5
TOTAL	65,440	100.0%	Other Professionals	2,707	60.3
				4,485	100.0%

LIBERAL ARTS and EMERGING UNIVERSITIES

Faculty Members			Library Personnel		
Rank	Number	Percent Distribution	Position	Number	Percent Distribution
Professor	5,219	23.4%	Librarian	156	7.9%
Assoc. Prof.	5,418	24.3	Assoc. & Asst. Lib.	138	7.0
Asst. Prof.	7,695	34.4	Curator-Specialist	102	5.1
Instructor	4,009	17.9	Dept. & Branch Heads	721	36.4
TOTAL	22,341	100.0%	Other Professionals	866	43.7
				1,983	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100.0 because of rounding.

2. How the Various Positions Pay

Other professional librarians. This category, which includes those who are neither administrators nor specialists, encompasses roughly half of the librarians covered in the survey. If they have less than five years of service, professionals who are neither specialists nor administrators receive about the same compensation as instructors.² Those with five or more years of service average more than instructors but less than assistant professors.

Of major importance from a career standpoint is the difference in the compensation which might be expected after some years of service. In all except the private colleges the compensation differential between the novices (defined here as those with less than five years of service) and the mature practitioners (those with five years or more) averaged about 14 to 17 percent of novice compensation (Table 3). If we assume the mature practitioners averaged at least fifteen more service years than the novices, their income differential amounts to about one percent a year compounded annually.³ In the private colleges the merit-service differential is even lower, about six percent, or four-tenths of one percent compounded annually.

Branch librarians and department heads. By and large, their average compensations approximate those of assistant professors in their respective institutions. In the public universities they receive a bit more.

For the increased responsibility and skills, as well as a service differential, department heads and branch librarians in universities receive on the average approximately one-third more than the novice professionals (Table 3). If we assume they average at least fifteen more years of service than the novices, their career increments amount to about two percent compounded annually. In the colleges it is even less—a shade over one and a half percent. Compare these career increment rates, if you will, with the salary schedules of public school teachers. Here vertical advancement on schedule tends to raise the salary of beginning teachers with a master's degree by as much in nine years as university librarians might expect in fifteen.⁴

² Compensation includes salary plus countable benefits (see Table 1, footnote 1, for greater detail). The definition corresponds with that used by AAUP in its compensation survey with two exceptions: the library survey does not include either cash tuition benefits or other benefits in kind for which there is a cash option.

³ Based on Table 3.

⁴ Current figures of NEA indicate that these increments might approximate 3 percent for teachers with the B.A. and 3.5 percent for those with the M.A., compounded annually.

Table 3
COMPENSATIONS: A COMPARISON OF RELATIVES

Weighted Average Compensation of Full-Time Library Personnel
 as a Relative of the Compensation of Beginning Professionals,
 the Compensation of Faculty as a Relative of the Compensation
 of Instructors, and the Compensation of Library Personnel as a
 Relative of Instructors, by Type of Institution and Control¹
 1969-70

	Universities		Colleges and Emergent Universities	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
I. Library Staff as a Relative of Beginning Professionals				
Library Personnel				
Library Director ²	262.4	274.4	197.1	174.7
Associate & Assistant Directors	186.7	194.2	151.2	138.7
Curator-Specialist	133.2	132.7	110.8	121.0
Department & Branch Heads	136.1	133.0	121.5	119.5
Other Professionals				
With 5 or more years service	114.0	117.4	114.7	105.7
With less than 5 years	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
II. Faculty as a Relative of Instructors				
Academic Rank				
Professors	208.2	234.3	196.5	200.9
Associate Professors	157.0	159.6	154.3	152.3
Assistant Professors	129.6	127.2	128.0	124.8
Instructors	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
III. Library Staff as a Relative of Instructors				
Personnel Classification				
Library Director	266.0	263.0	205.1	176.8
Associate & Assistant Directors	189.3	186.7	157.3	140.3
Curator-Specialist	135.0	127.5	115.3	122.5
Department & Branch Heads	138.0	127.9	126.4	120.9
Other Professionals				
With 5 years of service	115.6	112.9	119.4	106.9
With less than 5 years	101.4	96.1	104.1	101.1
Instructors (faculty)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹Relatives are calculated from the compensations shown in Table I.

²It is well to keep in mind that directors of libraries account for only about 2 percent of the professional library personnel in university libraries, while professors account for about 23 percent of total full-time faculty.

Associate and assistant librarians. The single simple generalization that can be made is that relative to the title, the position generally pays poorly. Even in universities with library budgets running well over a million dollars, associate and assistant librarians fail to receive as much on the average as professors, and in public colleges and emergent universities their pay approximates on the average that of associate professors. Private colleges remunerate them even less well than associate professors.

The relatively low compensation of associate and assistant librarians gives insight into the economic problems facing the profession. Except for occasional specialists these are ordinarily the second-highest paying positions in the library, yet the remuneration is relatively meager. The disturbingly low pay may indicate that the institution places a low value upon the position, that the position is filled with someone underqualified, or that the institution has taken financial advantage of its personnel. Moreover, remuneration prospects of this magnitude can hardly remain attractive to predominantly career-oriented men and women.

A word might be said about a further characteristic of the profession. Since there is only one director per library, it is difficult for an individual who pursues a library career to attain a differential as high as in the academic profession unless he lands the top library position. Unwittingly we force upon our librarians the necessity for professional nomadism. Except in fortunate circumstances where internal vacancies develop, one who desires career advancement must be willing to fold his tent and move to another institution.⁵

Directors of libraries. In large universities the director of libraries generally ranks with the deans—albeit the lower paid ones—and is compensated on a level higher than the full professor. In the liberal arts colleges and emergent universities compensation patterns are mixed, as Table I shows. In the public institutions the director of libraries receives about the same compensation on the average as his professorial colleagues. In the private colleges he averages significantly less. This kind of disparity again raises questions of equity and of wise use of resources. Are these smaller institutions, unintentionally perhaps, being penny-wise and pound-foolish in failing to provide a favorable economic climate for library personnel? We might bear in mind that even in the small college the library represents a large investment.

⁵ This may not necessarily be bad, but it is an economic fact of life that those who desire advancement must ordinarily be willing to change institutions.

III. A MORE DETAILED LOOK AT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMPENSATION STRUCTURES

1. Directors of Libraries

A sharp differential exists in the compensation of directors, as Table 1 will indicate. Directors in the public and private universities average about \$25,000, while in the colleges and emergent universities they receive on the average about \$19,600 in the public and \$16,200 in the private institutions. The director receives compensation averaging above that of professors in the public and private universities, where his position might be compared roughly to that of the lower-paid deans. In the public colleges and emergent universities his average compensation is slightly better than that of his professorial colleagues. It is considerably worse in the private colleges. The percentage differences from the average professorial compensation in the institutions in which they serve are shown below.¹

Director in Public Universities	+28%
Director in Private Universities	+13
Director in Public Colleges and Emergent Universities	+ 4
Director in Private Colleges	-12

Directors of Larger Libraries

If we consider the sample of libraries with ten or more professionals roughly representative of moderate- and large-size libraries, we find the following distribution of compensation for directors:

Compensation	All Combined	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Highest	\$37,000	\$35,900	\$37,000
Highest Decile	31,500	N.A.	N.A.
Highest Quartile	25,900	26,400	25,100
Median	22,800	23,300	21,800
Lowest Quartile	19,700	19,800	19,500
Lowest Decile	17,800	N.A.	N.A.
Lowest	14,100	14,100	15,500

For example among the larger libraries, all institutions combined, only one-fourth of the compensations were as high as \$25,900. If we consider salaries alone (without benefits), the highest quartile would approximate \$24,000. It is a profession where at the very top there are relatively few highly remunerated positions.

¹ "Professorial compensations" refers to the weighted average compensation received by full professors.

Directors of Smaller Libraries

In the smaller libraries (under ten professionals) the picture is dark indeed. Fewer than one-fourth of the directors receive as much as the average compensation of \$17,580 reported by AAUP for professors in colleges and emergent universities.²

Compensation	All Colleges and Emergent Universities ³	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Highest	\$21,180	\$17,870	\$21,180
Highest Quartile	17,070	16,440	17,230
Median	14,900	16,090	14,770
Lowest Quartile	12,630	14,040	12,630
Lowest	9,130	10,780	9,130

2. Associate and Assistant Directors

On the average, associate and assistant directors in the universities receive more than the associate professors (Table 1), but significantly less than full professors, and about 90 percent more than beginning professionals (Table 3). In the colleges and emergent universities, associate and assistant librarians are poorly compensated, receiving only about two-fifths again as much as beginning professionals in the private colleges and about half again as much as beginning professionals in the public colleges. Their compensation averages about \$15,000 and \$12,900 in the public and private institutions respectively. Moreover, in the private colleges their remuneration averages even less than that of associate professors.

The distribution of compensations for libraries with ten or more professionals and for those of smaller size (i.e. fewer than ten professionals) is shown below.

Compensation	Librarians with 10 or more Professionals		Libraries with Fewer than 10 Professionals
	Assoc. Dir.	Asst. Dir.	Assoc. or Asst. Dir.
Highest	\$29,600	\$24,200	\$19,400
Highest Decile	25,600	20,200	13,900
Highest Quartile	22,300	18,000	12,700
Median	18,400	15,700	11,100
Lowest Quartile	14,700	13,600	10,000
Lowest Decile	13,000	11,600	8,500
Lowest	11,700	10,200	6,800

² For AAUP statistics see the Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1969-70, published in the 1970 Summer issue of the *AAUP Bulletin*.

³ Since public colleges tend to be significantly larger than private liberal arts colleges, proportionately fewer of those institutions fall in the "small library" category. As a result, the compensation distribution of all colleges and emergent universities reflects primarily the compensation pattern of the private institutions.

We were interested in whether those with few years in grade received significantly higher salary increases than those with many years. It appears that while this may indeed be the case, statistics from the survey are inconclusive. Averages for some sub-groups are volatile, for some groupings are small and therefore sensitive to happenstance—which institutions happen to staff with individuals with less than five years or with more than five years in grade. Thus in the absence of a more comprehensive survey, we cannot ascertain whether salary increases are generally correlated with years in grade.

For department heads, specialists, and branch librarians the average increase in 1969-70 ranged mostly from \$550 to \$950. Among these positions no consistent pattern of differences seemed to prevail, although increases tended to be higher in the public institutions than in their private counterparts. It is also hard to generalize about any given position, e.g., Head of Acquisitions or Reference Librarian. Increases for associate and assistant librarians tended to average \$1,000 or more, except in the private libraries where they got somewhat less. Increases for directors generally averaged over \$1,000.

Of great interest to all librarians is the magnitude of salary increases. These have been divided into increases for those with less than five years in grade and those with five or more years in universities (Table 6) and in colleges and emergent universities (Table 7).

4. Average Salary Increases

While these positions may represent the first major promotion in the career ladder, for many, such as catalogers and reference librarians, they may also represent a dead end, an occupational plateau from which to date it has been impossible to advance only by changing institutions. And as the distribution of the average library compensation for each position shows (Table 4), even these advances are small by most economic standards.

3. Department Heads

Half of the larger college and university librarians (ten or more professionals) pay their associate and assistant directors on the average less than \$18,400 and \$15,700 respectively. In the smaller libraries, the median compensation of associate and assistant directors combined is \$11,100. Clearly a compensation ratio, levels of these magnitudes hardly provide attractive career opportunities, and it is obvious that many of the associate and assistant directors must be compensated with a title and not with money income.

Table 4
DEPARTMENT HEADS

DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE COMPENSATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES WITH TEN OR MORE PROFESSIONALS, 1969-70

I. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS COMBINED						
Compensation (1)	Reference (2)	Cataloging (3)	Acquisitions (4)	Circulation (5)	Periodicals (6)	Unclassified (7)
Highest	\$18,300	\$19,100	\$22,600	\$18,200	\$20,000	\$20,100
Highest Decile	15,400	15,900	15,600	14,400	13,700	16,000
Highest Quartile	13,700	14,500	13,800	12,500	12,500	14,000
Median	12,000	12,700	12,100	11,400	11,000	12,300
Lowest Quartile	10,700	11,400	10,700	10,200	10,000	11,100
Lowest Decile	10,100	10,900	9,800	9,300	8,700	9,700
Lowest	8,200	8,400	7,400	7,500	7,800	7,900

II. PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Highest	\$18,300	\$19,100	\$22,600	\$18,200	\$20,000	\$20,100
Highest Quartile	14,800	14,900	14,200	13,300	13,200	14,300
Median	12,800	13,300	12,200	11,600	11,700	12,700
Lowest Quartile	11,300	11,800	10,900	10,400	10,600	11,200
Lowest	8,800	9,400	8,200	7,900	8,300	7,900

III. PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Highest	\$17,700	\$18,700	\$17,300	\$15,900	\$14,700	\$19,600
Highest Quartile	12,000	13,100	13,000	12,000	11,000	12,700
Median	11,300	11,700	11,700	11,100	10,100	11,400
Lowest Quartile	10,400	11,200	10,900	10,000	9,000	10,200
Lowest	9,200	8,400	7,400	7,500	7,800	7,900

Interpretation of data: one-fourth of the large libraries (with 10 or more professional librarians) paid compensation of \$13,700 or higher for Head of Reference.

Table 5
DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE COMPENSATIONS
All Library Positions
Highest, Highest Quartile, Median, Lowest Quartile, and Lowest
Compensations by Library Position in Large and in Small Libraries,
1969-70¹
(11-Month Basis)

LARGE LIBRARIES²

Position (1)	Highest (2)	Highest Q (3)	Median (4)	Lowest Q (5)	Lowest (6)
Library Dir.	\$36,970	\$25,850	\$22,830	\$19,640	\$14,110
Assoc. Dir.	29,580	22,310	18,380	14,670	11,710
Asst. Dir.	24,240	17,950	15,680	12,570	10,180
Branch Head	20,700	14,280	12,550	10,820	7,250
Curator-Specialist	22,720	13,450	11,580	10,250	7,670
DH. Ref.	18,260	13,710	11,960	10,700	8,160
DH. Cat.	19,140	14,470	12,680	11,390	8,440
DH. Acq.	22,570	13,750	12,070	10,700	7,440
DH. Circ.	18,230	12,960	11,390	10,230	7,480
DH. Period.	19,950	12,460	11,030	10,010	7,760
DH. Unclassified	20,080	13,950	12,280	11,070	7,860
Cther Professionals	14,890	10,450	9,550	8,900	6,430

SMALL LIBRARIES²

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Library Dir.	\$21,180	\$17,070	\$14,900	\$12,630	\$ 9,130
Assoc. Dir.	19,390	12,650	11,080	10,040	6,810
Curator-Specialist	15,500	10,930	9,800	8,500	5,370
Dept. Head	16,370	11,070	10,090	8,900	6,420
Other Professionals	11,970	9,620	8,600	7,710	4,740

NOTE: Figures have been rounded to the nearest \$10.

¹ Interpretation of data: in one-fourth of the large libraries average compensation of assistant directors is \$17,950 or above. The highest average figure reported in the survey is \$24,240.

² Small libraries are defined here as those with fewer than 10 professional librarians, large libraries with 10 or more.

Table 6
AVERAGE DOLLAR SALARY INCREASES
IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES*
1968-69 to 1969-70

(11-Month Basis)

<u>Titles</u>	<u>Under 5 years in Grade</u>		<u>5 years & more in Grade</u>	
	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Library Dir.	\$1,570	\$1,900	\$1,160	\$1,330
Assoc. Dir.	1,660	910	1,240	1,190
Asst. Dir.	1,300	1,220	1,240	880
Branch Head	870	850	720	780
Curator-Specialist	920	730	810	690
DH. Ref.	960	870	730	580
DH. Cat.	840	880	930	710
DH. Acqs.	730	760	1,030	750
DH. Circ.	800	720	550	780
DH. Period.	790	560	670	550
DH. Unclassified	770	990	880	730
Other Professionals	670	630	640	650

* Data are weighted average salary increases with personnel numbers as weights when more than one person holds a grade position within the library.

Table 7
AVERAGE DOLLAR SALARY INCREASES IN
COLLEGES AND EMERGENT UNIVERSITIES*
1968-69 to 1969-70

(11-Month Basis)

<u>Titles</u>	<u>Under 5 years in Grade</u>		<u>5 years & more in Grade</u>	
	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
<u>With 10 or more Professionals</u>				
Lib. Dir.	\$1,690	\$1,310	\$1,490	\$1,090
Assoc. Dir.	1,270	1,140	1,090	960
Asst. Dir.	1,110	690	1,120	900
Branch Head	740	530	920	860
Curator-Specialist	680	600	530	570
DH. Ref.	840	620	930	680
DH. Cat.	890	820	990	700
DH. Acq.	890	810	940	650
DH. Circ.	820	680	1,050	590
DH. Period.	940	540	850	560
DH. Unclassified	800	860	1,260	770
Other Professionals	740	610	860	570
<u>With Fewer Than 10 Professionals</u>				
Library Dir.	\$1,060	\$ 850	\$ 950	\$ 780
Assoc. or Asst.	890	540	690	630
Dept. Heads	730	530	320	530
Curator-Specialist	—	400	—	560
Other Professionals	660	370	690	530

* Data are weighted average salary increases.

IV. FUTURE STUDY

These impressions are merely a beginning. Data could be analyzed in other patterns. For example, a size-of-library grouping different from the one used in this study would perhaps be more meaningful. Other types of distributions might shed more light on salary and compensation practices within the library profession or give an institution a better idea where it stands competitively. Hopefully, some of these approaches can be tried in subsequent studies.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For very important roles in the present study, we are indebted to the American Association of University Professors and to Mrs. Maryse Eymonerie, statistician for the AAUP Compensation Survey. With a long-standing concern for the economic well-being of college and university librarians, the AAUP gave the project its full cooperation. We would like to acknowledge especially the support given by Dr. Bertram Davis, General Secretary, and Dr. William Woolf of the Committee Z staff.

As in the case of the AAUP Survey itself, the really indispensable work and problem-solving was done by Mrs. Eymonerie, who processed the library questionnaires, developed computer programs, and compared compensations of librarians and their academic colleagues. Without the assistance of Mrs. Eymonerie and the cooperation of AAUP, the study could not have been undertaken in its present form.

Appendix I.

A NOTE ON THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE SAMPLE AND ON SURVEY TECHNICALITIES

Selection of the sample. Questionnaire forms were submitted to some 350 institutions selected to give a cross-section of three main types of institutions—universities, emergent universities, and liberal arts or four- and five-year colleges. They included public, private-independent, and church-related institutions with broad geographic distribution. Of the 350 institutions receiving questionnaires, 249 submitted processable data. Of these, universities are proportionately more heavily represented than the other types of institutions.

The reader is cautioned to bear in mind that each library does not have all positions that are included in the questionnaire. This is particularly true among the smaller libraries which may have no individual with the official title of Associate or Assistant Librarian. For this reason in some sub-groups the sample size is relatively small.

Representativeness of the sample: academic compensations. For purposes of analysis the institutions are divided into four categories: (1) Universities: (a) Public, (b) Private, which includes private-independent and a handful of church-related institutions; and (2) Liberal Arts Colleges and Emergent Universities: (a) Public, and (b) Private.¹ The public and private institutions are on occasion grouped together to provide a composite figure for that type of institution; e.g. (c) All Universities.

To evaluate the representativeness of the smaller library sample of 249 respondents, we compared the compensations of their faculty by rank with the weighted average compensations calculated from the larger AAUP sample of 995 institutions. In the university classification, the weighted average compensation for each rank in the library sample closely approximates the figure for the corresponding AAUP category. The deviations, none of which exceeds 2 percent, average one-sixth of one percent.

In the emergent universities and liberal arts college category, the library sample shows a slight upward bias. The bias is apparently caused by the same participation phenomenon experienced in earlier years by AAUP: namely, lower-paying institutions submit statistics less frequently than do higher-paying ones. The deviation averages 2.8 percent in the public category and less than one percent in the private grouping.

¹ AAUP statistics separate private-independent and church-related institutions. The latter pay significantly less than the former in the higher ranks.

The reader is cautioned to keep in mind, however, one difference between the library and AAUP surveys. Because of the small size of the library sample, we have had to use the not entirely satisfactory procedure of comparing a mixture of independent and church-related colleges (with the former predominating) with a private-independent AAUP category. It is believed the mixture does not change the results significantly as far as independent institutions are concerned—the church-related institutions with their frequently lower salary scales merely compensate for the previously described participation bias.

Representativeness of the sample: librarians. The question to which we now turn is whether the figures produced by the library sample reflect realistically the economic level of college and university librarians. From the standpoint of the sample itself there is no reason to think it is significantly less representative of librarians in the composite categories—department heads, curators, and other professionals—than it is of faculty. In the top-ranking positions the library sample probably has a unique upward bias. Libraries have only one director and few, if any, associate and assistant directors. Since the large higher-paying institutions probably make up a higher proportion of the smaller library sample than of the more extensive AAUP sample, the arithmetic means, medians, and upper quartiles may be overstated. Only further research will shed light on these relationships. Nonetheless, if this upward bias is kept in mind the statistics should give a reasonably good first approximation of the remuneration levels of librarians.

A further qualification should perhaps be mentioned on combining independent and church-related colleges into a single sub-set in the library sample. If separate statistics were calculated for the church-related and for the independent colleges, significant differentials in both faculty and library compensations would probably appear. The size of the differential is hard to estimate from the present small sample. Improved information will have to wait for a subsequent survey. But if the difference is as great as we suspect, church-related institutions as a whole are placed at a disadvantage in competing for staff.

Questionnaire processing. Each library report was reviewed for internal consistency, and fringe benefits were compared to those reported in the AAUP survey. Where problems existed that could not be remedied in the Washington office (e.g. revising fringe benefits or correcting a clerical error) or where peculiarities could not be explained, librarians were asked to clarify the data reported for that library. As a result, although we know that an occasional error must have slipped through, we have a quite acceptable degree of confidence in the statistics.

The distinction between salary and compensation. The reader is cautioned to distinguish between salaries and compensations. The latter includes the same benefits as the AAUP survey with the exception of cash, tuition, and cash-option benefits. In brief, compensation in the library survey includes salary, retirement benefits if vested in the faculty member by the end of his fifth year of service, the institution's contribution to life and medical insurance, permanent disability income maintenance, and social security.

Objectives and Conclusions. This study represents a preliminary attempt to collect data on salaries and compensations of college and university librarians, with two objectives in mind: (1) to compare the remuneration of librarians with that of their faculty colleagues, and (2) to obtain information on compensation structures within the college and university library profession, including differentials between positions, the distribution by position of compensations among institutions of a given type, and a measure of the economic status of the profession. The two-fold objectives are in part conflicting. The sample drawn for one is not the same as the type of sample which would be drawn for the other.² The study should therefore be thought of not as the last word on present-day patterns of remuneration, but as an initial research effort.

² The statistical problem arises in part because of weighting. The AAUP survey is a measure of the market and therefore uses faculty numbers (e.g. the number of full professors) as weights. Since many positions in college libraries are held by a single individual (e.g. Department Head), a sample drawn to be representative of faculty remuneration might be less representative of library compensations—it might have too few low-paying institutions of that type. A second problem, participation bias, was discussed earlier.

Appendix II
Weighted Average Salary of Professional Librarians
in Colleges and Universities, by Staff Position
and Type of Institution and Control, 1969-70

(11-Month Basis)

LARGE LIBRARIES

Position Title (1)	Universities		Colleges and Emergent Universities	
	Public (2)	Private (3)	Public (4)	Private (5)
Library Director	\$23,480	\$23,230	\$19,760	\$18,050
Assoc. Director	18,470	18,270	14,440	14,510
Asst. Director	15,550	15,300	13,970	11,380
Branch Head	12,080	11,480	10,230	11,680
Curator-Specialist	11,680	10,950	10,120	10,160
DH. Ref.	12,010	11,090	11,330	9,350
DH. Cat.	12,780	11,000	11,900	10,220
DH. Acq.	11,810	11,140	11,710	9,790
DH. Circ.	10,890	10,130	10,540	9,400
DH. Period.	11,070	9,400	10,860	8,590
DH. Unclassified	12,080	10,950	11,600	10,810
Other Professionals	9,130	8,660	9,570	9,390

SMALL LIBRARIES

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Library Director	-	-	\$14,520	\$13,570
Assoc. or Asst. Dir.	-	-	1,170	9,720
Curator-Specialist	-	-	10,140	8,160
Dept. Head	-	-	9,840	8,880
Other Professionals	-	-	8,740	7,880

NOTE: Figures have been rounded to the nearest \$10.