CRAFT AND JOB SATISFACTION:
NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE GRADUATES

Chad Henderson Morgan

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Information and Library Science.

Chapel Hill
2013

Approved by:

Joanne Gard Marshall

Thomas R. Konrad

Barbara Moran

Irene Owens

Zeynep Tufekci

ABSTRACT

Chad Henderson Morgan: Craft and Job Satisfaction: North Carolina Library and
Information Science Graduates
(Under the direction of Joanne Gard Marshall)

This dissertation examines the sources of job satisfaction among 1,833 library and information science (LIS) master's program graduates in North Carolina from 1964-2009. Only respondents who identified themselves as librarians were included in the analysis. The study first examined the effects of traditional work-related variables such as income, flexibility, co-workers, fringe benefits, and setting on job satisfaction. Based on the outcomes of the first regression analysis, the study goes on to examine perceptions of change in the profession over the previous five years and, in particular, the effects of change on older workers. Finally, the analysis introduces variables related to the notion of craft, professional achievement, and family dynamics to determine what impact they have on job satisfaction. The analysis also examines work-related variables that may have been masking the influence of craft, professional achievement and family dynamics. Craft combines the wish to perform one's work well independent of extrinsic factors or influences and the desire of the worker to create a quality final outcome or product which can be certified as such by objective standards. The major finding of the study is that craft and

professional achievement are the largest determinants of job satisfaction among LIS graduates. Meanwhile, variables such as marital status, whether or not one has children, and breadwinner status had no discernible bearing on job satisfaction. Supportive co-workers, being a woman, and membership in professional organizations likewise correlate with job satisfaction, while being a full-time worker, anxiety over job security, and working in an academic library setting contributed to dissatisfaction. Although LIS graduates generally report being very content in their jobs, this study suggests that they are anxious about changes such as the increasing number of temporary and freelance jobs and the perception that full-time staff are doing more work with fewer resources.

Acknowledgements

One incurs enormous debt in the writing of any dissertation and this is especially true in my case. I wish to thank first of all my colleagues and especially my boss, Dean Irene Owens, at North Carolina Central University's School of Library and Information Sciences for the patience shown me in the process of completing this process and the many special allowances that have been made for me so that I could. I would like, too, to thank my students at NCCU SLIS whose incisive comments during class discussions have often pushed me in the direction of new insights.

I must also thank the members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Bob Konrad, Barbara Moran, Irene Owens, and Zeynep Tufekci. Their comments both prior to and during my defense suggested to me new ways of thinking about the data and helped me to make sense of phenomena whose meanings initially escaped my comprehension. The staff at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's School of Information and Library Science has helped me clear administrative obstacles at every step of my academic career there. In this connection, Lara Bailey, Student Services Coordinator, deserves special thanks.

Professionally, Dr. Joanne Marshall is the one person without whom completion of this dissertation would have been unthinkable. She has been there through every phase of the process going back to my admission to SILS as a

Triangle Research Libraries Network Fellow. Beyond helping with the dissertation, Joanne made possible my entire professional career in LIS since 2005.

My greatest debt is to Jennifer Craft Morgan, my wife, for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Purpose, Background, and Research Questions

1.1 Background

The origins of the present work lay in the researcher's longstanding

fascination with the lives of working people which dates at least back to an

occupational folklore graduate seminar taken in the mid-1990s. Recent high-profile

works by public intellectuals Sennett (2008) and Crawford (2009) emphasizing the

need for craft in modern work coincided roughly with data collection for the

Workforce Issues in Library and Information Sciences Study (WILIS). The fact that

the WILIS survey asked several questions that seemed to the researcher to pertain

directly to craft in information work presented a chance to test Sennett and

Crawford's arguments among a large modern information workforce.

Library and Information Science (LIS) workers represent an attractive group

of workers to test the importance of craft in modern work because they seemed to

embody a paradox. On one hand, they were the kinds of office information workers

whose deskbound lives many of the critics of modern work decried. Yet in survey

after job satisfaction survey, LIS workers reported being overwhelmingly satisfied in

their work when contrasted with most other information professions. This paradox is

at the heart of what made LIS particularly attractive to the author. If craft played a

role in their job satisfaction, there existed the chance that a study of this

phenomenon could hold lessons for other information professions, whose practitioners rarely reported being as happy as LIS workers. In addition, the large population and large number of questions in the survey presented the opportunity to look at how an unusually large number of variables impacted LIS job satisfaction, including non-workplace variables.

1.2 Statement of Problem

The purpose of this research is to examine sources of job satisfaction among LIS graduates. Specifically it looks at whether and how structural and technological change in the profession is affecting traditionally high levels of librarian job satisfaction. Given this focus, only respondents who identified themselves as librarians are included in the analysis. In addition to focusing on the effects of demographics and traditional workplace variables such as flexible hours, pay, fringe benefits, and co-workers, it also seeks to find how factors that have not been studied in the LIS literature have affected job satisfaction. It will examine job satisfaction in three major contexts: job satisfaction in North America since the 1950s; the central role of craft in LIS work; and LIS in competition with other professions.

1.3 Research Questions

1. How do job satisfaction levels of librarians vary across age, sex, job level, job type, length of career, and other workplace factors?

2. How do household dynamics affect job satisfaction? Are breadwinners more or less likely to be satisfied? Does marital status affect satisfaction? Do children?

3.   What role does craft and professional achievement play in job satisfaction?

1.4   Conceptual Framework

There are two distinct but overlapping conceptual frames for this dissertation. The first is the large body of scholarship devoted to job satisfaction. Notable precursors to the systematic study of job satisfaction include the establishment and evolution of scientific management in the 1910s, the Hawthorne Studies at Harvard Business School in the 1920s and 1930s, and Abraham Maslow's pioneering Hierarchy of Needs Theory, propounded in the 1950s. New models and approaches to job satisfaction have proliferated in the decades since. Notable among them, Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976) argues that one's level of job satisfaction increases as the gap between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job narrows. Dispositional Theory holds that employees' innate temperament predisposes them to a certain range of satisfaction independent of the objective merits or features of a given job (Judge, Locke, and Durham, 1997). Equity Theory stresses the importance of the perception of fair and equal treatment to one's level of contentment (Huseman and Miles, 1987). Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory proposed that, while one set of factors tended to lead to worker satisfaction (including achievement, recognition, advancement, and growth), a completely separate group of factors caused dissatisfaction (such as salary, company policy, supervision, relationship with one's boss and peers, and security) (1968). In addition, there exist several recognized instruments for measuring job satisfaction. Among others, these include the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), the Brief Index of Affective Job

Satisfaction (BIAJS), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). The job satisfaction literature will be discussed in greater detail in the literature review (section 2.2), although it is worth mentioning here that there has been a trend in the job satisfaction literature in the last decade and more to address the changing nature of work in the information age. The Workforce and Aging in the New Economy (WANE) study looked specifically at how, with the decline of internal labor markets and job security, tech workers in recent years came to view their career and carved out meaningful professional lives for themselves (McMullin and Marshall, 2010). In the spirit of WANE, the Workforce Issues in Library and Information Science study (WILIS) seeks to examine how sources and understanding of job satisfaction is changing for information workers as long-held assumptions about what a job could and should be are challenged.

The second conceptual frame is an intellectual tradition which dates back at least to Marx but which has found its fullest expression in the recent work of the philosopher Richard Sennett (2000, 2008). Along the way, scholars as eminent and diverse as historian Christopher Lasch, economist Harry Braverman, and management thinker Peter Drucker have contributed to this discourse (Lasch, 1978, 1987; Braverman, 1998; Drucker, 1967, 1977, 1998). Though never formally codified as its own school of thought, the trait that unifies thinkers in this tradition might be described as an overriding concern with mastery of, and connection to, one's work. For the purposes of the present work, that concept will denoted by its historical label: craft.

As a concept, craft has been a preoccupation chiefly of sociologists, historians, and philosophers. LIS job satisfaction studies have meanwhile been more apt to look at the related concept, borrowed from scientific management, of "intrinsic rewards." The present study employs craft because it describes a much more specific relationship to work than "intrinsic rewards." The latter suggests only that one finds one's work enjoyable. Some workers may, perversely, enjoy tedious work at which they are incompetent, and such enjoyment would fall under the umbrella of intrinsic rewards. Craft, on the other hand, implies that one enjoys work because he or she is good at it and because the final product is a quality one. Even when the research questions in this dissertation are not explicitly about craft, they are implicitly so. When the dissertation addresses job satisfaction, it does so in the context of a more precarious economic situation than Americans have known, perhaps, since the early 1940s, one in which connection to one's work assumes a new importance as job stability declines. The discussion of librarianship's new place in the information work system of professions is likewise informed by consideration of craft, which may simultaneously be one of librarians' best defenses against professional incursions into traditionally safe areas of professional practice and one of their most promising future sources of continuing satisfaction in a changing professional marketplace.

1.5   Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation will unfold across five chapters. This first chapter provides the problem statement, research questions, and conceptual frame. Chapter Two will situate the project in the context of three scholarly literatures. Chapter Three will

describe the data set and methodology used in the study. Chapter Four is the data

analysis chapter. It (a) examines the job satisfaction of the study's dataset,

graduates of North Carolina's six LIS programs; (b) explores the results of

regression analyses designed to isolate the variables which most accounted for

satisfaction; (c) looks at the impact of household dynamics on librarian job

satisfaction; and (d) analyzes the role played by craft in librarian job satisfaction.

Chapter Five will discuss conclusions of the study as a whole, what they suggest for

the LIS in terms of how the field has and continues to change.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1   Introduction

This review surveys three literatures that frame the present dissertation: job satisfaction and LIS; craft in work; and the evolution of professions with an emphasis on librarianship and the information professions.

2.2   Job Satisfaction and LIS

In their 2005 book, *The New American Workplace*, anthropologists James O'Toole and Edward E. Lawler III neatly summed up the major findings of more than 50 years of job satisfaction studies. The key findings included overall lower levels of satisfaction and high turnover and absenteeism. Job satisfaction did not beget better job performance but quality performance was a huge predictor of satisfaction. Satisfaction tended determined by whether workers felt like they are being adequately rewarded for their work. There existed a direct correlation between worker and customer satisfaction. Also happy workers are less likely to want to unionize (2005). There were some persistent demographic features of the job satisfaction literature. First, there was a small but consistent correlation between advancing age and job satisfaction. Women reported being happier in their work despite having had, on balance, objectively worse jobs than men by any metric

(Hodson, 1989; Clark, 1997). Much of this makes a great deal of intuitive sense. More to the point for the present study, it makes sense in the context of a deskilled work world described by critics of the decline of craft in modern work.

Traditional ideas about career development often do not correspond to the reality of work in the current economy. They are, in truth, not even all that traditional. In the mid-20th century, career development was tied closely to internal labor markets. Employees entered an organization at or near the bottom and worked their way through a succession of job titles meant to indicate upward movement through the organization (Doeringer and Piore, 1985). Ultimately, as global competition required companies to make their workforces more flexible, organizations found it easier and more cost-effective to go with a managerial core supplemented by a periphery of temporary and/or marginally skilled workers (Ellig, 2005; Barley and Kunda, 2006). This allowed them to downsize more quickly when times got lean and, conversely, to add workers in flush times without taking on the risk of adding employees who stayed on their employment rolls for the next 30 years and earned pensions.

In the new economy, firms—and particularly the small IT firms that have proliferated in the new economy—tended to grow cautiously. They attempted to foster job satisfaction through more open communication practices and less hierarchical company structures in the manner described by management scholars such as Douglas McGregor. Findings of the WANE (Workforce Aging in the New Economy) project reinforced the emergence of a "risk society," in which work is more

fluid, piecemeal, and ephemeral than in the recent past. A bare majority of the IT workers in WANE suggested they had a "clear sense" of how they wished for their careers would unfold, and few expressed a high level of confidence in their careers playing out as they hope. All of this suggests a fairly fraught employment situation in which new economy workers—despite more communication and more collaborative working arrangements—would seem to experience an unusually high level of career anxiety when contrasted with their old economy counterparts (McMullin and Marshall, 2010).

Until very recently, librarians would appear to have experienced relatively little of the anxiety that other new economy workers have. For decades, they have been subject to dozens of job satisfaction studies, which suggest that they are "happy enough" in the words of Eva and McCormick (2008). Librarians most often expressed satisfaction about the importance of their work and the pleasure they took in performing it. Factors that most often weighed against satisfaction included low salaries and a perceived lack of opportunities. According to the results of three nationwide surveys published by Library Journal since 1994, reference librarians, librarians in smaller libraries, professional librarians (i.e., those holding a graduate LIS degree), and librarians working with new technologies were all more likely to express satisfaction with their careers/jobs (St. Lifer, 1994; Gordon and Nesbeitt, 1999; Berry, 2007). Another general librarian job satisfaction survey found that the happiest librarians were those who were older and had more professional experience, those who held an MLS, and those who worked directly with the public including, notably, reference librarians. Interestingly, the same study found that

librarian job satisfaction compared unfavorably with the national average, which makes it an outlier in the wider literature (Van Reenan, 1998). So obviously this dissertation hardly represents the first time that librarian job satisfaction has been placed under the microscope.

Aside from the *Library Journal* surveys, LIS scholars have come at the topic of librarian job satisfaction from several angles since at least the 1970s. Academic librarians have been a particular focus of job satisfaction studies. This is perhaps due to the fact that, among librarians, those working in university settings feel a unique pressure to publish (discussion of which will follow in Chapter 5). Among the more notable works from this diffuse literature, Chwe (1978) showed reference librarians in university settings happier in their work than their peers in technical services. Glasgow's survey of American academic librarians (1982) found that librarians' "perception of their work"—the constellation of factors other job satisfaction scholars have termed "intrinsic rewards"—to be the most accurate predictor of satisfaction. Predictably, salary, rank, and opportunities for advancement also correlated with a positive view of one's job. Examining the same population roughly a decade later, Mirfakhrai (1991) found that, while opportunities to move up within the organization remained important, other key factors promoting job satisfaction were the size of the library (the smaller the better) and co-worker relationships. Meanwhile, perceived supervisor incompetence and career immobility ranked first among variables predicting dissatisfaction. Lim (2008) showed that, for IT workers in academic libraries, the principal correlates for job satisfaction were "salary, an MLS degree, a sense of belonging, faith in wanting to belong, a feeling of

acceptance, job autonomy and promotion opportunities." Together, these studies paint a remarkably consistent picture of the factors contributing to academic librarians' job satisfaction over the course of several decades.

The other setting to attract the attention of LIS job satisfaction researchers has been the public library. Schneider (1991) compared the stress levels of "public service" and technical services workers at a large urban public library and found them noticeably lower among the former. Bartlett (1998) specifically looked at how supervisor activity related to worker satisfaction in Wake County, North Carolina and concluded, unsurprisingly, that when bosses "self-disclosed," offered assistance to those working under them, and provided frequent feedback, they were better able to cultivate happy workers. A pair of articles by Goulding (1991, 1995) isolated factors contributing to satisfaction on the part of public library support staff and paraprofessionals. These included frequent interaction with the public, having a stake in the organization's success, and other strictly work-related factors typically grouped under the "intrinsic rewards" label. As this brief survey suggests, public librarian job satisfaction studies tend to focus more or less narrowly on one aspect of satisfaction, whether that be a single aspect of the job or one sector of the workforce. Similarly, these studies tend to focus on a single public library or library system. On balance, though, their results jibed with what was found about academic librarians and LIS workers generally.

2.3 Craft and Information Work

The use of *craft*—defined as "intellectual power; skill; art"—in English dates back at least to 808 AD per the OED. Its close cousin *craftsmanship*—"The performance or occupation of a craftsman; skill in clever or artistic work; skilled workmanship"—is a relative neophyte having come into use only circa 1652. As befits their vintage the words evoke the world of pre-industrial artisans, of smiths, coopers, wheelwrights, glaziers, braziers, cobblers, and the whole cast of skilled workers who made things before machines did. Craft and craftsmanship, terms used synonymously here, did not go by the boards with the introduction of the spinning jenny. For present purposes, Richard Sennett's flexible definition of those terms is used. (See Appendix I for this and all definitions.) "'Craftsmanship' may suggest a way of life that waned with the advent of industrial society—but this is misleading," Sennett wrote. "Craftsmanship names an enduring, basic human impulse, the desire to do a job well for its own sake" (2008). This definition is notable for a couple reasons. First, Sennett's identification of craft as "an enduring, basic human impulse" frees the concept from its etymologically imposed cage. Craft is not some dusty relic of the pre-industrial past (the Guilded Age?) but part of what it means to be human, and it is timeless. "Craftsmanship cuts a far wider swath than manual labor," he elaborates. "It serves the computer programmer, the doctor, and the artist; parenting improves when it is practiced as a skilled craft, as does citizenship." This is a sweeping claim but not, as will hopefully become clear, one without supporting evidence. People define themselves and are defined by their work. Being able to take pride in one's work would therefore seem to be a fairly

universal need. But, as Sennett is careful to point out, craft properly understood doesn't allow for airy, personal standards of success. Rather, "craftsmanship focuses on objective standards, on the thing in itself" (2008). There are no green participant ribbons in the world of craft. Either the wheel fits the axle or it does not. Either the patient is cured or he is not. Either the program works or it does not.

The idea that happiness in work is intimately related to the results of one's work did not, of course, originate with Sennett. The first critic of the declining craftsmanship to place the phenomenon in a full-fledged theoretical framework was Marx, who propounded his theory of worker alienation in the 1840s. It held, in brief, that alienation of the industrial worker was two-fold. First, unlike artisans and craftsmen, industrial workers did not own the means of production. They had to do as directed by capital; they had little job autonomy in the parlance of 20th and 21st century job satisfaction researchers. Second, industrial workers were alienated from the products of their work; they only performed a part of the process and they left the finished product with the employer.

Among actual workers, in contrast to theorists, the sense of something having been lost with the decline of craft dates to the 18th century and the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution. This first alienation is outlined in E. P. Thompson's seminal *The Making of the English Working Class* (1966), which traced the rise of English labor radicalism from the 1790s through the Chartist movement of the 1830s and 1840s. Unlike Marx and traditional Marxist historians, Thompson was not a historical determinist, and he did not view the formation of a self-conscious working class as inevitable. He emphasized the agency of workers in creating labor radicalism. In

Thompson's view, the crucial development was the formation of class consciousness—not the objective fact of social class as it had been for Marx. That is to say that Thompson emphasized the development of the working class's awareness of itself *as a class* and the recognition of its discrete class interests as the point at which class could become a motor for history. In a complex world, there are a lot of potential sources of identity; nationality, religion, race, ethnicity, and gender foremost among them. There was nothing inevitable and, taking the long view, something quite rare about class being the defining issue in society. It transpired that Marx happened to have lived and written during one of those rare times, and he projected his experience backward (and forward) across the entirety of human experience. Seen through Thompson's lens, Marx was a great scholar, yes, but very much a peculiar product of his particular place and time.

In the U.S., the New Labor Historians of 1970s and 1980s likewise went somewhat beyond the traditional Marxist critique of de-skilling and the alienation of the workers from the products of their labor. Drawing on Thompson, they took as their subject changing work habits and the culture of work. Nor, per this new school, was class consciousness the lens through which to view most workers' lived experience. Recall that Thompson documented one of the relatively few episodes in all history in which class can be said to have had primacy. The New Labor Historians suggested that small-c culture—the complex of norms, values, and customs all internalize mostly without realizing it—defined workers' existence more than anything as high-minded as labor relations. This was particularly the case in a nation that never really developed a politically powerful radical labor tradition. In the U.S.,

workers found satisfaction within rich ethnocultural communities and the various cultural practices therein: religion, song, sport, cuisine, extensive kin networks, etc. One of the myriad cultural expressions through which workers located identity and meaning was pride in craft. In short, the New Labor History took a much more inclusive view of working people's experience. They found that workers created meaning for themselves in any number of ways that had nothing to do with class warfare. This was Thompson with a twist: the agency of working people still took center stage but that agency was not always, or even usually, exercised to advance class interests conventionally understood. The key works in this tradition are Gutman's *Work Culture and Society in Industrializing America* (1976), a collection of essays from over a decade's worth of work which promoted the idea that working lives were far too complex to be understood solely through the lens of labor relations. Wilentz explored the political dimension of artisans' lives in Jacksonian New York (1983), arguing that workers expressed their anger at industrialization and the decline of craft—and, by the way, having to complete with free black and slave craftsmen, a point often elided by white liberal historians—through the vehicle of radical Jacksonian Democratic activism. In a Southern context, the New Labor History is most associated with Hall et al.'s *Like a Family* (1988), which documented the relationships and folkways which sustained southern millworkers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Beginning in the 1930s and continuing over the following two decades, AT&T executive and management thinker Chester Barnard consistently emphasized both monetary and non-monetary incentives for workers, including pride in one's work, to

improve organizational efficiency (Mahoney, 2002). For the psychologist Abraham

Maslow, who influenced a generation of management thought beginning in the

1940s, self-actualization rested atop his famous pyramid of human needs (1997).

Other leading lights of twentieth century management thought have followed up on

this central insight. McGregor sought to instill a new set of assumptions about

workers which he termed Theory Y, stressing workers' capacity to assume

responsibility and initiative in their jobs so long as they understood their stake in the

organization and were able to work toward goals they understood (2005). Over a

long and mind-numbingly productive career as a management scholar and

consultant, Peter Drucker advocated for managers bringing workers into the

decision-making and goal-setting processes. Among other things, workers often

knew as much or more about the workings of an organization than managers.

Moreover, Drucker's thinking went, giving employees a stake in the planning and

outcomes of an organization would naturally make them more motivated workers

(1967; 1977; 1998). Someone of a Marxian bent could, with a minimum of

intellectual contortion, characterize much management thought of the twentieth

century as seeking to re-connect alienated workers with the products of their labor

without having management relinquish fundamental control of the process.

Such a reconnection became necessary because of the rise and the uniquely

alienated circumstances of the modern information professional. According to

communications scholar Beniger (1986), information work went from accounting for

less than one percent of the US civilian labor force 1800 to roughly half of it in 1980.

Since that time, this increase has continued apace although the percentage would

vary according to one's definition of information work. It may be more accurate to say that while people who work with their hands continue to make up over 30 percent of the U.S. workforce at a conservative estimate, information work has constituted a larger and larger part of their job or, alternatively, that the lines between information and other kinds of work have increasingly blurred. Workers with an information-work component to their job would approach 100 percent in the developed world. This point will emerge more fully later in the review. For now, it is enough to note that the problem of having more information workers in a society, from a job satisfaction perspective, is a problem precisely to the extent that such work tends to be more abstract in nature than most kinds of manual labor, and its results commensurately less observable. When information work really began to take root in the nineteenth century, it did so in large corporations. Once companies reached a certain critical mass, in order to keep track of large and complex operations, they required dedicated workers for this task; bean counters just count, do not actually produce, beans. Information work is thus "born" alienated in the Marxist sense. And as corporate/governmental operations grew ever more distended, the information professionals charged with managing them tracked ever smaller pieces of the overall operation. Not only, then, were they alienated from any sort of productive labor in the traditional sense but as organizations grew, like de-skilled industrial workers, their contribution often grew increasingly smaller to the point of being imperceptible.

More recently, Crawford (2005) has placed information workers' alienation in a new context. A fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture at the

University of Virginia and owner of a small motorcycle repair concern in Richmond, Crawford counsels that one answer to the problems posed by information work is to leave the office altogether and learn a manual trade. Become a mechanic or a plumber. Enter careers which cannot be outsourced, which will always be around, and which, lastly, pay better than the typical cubicle-track job. He posits a kind of localistic resistance to globalizing tendencies akin to the setting up of farmer's markets and co-ops. According to Crawford, only an irrational cultural prejudice against blue-collar work prevents people who would be better served learning a trade from doing so. There is one not-insubstantial roadblock to the fulfillment Crawford's vision of a virtuous, neo-Jeffersonian republic of small craftsmen. Namely, unless the world adopts Crawford's and the anti-globalists' call to halt globalization in its tracks—and there is no indication this is happening in any meaningful way—his book amounts to an unusually erudite self-help manual. Some small number of office drones may be able to learn a craft and find happiness that way. Since the majority of jobs being created in the global economy are for information work, what good does Crawford's advice do all the people who must fill those positions? Crawford's advice, in other words, may be taken by this or that individual, but it is hardly good advice for society as a whole. Or as Kelefa Sanneh asked in her *New Yorker* review of Crawford's polemic, "if the demand for mechanics is basically inelastic, how can [the mass migration of former office workers into the trades] offset other trends?"

Modern information workers would thus seem caught in a tightening vise of malaise for which there is no precedent. Unlike Thompson's nineteenth-century

English workers, the modern information worker cannot find solace in class solidarity (most wear white or off-white collars). And unlike American industrial workers of the 19th and 20th centuries, the deracinated workers of the new economy are less likely to take comfort or find meaning in close-knit ethnocultural communities. Sennett has been particularly pointed in his criticism of the new economy, and he is especially keen on this point: i.e., the absence of community, traditionally defined, and the implications that has for modern work. In *The Corrosion of Character*, he tracks the decline of a Boston bakery. Formerly an exclusively Greek bakery, specializing in Greek baked goods and with Greek employees, it had expanded and now made what the market required: 100 bagels today, 100 loaves of French bread tomorrow. The workforce was no longer even nominally Greek. And yes, this was not one's traditional information work job. Except that it was. The process of baking bread was broken down into tens of timed components, Ray Kroc-style. The "bakers" themselves manipulated screens to do their work but they did not have the skills actually to fix the machines, let alone any concrete understanding of how to make bread. The problem, as Sennett saw it, was not that the machines are hostile to them and are taking away their craft in the sense that 19th-century workers were rendered redundant by industrial technology. The problem was that the machines were *too* user-friendly. They did all the work. Task difficulty is anathema in a world where a flexible workforce is the rule. Employers need their transient workforce to be able to pick up the skills to bake bread (or perform whatever task) quickly, and that means having a user-friendly system in place where machines do most of the work and employees are interchangeable. Sennett: "When we diminish difficulty and

resistance, we create the very conditions of uncritical and indifferent activity on the part of the users." In other words, the needs of our global, dynamic, information-centric society demand that work be simplified. And this militates against the any real self-actualization in work. Here Sennett seems to channel American historian Christopher Lasch who made an almost tiresome habit of excoriating Frederick Winslow Taylor and scientific managers generally for their "expropriation of craft knowledge formerly controlled by the workers" (1987).

Another aspect of a flexible, polyglot workforce always in flux is that it weighs against the growth of the kinds of cultural communities that made life meaningful for many nineteenth-century industrial workers. Even though they may not have found meaning in their work, they were able to find meaning in their culture, their community. With satisfaction at work on the wane and no similarly robust traditional communities to tap into, the question becomes how information workers will find meaning or identity. Florida (2003) has provided something of a counterweight to the doom and gloom of Marx, Sennett, Crawford, et al. Citing the growth of "knowledge-based professionals," he argues that "The numbers of people doing creative work has increased vastly over the past century and especially over the past decade." This rise will continue, Florida predicts, and those cities, regions, nations who do the most to attract the creative classes will benefit commensurately.

There is some evidence for Florida's optimism in the LIS literature. Indiana University librarian Mark Tyler Day wrote as early as the mid-1990s about the need to "humanize information technology" and how his library tried to do this with electronic texts. This effort has eventuated in the increasingly vital digital humanities

project. The project obviously picked up considerable momentum since then with the establishment and growth of countless online cultural repositories. In "The Knowledge Smiths: Librarianship as Craftship of Knowledge," Yonathan Mizrachi (1998) made the connection between a new kind of librarianship and craft explicit. He argued that the growth of the internet and more complex information environments meant that "librarians and information specialists can no longer maintain their traditional, relatively passive role, and should aspire to become active participants in knowledge seeking." Instead, they will "be called to intervene and assist users in context of higher levels of information processing (knowledge, understanding, reflection, and application)." He modestly concluded that the "main, and perhaps the somewhat revolutionary, implication" of his article was that "the centre of gravity in the information professional's practice and training should move from data and information retrieval and mediation to nothing short of acting as knowledge seekers, editors, and interpreters." Computer Scientist William Waite similarly invoked an element of craft as essential to "the design, construction and operation of efficient and economical structures, equipment and systems" (1996). And of course, craft is assumed by the metaphor of information architecture. Whether and to what extent librarians see themselves as practicing a craft and whether the more "active" role for librarians posited by Mizrachi has materialized in the years since his article is one of the central questions addressed by this dissertation.

2.4   The Development of Professions

Although some professions like medicine and law trace their origins `to medieval times or even antiquity, it was really only in the nineteenth century that professions developed as they are constituted today, with formal associations, licensure, codes of ethics, and the other barriers to practice. According to Bledstein (1977), professionalization occurred in the U.S. first with the establishment of scientific medicine over its folksier competitors and then with the creation of the first university-level professional schools, notably in accounting, architecture, various branches of the professoriate, and the law. The formal study of professionalization began in the 20th century with the full emergence of various flavors of social science, especially sociology. There exist four major schools of thought on the subject: Functionalism, Monopolism, what may be termed the "Professions as Embodiment of Pre-Modern Values" school, and "System-ism."

Early studies of professionalism from the 1930s and 1940s tended to focus on case studies of individual professions and on the enumeration of professional characteristics such as education, organization, and ethics. According to the Functionalists, the most prominent being Talcott Parsons, professions were the logical upshot of the emergence of experts in various fields. The very fact that scientifically trained experts now existed, in contrast to pre-modern specialists whose knowledge was grounded in trial-and-error and folk wisdom, required patients/clients to recognize this expertise and defer to it. And it required professionals to recognize one another in a spirit of collegiality and collaboration.

Professions, in other words, were the logical conclusion of the emergence of the first real experts.

A product of the politically radicalized atmosphere of the 1960s and 1970s, Monopolists argued that professions emerged not as a natural consequence of expertise but because groups of "experts" aggressively tried to claim for themselves pieces of the emerging white-collar work landscape for themselves and to control them. According to Larson (1977), professions were first and foremost creatures of the market, created to exercise control over, and derive profits from, given areas of practice. This line of thinking was taken to its logical, endearingly nutty extreme by Collins in his 1979 book *The Credential Society*. Collins posited the growth of a "sinecure sector" dedicated to "political" (i.e., non-productive) labor as more and more actual work was done by machines. Since all these sinecures by definition did not perform meaningful work, there was no way to determine the best fit for a given professional job. Credentialing bodies and systems emerged to determine which nonentity got to occupy which superfluous post.

In a similar vein, the historian Samuel Haber argued that the rise of professionalism represented something of an anti-meritocratic backlash to modern work culture. According to Haber, the professions occupy a singular place in the universe of modern work. Unlike the functionalists and the monopolists, Haber saw professions not as forward-looking exemplars of modernity nor as cynical faux-guilds but as throwbacks to the pre-modern values of authority, honor, and duty. That is to say that in an increasingly impersonal world in which labor is debased, professionalism was an attempt to rescue work from rationalization and imbue it with

meaning. In this sense, Haber sounds very like the critics who decry the decline of craft in modern work and seems to see in professionalism a response to the same processes that deskilled artisans. While professions freed their members up from some of the more vexing aspects of supervision and protected them from the vagaries of the market, they also provided them with a sense of community and purpose. Haber likewise opposed the view of professions as constituting a system (more about which below). He instead portrayed the world as a place where people are not always rational actors, where they act on mixed motives, and where they sometimes adopt values that may not seem to accord with the world in which they live.

Propounded by sociologist Andrew Abbott in the late 1980s, "system-ism" represents the most widely accepted model of how professions rise and evolve. Although diametrically opposed, Abbott pointed out, functionalists and monopolists shared some basic assumptions: They saw professions as an occupational group, and they saw them as mostly exclusive. By contrast, Abbott emphasized the interrelation and competition between professions; professions cannot be understood by isolated case studies of given professions, but must be understood in relation to one another. It is true, Abbott thought, that professions are formed to control an area or, more accurately, areas of practices. What previous interpretations missed, though, was that professions are constantly at war with other professions at the edge of their expertise. Only within the context of this struggle does the growth of professions make sense. Cast another way: Why would doctors

feel the need to create the AMA if their expertise was sufficient to ensure their status?

The particular focus of this dissertation, of course, is the information professions. Abbott defined them as those professions which sought to "help clients overburdened with material from which they cannot retrieve usable information" (1988). According to Beniger in The Control Revolution (1988), the advent of large numbers of information professionals (in what Abbot calls the "quantitative task area") is the logical outcome of the industrial revolution. Only once industrialists and corporations were producing a certain number of widgets did it become incumbent on them to hire armies of clerks, accountants, and middle managers. According to Abbott, information work can be divided into two mostly distinct categories: the qualitative and quantitative task areas.

The qualitative task area comprises, effectively, librarians. Or at least it did when *The System of Professions* came out in 1988. Another example of a profession in this area is journalism. Although there are schools of journalism, professional associations, etc. it is not particularly successful as a profession because it is highly permeable. The historically larger and more market-oriented of the two branches of information work, the quantitative work task area has also had the more contested history. Accounting is the anchor profession of the quantitative task work area, which also encompasses economists, statisticians, and business consultants.

In the US, librarians originally carved out the niche of handling the printed resources of colleges, schools, cultural institutions, corporations, and communities

(Garrison, 1979). Librarians made attempts to expand their function to include education and outreach in the 19th century, but were rebuffed by teachers and subject specialists. Under the leadership of Melvil Dewey, in the late nineteenth century the profession began to take the shape it would retain for over a century. It is rare to be able to claim that individuals have much agency in shaping history. But one has to say that Dewey's decisions, personality, and organizational zeal in the late nineteenth century did a lot to shape the profession over the course of following century and more (Wiegand, 1986). Special librarianship was one of the few attempts by librarians to expand their purview. It was an example of librarians trying to stake out professional space for themselves within private companies, and it met with limited success.

The emergence of librarianship in the late nineteenth century makes perfect sense in the context of the US's unprecedented transformation during this period. According to the historian Robert Wiebe in his historical synthesis of the Gilded Age and Progressive-Era U.S., "America during the nineteenth century was a society of island communities," characterized by poor communication, limited knowledge accumulation, intense localism, close kinship, and community ties. Transportation and market revolutions upset this deeply parochial scheme. In island communities, "power was personal." Interested parties could easily discern the power brokers in their locality, and make sense of their small cosmos. Increasingly, though, knowledge of the local community was insufficient to account fully for one's situation. For the first time, state and national authorities and global markets began to impinge on local lives in meaningful and sometimes ruinous ways. While fence laws

emanating from state capitals made subsistence farming lifestyles—which had characterized settled human existence since the invention of agriculture—impracticable for most, fluctuations in grain and cotton prices based on production of the same goods in Africa or Asia rendered farm production for the market increasingly problematic. All the while, urbanization, mass immigration, and mass communication contributed to a more and more "distended society," which could no longer be understood in local terms. There were two responses to this. One could resist centralizing forces as in the cases of the populist movement and radical labor unionism. Alternatively, one could try to order a world made incomprehensible by ill-understood forces in the manner of the Progressive reformers of the early 20th century. Librarianship was of a piece with the efforts of Progressives to introduce order into a radically disordered society.

The literature on Southern librarianship specifically resembles the literature on professions during its functionalist phase: i.e., there are many case studies but very few attempts at synthesis as yet. Still, there is a lot material, much of it quite good. For North Carolina alone, the selection is rich. To begin, there are the superb biographical studies of Louis Round Wilson by Robert S. Martin and Maurice F. Tauber. Noteworthy, too, are articles by Patrick Valentine, which variously explore antebellum print culture in North Carolina, the state's public library movement in the first half of the 20th century, and the story of Raleigh's first black public library. A series penned by Elizabeth H. Smith for *North Carolina Libraries* ably laid out the major milestones for the state's libraries from 1905 forward. When one casts his or her net for books and articles about the history of southern librarianship generally,

the number of useful works multiplies. Much of the focus has been on ways in which libraries and library schools served as loci of early integration (Churchwell, 1998; Graham, 1998; Lipscomb, 2004) or as centers of learning for underserved African-American populations (Albritton, 1998; Graham,, 1998; Spooner, 2001; Valentine, 1998; Wheeler, 2004). This literature also includes an article on libraries as an expression of the South's "Culture of Resentment" (Carmichael, 2005), which, while a real enough phenomenon, does not really pass muster as an explanation of library expansion. Beyond that, there have been few efforts to venture a unified theory of "Southern librarianship" as such. The fact is, the South has always been more diverse than has been generally supposed and libraries in the upper South have always had as much in common with those in lower tier northern states as with those in the Deep South. For an extended meditation on the evolution of librarianship in the state of North Carolina, please see Appendix II.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methodology

3.1   Data Source

This study used survey data collected by the Workforce Issues in Library and

Information Science (WILIS) study funded by the Institute of Museum and Library

Services (IMLS) between 2005 and 2012 (http://www.wilis.unc.edu/). The purpose

of WILIS 1 was to "to build an in-depth understanding of educational, workplace,

career and retention issues faced by LIS graduates" (Marshall et al., 2009). More

broadly, it was to discern patterns in the careers of LIS graduates over time and

across programs.

A collaborative effort on the part of the University of North Carolina at Chapel

Hill's School of Information and Library Science and UNC Institute on Aging, WILIS

is a study in three phases. The first phase, WILIS 1, was an in-depth retrospective

career study that included all graduates of five LIS master's degree programs and

one paraprofessional program in the state from 1964 to 2005. Programs included in

the survey were the Appalachian State University Library Science Program; the East

Carolina University Department of Library Science and Instructional Technology; the

North Carolina Central University School of Library and Information Sciences; the

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Information and Library

Science; the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Department of Library and Information Studies; and the paraprofessional Central Carolina Community College Library and Information Technology Program. Graduates of UNC-Chapel Hill SILS up to 2007 were also surveyed. The diversity of the programs studied is one of the signal strengths of the WILIS 1 data. They ranged from programs at Research I universities rated among the best iSchools in the nation to ALA-accredited programs with significant online, night, and weekend offerings to accommodate working adults to departments in larger schools tasked with training school librarians to the community college paraprofessional program. The diversity of types of LIS schools in one state is one of the rare if not unique advantages to setting the study in North Carolina.

The second phase, WILIS 2, used the recent graduates' portion of the WILIS 1 survey to create and test an alumni tracking system that all LIS master's programs could conceivably use in the future. WILIS 3 is preparing and archiving the WILIS 1 and two datasets in the Dataverse Network system maintained by the Odum Institute for Research in Social Sciences at UNC Chapel Hill (http://arc.irss.unc.edu/dvn/).

The present work makes use only of the data from the original WILIS 1 survey. The first step in building the census was to have the six participating programs furnish alumni lists. From there, the study staff attempted to confirm contact information utilizing web searches, the AlumniFinder Search Service, and postcards advertising the study and requesting subject replies. In addition, the staff posted announcements of the study to potential subjects on relevant discussion boards and listservs. The population for this project totaled roughly 9,000 subjects.

The WILIS 1 survey instrument was modeled after that of the WANE

(Workforce Aging in the New Economy) study and used many of the same career

questions, making it ideal for comparative purposes. WANE was a three-phase

international comparative study of information technology employment carried out by

academic researchers in Australia, Canada, the European Union, and the United

States. It attempted to determine what counted as work in the IT industry; whether IT

firms were cognizant of aging workforces; if so, how and if they accommodated

aging workers; what barriers existed to entry into IT work; and how companies

fostered new skills (http://www.wane.ca/overview.htm). Since WANE was something

of the model for WILIS1 particularly and since it speaks to a lot of the concerns

addressed herein in a different but related context, the corpus of work produced by

the WANE team since 2002 will be something of a measuring stick against which the

results of the present study may be profitably compared. WANE provides, in other

words, valuable context for this dissertation across national and professional

borders. Since it deals specifically with IT workers, it also offered opportunities for

comparison with the WILIS data (McMullin and Marshall, 2010).

The WILIS one survey came in two versions: one for professionals and one

with wording changes for paraprofessionals. Both versions were available to

respondents online but could be physically mailed to them upon request. The survey

combined closed- and open-ended questions. It asked respondents about up to six

jobs: one's job before entering an LIS program, first job after the LIS degree, current

job, last job, longest job, and highest-achieving job. For each job the survey asked

respondents about several potential sources of job satisfaction including pay, benefits, mobility, intrinsic rewards, nature of work, autonomy, and co-workers.

The WILIS team took preliminary measures to ensure the validity of the survey instrument and an adequate response rate. In the first instance, a pilot study was conducted in March 2007 with 750 random subjects from the population. In the second, the WILIS team carried out a survey of 400 random non-responders to ascertain causes of non-response and to try to adapt the framing of the study accordingly to potential subjects. One-hundred forty-four non-responders took the time to take this second survey. The most important common reason cited for failure to participate in the pilot study (33%) was lack of time. One upshot of these efforts was that the WILIS team concluded the respondent pool to be representative of the population they wished to study. Another was a general "tightening-up" of the survey in which researchers validated the survey skip logic and edited the document to render it as concise as was consistent with getting a reasonably complete overview of subjects' LIS careers. As a result of these efforts, the final research instrument is simultaneously exhaustive and taut. In printed form, the full survey stretches to some 93 pages and provides a solid impression of subjects' education, career trajectory, and sources of job satisfaction as LIS workers. One respondent pointed out a potential difficulty with the long format. "This is a very, very long survey that took a long time to complete," she wrote. "I wonder how that fact will affect the final results. Will it mostly describe the situations of the extremely passionate and the extremely disgruntled? I hope not. I hope you get a broader response."

WILIS researchers made special efforts to guard against that possibility. In September 2007, they made the survey available to the 7,563 subjects whose contact information they could confirm. They sent subjects notifications via mail and email with log-in instructions and a two-dollar bill incentive. The survey was taken down in December. In that time, 2,653 of the 7,563 completed surveys resulting in an approximate participation rate of 35%. The survey yielded 1,700 variables for potential analysis. Fully three quarters of respondents were from the southeastern United States with 57 percent from North Carolina, and respondents' average age was 32.7 years. Nonwhite respondents constituted only 11 percent of the sample. Seventy-six percent were employed fulltime, and 20 percent were retired.

3.2   Data Subset

In section B of the survey, there were questions that asked (a) whether the subject is currently employed and (b) whether she or he considers her/himself a librarian, an information professional, neither, or both. The current project analyzed the data of subjects identifying themselves as librarians only and not of those who identifying primarily as an "information worker" or by another label. The reason for this, on the one hand, was a wish on my part to place a manageable limit on the data needing to be analyzed. It also represented an effort to make the study population as comparable to those of previous studies of librarianship as possible for comparison's sake. Since one of the central aims of the study is to view an oft-studied topic through a different theoretical lens, it seemed advisable to confine my focus primarily to librarians in order to see how the application of craft to the

question of librarian job satisfaction changed the existing, well-established portrait. Still, this dissertation will of necessity touch on the subject of librarians' relationship to other information workers as professional boundaries shift and settle and shift again. There is also the fact that those indicating that they considered themselves both librarians and information were part of the sample. Information workers who happen not to work in a library setting will therefore not be escaping scrutiny altogether, but neither will they be the focus of the study. Having chosen to focus on librarians, several subjects were eliminated based on non-response to one or another question corresponding to variables such as income, supervisory status, or co-workers. This process eventuated in a data set of 1,883 working librarians. No further data were collected.

3.3 Data Analysis Plan

Most of the data analysis for this dissertation was quantitative, and SPSS version 15.0 was used to analyze that data. Each research question examined several variables among the more than 1,700 in the WILIS 1 dataset as they applied to the study sample. Variables were selected from sections A (Demographics and Education);B (Job History); F (Current Job); G (Last Job); H (Longest Job); and J (Breaks in Employment) of the survey.

The first research question asks how variables that represented one or more of the nine facets of the Job Satisfaction Survey interacted with job satisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Survey was chosen as a reasonably objective means of selecting variables to correlate with job satisfaction for two reasons. In the first place it was

comprehensive, with its nine facets covering most conceivable workplace-related sources of job satisfaction. The second reason the JSS was chosen was that it could be freely used and modified for noncommercial research and educational purposes. The job satisfaction variable used comprised the survey questions F36C, F36D, F36; this scale was arrived at in a process described in Chapter 4.

The variables analyzed in relation of job satisfaction for the first question ("How do job satisfaction levels vary across age, sex, job level, job type, length of career, and other factors?") were: age (question A17); sex (A20); race (A19); income (A22); benefits (F26-F28h); organization type (F1a); organization size (F1c); job level (F15); opportunity for advancement (F35c); and two co-workers variables (G14 and G15). Three discrete regression analyses were run. In the first, only traditional workplace-related variables that have correlated with job satisfaction in past studies were considered. The reason this tack was taken was to gauge how closely this population resembled those surveyed in previous LIS job satisfaction studies. With this baseline in place, some judgment could be made regarding the typicality of this group before moving onto the analysis of less-studied variables. Initially, only two regressions were planned, but another regression—which became the second of the three—was run because of an unexpected finding with regard to older workers (Chapter 4). In the third regression, all the variables related to family dynamics and craft and professional achievement were entered. In other words, the first two regressions represent mostly an attempt to answer research question one while the third regression's aim is to answer questions two and three.

Variables analyzed for research question number two ("How do librarians accommodate life/work balance? How does the balance vary between male and female librarians and how has it shifted over time and across successive jobs? To what extent do sex and household dynamics affect job satisfaction? Are breadwinners more or less likely to be satisfied?") were: sex; income; breadwinner or not (F39); parenting responsibilities (J5); and job satisfaction (F36C, F36D, F36E). Variables analyzed for research question number three ("What role does craft play in job satisfaction? Does increased job instability result in a commensurate increase in the importance of craft in work?") were craft and job satisfaction. The craft variable, like that for job satisfaction, was a summative scale comprising survey questions F10A, F35A, F35B, F35E, and F35F. The creation of this measure is described in Chapter 4.

In addition to the closed-ended questions, the survey provided several opportunities for respondents to add texture to the strictly quantitative data. These included, notably, a question near the outset of the survey asking subjects to give a career overview. The survey likewise gave respondents chances to express, in their own words, how they viewed their professional identity; why they entered the LIS field; how they would describe their work setting(s); why they left given jobs or the profession as a whole; what they would change about their jobs; and any other information about their education or career that they felt was not captured by the other survey questions. Several questions gave subjects the option of elaborating an answer if they felt their response was not covered by the survey's existing categories.

I used these open-ended responses to two ends in Chapter 5. First, open-ended responses often summarized or otherwise bore out findings from the strictly statistical analysis. The other way in which open-ended responses were used was to highlight phenomena that did not show up as statistically significant. One of the benefits of being able to work with this large a sample was that it gave me a lot of latitude in terms of how many variables one could add to the model without compromising it. But reading through the open-ended responses it struck me that another way in which a large sample is useful is that it allows researchers a chance not only to examine the central tendencies of their population but also to look at its diversity of experience. Put another way, there were a lot of thoughtful and/or telling responses in the data that bore no particular relation to the statistical data but which were deemed worthy of consideration by virtue of the quality or even the uniqueness of the response. In order to make the analysis manageable, its focus was narrowed to responses to the 15 questions listed in Table 1. Questions were chosen either because they spoke most directly to the questions of job satisfaction or professional identity or because they seemed likely to evoke responses that testified to the population's breadth of professional experience. Although the author avoided the use of block quotes, an attempt has been made, insofar as possible, to let the subjects speak for themselves, adding only necessary contextualizing information to their responses.

TABLE 1: OPEN-ENDED WILIS1 QUESTIONS ANALYZED

Question No.	Question
A8a	Please list them [other factors motivating the subject to enter an LIS program]
Intro_B-Text	If you were going to provide someone with a brief overview of your career over time, including both LIS and Non-LIS positions, what would you tell them?
F23	Why would you like to change the number of hours you work in a typical week?
F58	Please describe how your treatment has been affected by each of the following…
F58a	Race or ethnicity
F58b	Sex
F58c	Being considered too young
F58d	Being considered too old
F58e	Mental or physical disability
F58f	National origin
F58g	Family responsibilities
F58h	Sexual orientation
F58i	Religion or religious beliefs
F68	Why do you feel there is pressure for middle aged workers to retire early?
QEND	It is important to our study that we have an understanding of your entire career history. If this survey did not give you the opportunity to address your most important positions, gaps in your employment, or other issues you believe would be relevant to a more accurate representation of your career, please share this information with us now.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis

4.1   Introduction and First Research Question

This chapter begins by attempting to answer the dissertation's first research question: How do job satisfaction levels vary across age, sex, job level, job type, length of career, and other factors? Key variables include job satisfaction, age, sex, race, pay, benefits, organization type, organization size, job level, opportunity for advancement, and co-workers. For this question, the study population will be defined as currently working library professionals who have graduated from LIS master's programs in North Carolina. Respondents to the survey tended to remain in the region but they also emigrated elsewhere, predominantly within the US, with roughly three-quarters settling in the Southeast. The reason for focusing on this population is that the study proceeds from the proposition that librarians have been on balance very satisfied with their job (Albanese, 2008; Kuzyk, 2008). The study does not look for change over time as much as it tries to identify the sources of librarian job satisfaction. Factors to be assessed were selected because they fitted under one of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)'s nine facets (Spector, 1985). (For a full listing of the 36 individual items in the JSS—four corresponding to each facet— see Appendix III.) Using analysis of variance and ordinary least squares regression, the present study looks at how these variables interact with each other along with

other personal characteristics such as age, sex, and race to produce satisfaction. As the LIS literature has few studies of job satisfaction that include librarians across settings, an inductive and exploratory approach was taken to building the analytic strategy. Each piece of further analysis is aimed at applying theoretical insights that emerge from my interpretation of the data. As such, the methodology is not laid out in a traditional quantitative approach. Rather, insights gleaned from the literature, qualitative findings and quantitative analyses are used to inform decision making from one research question and one analysis strategy to the next.

4.2   Descriptive Results: Job Satisfaction

Questions were chosen from the WILIS1 survey to create a summative scale to measure job satisfaction (henceforth, JOBSAT): F36C ("Overall, I am satisfied with what I do in my job"); F36D ("I am generally happy with my CURRENT work environment"); F36E ("I still like my job.") and F37 ("Knowing what I know now, if I had to decide all over again, I would still decide to take the job I now have"). These questions were chosen because they spoke, or seemed to speak, most directly to contentment with one's job. Further, these questions have been used to measure job satisfaction in several long standing surveys such as the Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn and Staines, 1984).

In order to ensure that the summative scale worked and would lend itself to analysis, a preliminary feasibility study was conducted. To increase the internal consistency reliability of JOBSAT (in other words, to ensure that when respondents answered the four selected questions they were speaking substantively about the

same thing), it was determined that F37 be dropped using the alpha if item deleted statistic. The metric that was used for job satisfaction, then, was F36C+F36D+F36E/3 (Cronbach's alpha=.905). For this, as with the other questions, qualitative data were utilized to support and complement the statistical findings.

Using listwise deletion, cases with missing data on the variables of interest were removed from the final analytic sample. Subjects selected into the JOBSAT analysis by indicating that they considered themselves librarians and that they were currently employed. Subjects were then eliminated who did not answer one or more questions that map to the 11 variables the researcher wanted to correlate to job satisfaction. In doing so, the deliberate decision was made to keep the income variable (which had the highest number of cases missing as it is a sensitive measure) because it was deemed too central to be left out of the analysis. As it developed, it proved significant in the model. One-thousand eight-hundred thirty-three subjects had no missing data on any of the variables for the first research question, and this group constituted my data set. There was a minimum of one and a maximum of four on the job satisfaction scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree on a four-point Likert scale). The mean was 3.2 with a standard deviation of 0.61, meaning subjects rated their level of job satisfaction slightly above "agree" on the scale. This finding comported with those of most existing librarian job satisfaction studies (Table 2).

TABLE 2: LIS GRADUATE JOB SATISFACTION

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Jobsat	1833	1.00	4.00	3.1973	.60699
Valid N (listwise)	1833				

In addition, the author conducted a one-way analysis of variance comparing levels of satisfaction among various types of library and non-library workers. The different categories of LIS workers used in the analysis were school librarians, public librarians, academic librarians, special librarians, and non-librarians. The sorting of subjects into one of five settings categories is discussed in detail in section 4.4. No significant difference existed between the five categories in job satisfaction.

4.3 Analytic Strategy

In the initial JOBSAT regression, job settings were retained as predictors because it remained possible that, while no differences emerged in the ANOVA, there was still a relationship between setting and job satisfaction that was being masked by other variables. In other words, these variables were included as control variables. In addition to the five possible job settings, basic demographic information and variables that corresponded to one of the nine aspects of Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey were included. Tables 3, 6, and 7 show the variables inserted into the regression alongside the questions to which they corresponded on the WILIS 1 Survey. Altogether 26 variables were used in this first regression, which was well within the acceptable subject-to-variable ratio range for a sample of this

size. Using the recommended 15:1 subject-to-variable ratio for behavioral research, a regression including 26 variables would have been acceptable with as few 390 subjects (Pedhazur, 1997). It is, however, a sufficiently large number of variables that they will be addressed as three discrete groups—settings variables, demographics, and conditions/benefits—for the sake of clarity.

4.4   Measurement: Type of Library Context

Job setting was included in the first analysis because it clearly corresponded to one of the JSS's facets, "type and size of organization." Moreover, job setting has served as a lens through which numerous LIS scholars have examined job satisfaction, usually focusing on academic libraries (Glasgow, 1982; Mirfakhrai, 1991) or public libraries (Bartlett, 1998; Goulding, 1991, 1995; Schneider, 1991). In spite of this, little has been written about the relative satisfaction of librarians working in different settings. As one can see in the "job setting" question (Table 3), respondents were given 11 options. For the purposes of data analysis and coherence, 11 of these options were further sorted into five major settings: school library, public library, academic library, special library, and non-library. Persons indicating they worked in a "College/university library" or a "Community college/technical institute library" were grouped together as "academic librarians." Those checking "Health/medical library," "Law library," "Corporate library," or "Other, special library" were deemed "special librarians." Subjects who claimed to work for a "Consortium," "Federal, state, or local government," and "Other please specify" were classified as working in non-library settings. This scheme was not without its

drawbacks. One claiming to work for a "consortium," for example, could plausibly be said to work in any of three or four of the types of settings listed here, and it is not clear in instances where respondents checking "federal, state, or local, government" ought to be classified based on that information alone. But as a rough measure, the scheme was adequate. It was determined that going into the open-ended responses to "other, please specify" to determine where each of those respondents ought to be classified could not be justified in any cost-benefit analysis.

TABLE 3: JOB SETTINGS VARIABLES

Variable	Corresponding Question in WILIS 1
Job setting (whether school, public, academic, special, or non-library)	F1a. Which of the following best describes the TYPE OF LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER you work in: (Possible answers: School library/media center; Public library; College/university library; Community college/technical institute library; Consortium; Health/medical library; Law library; Corporate library; Federal, state, or local government; Other, special library; Other, please specify)
Organization size	F1c. How many people work at your company or institution (not just your library/information center or department) at all locations? If self-employed, including yourself, how many people do you employ? (Possible answers: One; 2-9; 10-24; 25-99; 100-499; 500-999; 1000+)

As Table 4 shows, the number of respondents broke out remarkably evenly among the five settings, with the largest number of subjects working in school library and non-library settings and academic librarians coming in a close third. This relatively even distribution simplified comparison by dispensing with small-sample-size concerns. A further reason for inclusion of the job setting variable in this analysis was that, unlike most other variables in the initial regression analysis, there is almost nothing written about how levels of job satisfaction vary between types of library organizations. So unlike organization size, to take the conceptually closest

44

example, previous studies provided no clues as to which way the data would break.

These findings are discussed in detail in section 5.7.

TABLE 4: TYPE OF LIBRARY JOB SETTINGS

Setting Group	Total number in Sample (Percent)	
Academic library	432	(23.6 %)
Non-library	442	(24.1%)
Public Library	285	(15.5%)
School Library	442	(24.1%)
Special Library	232	(12.7%)
Total	**1833**	**(100%)**

4.5   Measurement: Organization Size

Unlike job setting, there have been several studies addressing the issue of

how organization size affects job satisfaction, both in the LIS and the general job

satisfaction literature. These studies, by and large, say one thing: that working in a

smaller organization correlates with higher job satisfaction (Curry, Wakefield, Price,

and Mueller, 1986; Beer, 1964; O'Toole and Lawler, 2005; Glasgow, 1982). The

main reasons adduced for this were that workers in smaller settings can see more

clearly the ways in which their work contributes to the organization's proper

functioning and that esprit de corps emerges more naturally in smaller groups.

These factors, in turn, tend to give workers more of a stake in their organization's

success. This finding complements another common in job satisfaction studies:

namely, that positive co-worker relations are one of the best predictors of job

satisfaction. So it was with the WILIS 1 survey as working in larger-sized organizations correlated negatively with JOBSAT.

4.6   Measurement: Age

Workplace studies going back to the mid-twentieth century have consistently shown a small positive correlation between advancing age and job satisfaction (O'Brien and Dowling, 1981; O'Toole and Lawler, 2005). One previous study has shown the same relationship exists between age/experience and job satisfaction among librarians (Van Reenan, 1998). This appears to indicate that employees' satisfaction increases as they move up the career ladder and acquire more status, control over their own work, and financial security. There could also be a "mellowing" component to older workers' reporting greater satisfaction. The expectation was for there to be a corresponding small increase between age and satisfaction in my sample. It therefore came as a surprise—one of the few to come out of the first JOBSAT regression—that age had no significant effect on satisfaction. Since the issue was not addressed in previous librarian job satisfaction surveys, three operating theories were evolved for why older LIS graduates did not express greater satisfaction with their jobs than their younger counterparts. Fortunately, there were ways of validating all three.

The three theories formulated to explain older workers' non-tendency toward greater job satisfaction were as follow, in descending order of plausibility. The first theory was that because librarianship was a relatively low-paying profession, the benefits that made other aging workers happier including, notably, higher pay did not

accrue to librarians to the same extent. In this scenario, librarians were less likely to earn the "happiness dividend" that other aging workers did. The case for operating theory number one would be strengthened if the JOBSAT regression showed salary to be a predictor of job dissatisfaction. It is worth noting briefly that previous librarian job satisfaction studies to consider the question have indeed shown this to be the case so preliminarily there was some reason to think this theory sound (Glasgow, 1982; Mirfakhrai, 1991).

The second operating theory was that the profession of librarianship had changed so radically in recent years that older (and presumably, mostly longer tenured) members of the profession felt professionally displaced. This theory made a certain amount of intuitive sense to the extent that someone entering the profession 20 to 30 years ago would have arguably witnessed more technological change than all the generations of librarians since the formal founding of the profession in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. WILIS1 had two batteries of questions seemingly specially made to test this proposition. Questions F52a-e asked subjects the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements "COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO, I am currently required… (a) To perform more new tasks; (b) To perform more difficult tasks; (c) To perform more high tech tasks; (d) To perform a wider variety of tasks; and (e) To delegate more of my tasks to assistants." Questions F53a-f asked the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the statements "COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO, I am currently required… (a) To perform more routine tasks; (b) To work harder; (c) To perform more managerial functions; (d) To assume a greater leadership role; (e) To perform more financial

tasks; and (f) To perform more tasks once done by assistants." These questions were included in a second JOBSAT analysis specifically to test the second operating theory. If it developed that increased workloads or the transformed nature of the work itself correlated negatively with job satisfaction then that would help explain why older LIS workers were not as content as previous studies suggested they would be.

The third operating theory was also, in my view, the least probable. It went thusly: In a feminized profession like librarianship where pay was low and flexibility was prized, the "happiness dividend" from moving up in the profession may not be as large as in other fields. That would be because, so the theory went, librarians constructed their identity less around their careers than employees in other professions and more around family or other non-career-related sources of identity. The researcher developed this theory after having read a number of responses to open-ended WILIS1 questions that suggested its possibility. Specifically, the theme of the primacy of family, particularly in relation to one's career, kept recurring in the responses to question "Why would you like to change the number of hours you work in a week?" (F23). "To allow more time for family," went one representative response. Another survey respondent confessed a desire "to spend more time with my family and to enjoy personal interests." A third complained of "work[ing] too long and too hard; not enough balance in my life—need more time for self and family." These are just a few examples of the family theme, chosen virtually at random. It would be hard to overstate how prevalent the family theme was in the open-ended responses. As mentioned above, 14 open-ended questions were chosen for

analysis. The large majority of response spaces for these questions were left blank. Yet there were fully 204 individual responses that mentioned family. This in itself obviously offers no proof of my operating theory.

It was, though, enough evidence to beg the question: For people this family-focused—and apparently willing to trade salary potential for flexibility—might job-based achievement simply not be as rewarding as it is for others? The author will try to determine whether there is additional support for this theory in the third JOBSAT regression, which examines family and craft/professionals development variables. If it happened, for example, that extrinsic rewards such as pay and benefits did not predict job satisfaction in librarians to the extent they do in other professions, this non-relationship would go toward supporting the theory.

4.7   Measurement: Sex

One of the most persistent and, for many scholars, bedeviling features of the job satisfaction literature has been the fact that women report being happier than men despite having objectively worse jobs. This fact has begotten several agitated-sounding article titles in sociological and economic journals that reverse the traditional main concern of job satisfaction scholars, which might be stated as "Why are workers not happier in their jobs?" With titles like "Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Dissatisfied?" (Hodson, 1989) and "Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why are Women so Happy at Work?" (Clark, 1997), these articles make it sound like excessive job satisfaction was a problem wanting a

solution. To the extent that women were not given work or paid according to their qualifications, of course it was.

One seeking a systemic explanation for librarians' traditionally high levels of satisfaction could do worse than citing the fact that the large majority of librarians are, and always have been, women. If a profession is composed mostly of women and women report being happier in their jobs, it just follows that the field as a whole should be a fairly content one. But with larger numbers of men entering the LIS workforce in recent decades, there is a real chance to learn something by comparing their satisfaction relative to their female counterparts. If men reported being as happy as women in LIS work, then we could conclude that there is something about the nature of the work itself that makes workers happy. If, on the other hand, women reported being happier, then we could reasonably conclude that the fact that librarianship was a feminized profession accounted, in large measure, for traditionally high levels of satisfaction. In that case there might be a dispositional explanation for job satisfaction findings, along the lines of "women are just happier in general and therefore also happier in their work." What would seem more likely, however, would be that women bring different expectations to their work. It turned out that being a woman was one of the best predictors of job satisfaction in the sample. This is an important finding the implications of which are explored in the conclusions chapter (section 5.3).

4.8   Measurement: Race/Ethnicity

Race seems not to be much of a factor in the broader job satisfaction literature. This is not to say that all races are equally happy with their work, only that, per O'Toole and Lawler (1998), "the primary determining factor appears educational attainment, not race," with better-educated workers tending to be much more satisfied. In other words, racial groups' job satisfaction appears to be commensurate with how much education they received. The issue of race's effect on job satisfaction is little explored in the LIS literature. To the extent that it has been studied, it seems not to have impacted satisfaction significantly. Where it has been addressed, race and library job satisfaction studies have focused on the experiences of African-Americans. Having conducted a survey of African-American librarians, Preston (1998) concluded that racism was not a significant factor in job satisfaction. A 2000 survey of librarians "of African descent" working in ARL libraries did not find a statistical relationship between race and satisfaction, but enumerated several sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction so as to help research libraries in their efforts to recruit and retain persons of color.

This is not to dismiss the impact of race or to suggest that it has no impact on the shape of minority librarians' career paths. Given that African-American and other minority groups have traditionally constituted a much smaller proportion of the LIS profession than they have of the population at large, clearly there are some barrier-to-entry issues that the profession could better address. Additionally, it may be said that survey research as a research method may be a bit of a blunt instrument when it comes to assessing the attitudes of special populations. Surveys, it is true, allow

researchers to gather a lot of information relatively easy, information that may then be subjected to quantitative analysis. But there is something like an inverse relationship between quantity of information gathered and, if not quality, then very certainly its richness. All of which is to say that, although race appears not to impact LIS job satisfaction, in cases where special populations are involved, researchers generalizations should carry the caveat that some sort of qualitative research design such as unstructured or semi-structured interviews may be more appropriate. The need of another method to address the reality of special populations' experience will also be addressed in the "limitations" section of chapter five (section 5.14).

TABLE 5: CONDITIONS/BENEFITS VARIABLES

Variable	Corresponding Question in WILIS 1
Fulltime worker or not	F8. Are you considered a full-time employee?
Family Income	A22. Roughly, what is the total yearly income before taxes of your immediate family? This includes: your income, the wages of everyone else in the family who works, and income from any other sources? (Possible answers: $0-$19,999; $20,000-$29,999; $30,000-$30,999; $40,000-$49,999; $50,000-$59,999; $60,000-$69,999; $70,000-$79,999; $80,000-$99,999; $100,000-$149,999; $150,000 or more)
Employer-provided health insurance or not ("Hlthinsemp" in the model)	F27a-f. Which of the following applies to you? (Possible answers: Purchase health insurance through employer; Health insurance fully paid by employer; Health insurance partially paid by employer; Covered by your spouse's partner's policy; Have your own health insurance policy; Other insurance situation) (all respondents indicating something other than "Health insurance fully paid by employer"=reference category)
Other kinds of employer-provided insurance (dental, life, disability, etc.) ("otherins" in the model)	F28a-e. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answers: Life insurance; Disability insurance; Drug plan; Extended health care plan; Dental plan) (respondents marking none=reference category)
Retirement Plan (f28fr in model)	F28f. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Retirement pension plan)
Car allowance/car loans (f28hr)	F28h. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Car allowance/car loans)
Vacation days (f29fr)	F29f. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Vacation days)
Sick or personal days (f29gr)	F29f. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Sick or personal days)

Variable	Corresponding Question in WILIS 1
Professional membership (f30dr)	F30d. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Professional membership)
Flexible hours (f30er)	F30e. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Flexible working hours)
Home computer (f31br)	F31b. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Home computer)
Cellular phone (f31cr)	F31c. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Cellular phone)
Work away from office (f31dr)	F31d. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Possibility for work away from office)
Organized social activities (f31fr)	F31f. Which of the following non-salary benefits/incentives does your employer fully or partially pay for and provide to you? (Possible answer: Organized social activities)
Supervisor or not (Supervise f9)	F9. Do you supervise (manage) other people in this job?
Career opportunities (Careeroppf35c)	F35c. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following (Possible response spectrum: Four-point Likert scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree"): I believe that I have opportunities for promotion within the field given my education, skills and experience
Co-worker cohesion (coworker1 f13)	F13. I feel I am really a part of the group of people I work with. (Possible response spectrum: Five-point Likert scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree.")
Co-worker support (coworker2 f14)	F14. I have the support from co-workers that I need to do a good job. (Possible response spectrum: Five-point Likert scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree.")

4.9 Measurement: Full-time Worker or Not

The first workplace variable in the regression was whether subjects claimed to be full-time workers or not. Although this does not map to one of the 36 items in the JSS, it could be said to fall under a couple of its nine facets such as benefits, job

level, and opportunities for advancement. In any case, there was room for a lot of variables with a sample size of 1833, and the decision was made to put in anything in the model that might plausibly affect job satisfaction.

4.10   Measurement: Income

An income variable had to be included because (a) it maps to an entire facet of the JSS and (b) librarians had complained of poor pay in past job satisfaction surveys. In the first instance, household income was used instead of annualized individual income because so many of the respondents emphasized the primacy of family in relation to work and also because it correlated more closely with job satisfaction than individual income in a preliminary test. In the first JOBSAT regression, family income proved to be one of the seven workplace variables to correlate with job satisfaction. After the three primary regressions were run, a separate regression was run in which annualized salary replaced family income to verify that it did not predict job satisfaction. Indeed, it did not predict job satisfaction in the new regression.

Subsequently, it was decided that the preliminary testing of individual income versus family income was not sufficient to eliminate it from consideration when other factors were added into the model. Annualized salary was therefore substituted for family income in both a stepwise and a block model regression, which were run after the third regression (Tables 18 and 19, pp. 104-06). In neither model did annualized salary register as significant.

4.11 Measurement: Working Conditions and Benefits

Whether respondents' employers provided health care or not was an obvious choice for inclusion in the first JOBSAT regression. It mapped to the benefits facet of the JSS and seemed obviously like it could have an impact on one's job satisfaction. There were six options in the health insurance survey question (F27a-f) covering a corresponding number of possible coverage situations. For the purposes of the regression, responses were sorted into two groups and made all responses other than "Health insurance fully paid by employer" the reference category.

Questions F28 a-e asked respondents whether they received other forms of insurance from their employer including life insurance, disability insurance, a drug plan, an extended health care plan, or a dental plan. It was included in the regression because it corresponded to the "benefits" facet of the JSS and because it seemed an obvious candidate to affect job satisfaction. For the regression, responses were sorted into two groups, those who received any kind of insurance and those who received none, with the reference group being those with no additional employer-provided insurance.

Question F28f asked respondents whether their employer provided them a "retirement pension plan." Although this was part of the same battery of questions as various insurance plans included in the "other kinds of employer-provided insurance" variable, "retirement plan" was made its own separate variable for two reasons. The first was intuitive: A retirement plan just *seemed* like it could be potentially more important than the other kinds of insurance with which it was grouped and therefore worthy of looking at on its own. The second reason was grounded in the literature

review. Since more and more employers—particularly in the tech sector where LIS

graduates might be expected to seek work if they left librarianship—were seeking to

shed benefits, it was thought that an employer-provided retirement plan might

constitute a much-valued hedge against financial uncertainty in the current

environment. Whether or not that kind of thinking factored in, the retirement plan was

the only benefit variable to correlate with job satisfaction in the descriptive results.

The problem was that it correlated negatively with JOBSAT. How to explain? One

possibility is that this result is somewhat fluky, to the extent that it barely registered

as significant and that it fell out of significance when other variables were

subsequently added to the model. But the researcher is inclined to think there is

more to it since, in a subsequent model, being a full-time worker also correlated

negatively with job satisfaction. It would develop that it this mild negative association

between having a retirement plan would make sense as a bigger picture emerged of

overtaxed LIS workers deprived of support staff and unable to perform their tasks as

well as they wished. In a context where the quality of work is paramount and pay

and benefits secondary, it made a kind of sense that being full-time worker with

benefits might actually be a slight negative.

The "fluky exception" referred to previously was the fact that, while health,

retirement, and other kinds of insurance failed to correlate positively with job

satisfaction, the one benefit to register in the regression was whether respondents

were given car allowances or car loans. The variable was included as something of

an afterthought. It is not something that would likely show up on a survey created

expressly to measure job satisfaction, and it was not on any of the job satisfaction-

measuring instruments examined in searching for a template on which to base selection of variables. But it was a benefit and, as such, qualified for inclusion. Since there was no concern about having too many variables in the model, it went into the model. There was a reasonable explanation for its significance. First, it is a rather rare benefit for LIS workers—only 83 (4.4%) respondents received it. Of these 83, over 60 were either extremely senior management (directors of libraries, deans of LIS schools, etc.) or persons whose jobs required a large amount of travel or field work (extension librarians, sales staff for vendors, etc.). The fact that extremely high-level executives would express higher satisfaction makes sense and squares with findings in the general job satisfaction literature. It likewise computes that a car allowance or car loans would contribute to the satisfaction of those whose work requires extensive travel. One respondent did make mention of such an allowance, saying that "if we used our cars to travel to a work site, we were paid mileage and if we traveled to attend required courses we were paid mileage. For overnight stays to attend required training, the state supplied an allowance for food/lodging."

The Vacations Days and Sick Days variables are treated together here because they were similar and because they are often dealt in concert within organizations as "paid time off." Both map to the benefits facet of the JSS. And while neither have showed up in LIS job satisfaction studies, that may have been because they were not asked about. It also occurred to me that both were related to another factor that librarians had cited in past studies as contributing to their job satisfaction, namely flexible hours. In the initial JOBSAT regression, however, neither correlated with job satisfaction.

Employer-provided professional memberships was another variable included in the initial regression because it was a benefit, because there was a question in the survey about it, and because there was room in terms of how many variables could be used without compromising the model. The author did not anticipate its being significantly tied to librarian job satisfaction, and it was not.

Flexible Hours, by contrast, was a variable that might be expected to correlate with librarian job satisfaction based on previous studies. My thinking was that its importance was probably related to the priority many LIS workers placed on family and outside interests. In the open-ended responses, many respondents made remarks to this effect. A reasonably representative assortment of the more thoughtful responses of this sort would include the subject who wanted more flexible hours "[b]ecause I could then have a life outside my job, such as maintaining my garden, helping my 88 yr. old mother, staying abreast of errands and chores"; the woman who wrote "I'd like to have a real life—see my husband, work in my yard. I'd like to be able to put in an actual 8 hour day and not take work home"; the tenured librarian nearing retirement who cited being "tired" and wishing to have more "time to do more reading and community work"; and the wonderfully frank soul who claimed to need more flexible hours because "I'd like to sleep more. Seriously." The wish to maintain maximum flexibility so as to leave aside time for family and outside interests could also play a role in which library environment LIS graduates elected to work. "While I would have liked to work in a University setting, I have chosen to work in a public school library because I could work and take classes at [redacted], take care of my children because of the school schedule, and share summers and

weekend/night hours with my family," one school media specialist reported. She added: "It is meaningful work with great variety."

Part of the reason LIS workers valued flexible hours are reasons that might have been guessed at and that have been cited in previous studies: a wish to spend time with family or pursue hobbies or to slow down a bit as retirement approached. And in the model, flexible hours did correlate with job satisfaction as expected. What was surprising—and constituted one of the major findings of this study—was that flexible hours did not correlate in a subsequent model because it was, in part, masking another source of job satisfaction. In other words, librarians and other LIS workers valued flexible hours not for their own sake but because they allowed for something else.

As with the Vacation Days and Sick Days, the Home Computer and Cell Phone variables being treated together because they were included for the same reason and garnered the same results. The survey asked respondents whether their employers provided them home computers or cell phones (F31b and F31c, respectively). The variables could be mapped to the JSS's benefits facet and, given the significance of Car Loans/Car Allowance (although this was obviously not known at the time they were selected into the model), it seems plausible that such material perks could correlate with job satisfaction. They did not. Given the importance customarily accorded to flexible work hours and the fact that it could be mapped to a facet of the JSS, the Work away from the Office variable was included in the model. It was not significant either.

The importance of co-workers to one's job satisfaction has been correlated with job satisfaction in a number of previous studies. Because of this and because it could fall under either the benefits or the communications facet of the JSS, the Organized Social Activities variable was added into the model. It did not correlate with job satisfaction.

In past studies, higher rank within one's organization has correlated with increased librarian job satisfaction. That and the fact that it mapped to the contingent rewards facet of the JSS was sufficient to ensure the Supervisor or Not variable's inclusion in the model. It did not correlate with JOBSAT. There are a couple possible reasons why. One is that it did not correlate because of the way the question was posed. Depending on the size of the organization, being a supervisor may or may not translate to being in a high place in the pecking order. Librarians in one-man and one-woman shops supervise no one yet are responsible for their whole operation, and there are armies of middle managers within larger libraries. A second theory for why this variable did not register as significantly correlated with JOBSAT is that something became more onerous in being a library supervisor in the recent past before the WILIS1 survey was administered. This second theory will be tested by variables being added into the second regression (Section 4.26).

Career Opportunities was another variable that had predicted job satisfaction in several previous studies of librarians. Due to this and the fact that it had it fitted easily onto the JSS's contingent rewards facet, it was included in the initial model. Unsurprisingly, given previous findings, it was found to be correlated with JOBSAT.

Supportive and useful co-workers have been found consistently to improve job satisfaction both in general cross-occupational job satisfaction studies and in LIS-specific ones. And they constitute their own facet in the JSS. The decision to include both the Co-worker Cohesion and the Co-worker Support variables in the model was an obvious one, therefore, and the expectation was for one or both to correlate with JOBSAT. Both did.

4.12:   Results: Conditions/Benefits Variables

From the initial JOBSAT regression, there were several notable takeaways. What was most striking was the extent to which the WILIS population resembled those in LIS job satisfaction surveys which came before them. They were, on balance, very happy in their jobs. Those who worked in smaller organizations tended to be happier in their posts. Women tended to be happier than men. Co-workers were enormously important with both co-worker variables correlating with job satisfaction and Co-worker Support having the largest beta of any variable in the model by a large margin. Income, career opportunities, and flexible hours all moved the job satisfaction needle as well. The only surprise among the significant variables was that Retirement Plan correlated negatively with JOBSAT.

Meanwhile, race, other (non-health) kinds of insurance, and many of the less essential benefits seem not to have impacted LIS workers of job satisfaction. Surprisingly, whether LIS workers' employers provided their healthcare did not correlate with job satisfaction. One theory to account for this circumstance was that health benefits may not be as important to LIS workers because they may not their

families' primary breadwinner and may get their coverage elsewhere. That theory could not be validated in subsequent regressions. What could be said was that, for a large portion of the sample, the stresses of being a full-time worker in an increasingly overworked profession were often not worth the benefits that accrued to them as a full-time worker (Section 5.5).

It was slightly surprising that being a supervisor did not contribute to job satisfaction more but, as mentioned in the discussion of the question, this could have had to do with the way the question was posed. Overall, then, this seems to be a remarkably typical group where conventional variables used to account for job satisfaction were concerned.

In addition to the failure of Retirement Plan to register as significant, two other findings gave pause. The first was women reporting being happier than men. It was not that this was unexpected. This squares with the findings of most job satisfaction surveys and could be attributed either to dispositional factors or the fact that it may be less stressful to not be the primary breadwinner in a family. There is also the possibility that women may feel more comfortable than men working in a traditionally feminized profession. At least one man in the sample confessed that the feminized nature of librarianship was a source of work-related tension. "I often feel a gender bias from this field dominated by females," he volunteered. Because of this fact "teamwork and collaboration from coworkers is effected [sic] and misunderstandings develop." This finding introduced an element of ambiguity into what, to that point, had been a mostly unsurprising analysis.

The other aspect of the first JOBSAT regression to concern me was more problematic, even to the point that it caused me to run an unplanned regression to account for it. Unlike most other job satisfaction surveys, in WILIS1, age was not a factor in satisfaction. Typically, older workers are happier in their work than younger workers but not in this case. The author previously outlined some potential explanations for why they were not in the WILIS1 data, but in order to test those theories, new variables would have to be introduced into the model.

4.13: Age and New Skills/Proliferating Tasks Variables

In the WILIS1 survey, there were three batteries of questions particularly well-suited for ascertaining sources of anxiety for aging and experienced workers. Questions F51a-F53f comprised 13 total questions which asked respondents how they felt about changes in their jobs over the past five years. The questions constituted variations on the theme of how much pressure subjects felt to acquire new skills or perform more tasks. The one question that did not conform to this formulation asked subjects whether they felt "more concerned about [their] job security." In order to determine their impact on aging workers specifically, each was correlated with advancing age. The new variables were next inserted into the model to see which of the variables correlated with job satisfaction for the whole sample. The results may be glimpsed in Tables 9, 10, and 11, but the variables will be addressed individually below.

TABLE 6: NEW SKILLS/PROLIFERATING TASKS VARIABLES

Question No.	Question Text
	Preface for F51 questions: "How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO…" (Possible response spectrum: Four-point Likert Scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree.")
F51a. F51b.	I feel more pressure to continually learn new skills I am more concerned about my job security
	Preface for F52 and F53 questions: "How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO, I am currently required…" (Possible response spectrum: Four-point Likert Scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree.")
F52a. F52b. F52c. F52d. F52e.	To perform more new tasks To perform more difficult tasks To perform more high tech tasks To perform a wider variety of tasks To delegate more of my tasks to assistants
F53a. F53b. F53c. F53d. F53e. F53f.	To perform more routine tasks To work harder To perform more managerial functions To assume a greater leadership role To perform more financial tasks To perform more tasks once done by assistants

4.14 Measurement: Learn New Skills

Feeling "the pressure to continually learn new skills" (F51a) was unusual among the new variables in that it neither correlated with advancing age nor with JOBSAT in the second regression. Despite librarianship's reputation as a rapidly changing field, LIS workers, at least in this population, seemed not to be under undue pressure to expand their skill sets. Either that or, what seems more likely, being able to learn new skills was perceived to be one of the perquisites of the job. And indeed, several subjects made remarks to this effect. One claimed that she entered the field explicitly because it "allowed me to use my previous degrees and

offered the opportunity to build on these skills and develop new skills." Another

entered LIS because it offered "greater opportunities for lifelong learning. I was

spending all my free time in libraries anyway. [It was] an opportunity to use my

previous career skills in a new profession."

4.15   Measurement: Job Security

Unlike learning new skills, the job security variable had a lot of impact. A

perceived lack of job security correlated negatively with satisfaction overall, and

older workers were understandably more preoccupied with it than were their younger

counterparts. It was also the strongest correlate of all the new variables. Some mid-

and late-career professionals confessed to feeling pressure to retire as their libraries

tried to update their images. One cited "statements by various coworkers that the

library needs a younger image" as a reason for feeling pressure to retire. "The

director is certainly promoting this in the new hires," she added. This concern with

job security formed the first part of what became an emerging picture of an LIS

management class in crisis.

4.16   Measurement: New Tasks

While aging workers did not object to learning new skills, they were more

averse than younger workers to having to perform more new tasks. In the

regression, however, the new tasks variable did not correlate with JOBSAT. Several

librarians made the point that the diversity of tasks was one of the things they liked

most about their jobs. One cited the following reasons for entering LIS: "Enjoy linking

people with information solutions. Appreciate position of librarian within school setting. Love of knowledge & research. Enjoy variety of tasks." The fact that older workers would be more anxious on this count makes sense, too, to the extent that moving up the career ladder entails having to perform more new duties. And, it would emerge, it may have not been new tasks per se that caused dissatisfaction so much as it was having to take on new tasks without relinquishing old ones.

4.17 Measurement: More Difficult Tasks

Like having to perform new tasks, having to perform more difficult tasks was another variable that afflicted older workers more than younger. And like the previous variable, it did not correlate with job satisfaction. There are two possible conclusions to draw from this. First, it could be the case that LIS workers are assigned more difficult tasks and more onerous responsibilities as they are promoted. So it would make sense that those who have been in the profession longer would be more likely to complain of this. The second is that older workers could be more set in their ways and more resistant to having to perform more difficult tasks. The fact that the "learn new skills" variable did not disproportionately affect older workers belies this second explanation. So would what emerged in the analysis of the next variable. The fact that older workers are likelier to cite having to do more difficult tasks, therefore, is likely the effect of career promotion.

4.18   Measurement: More High-Tech Tasks

This was one of only three of the new skills/proliferating tasks variables that did not correlate with advancing age. Older workers were as keen to take on more high-tech tasks as younger workers. Several were salty about the idea that they were not perceived as such, in fact, with some claiming that this widely held misperception adversely affected their career prospects. One complained that her younger supervisors thought "that there is no chance of 'regular' employment after 50. Also there is an assumption that someone over 50 does not keep up with high tech skills (which I do)." Another decried the lack of old-economy internal labor markets that allowed for lifetime upward movement through an organization and seemed to tie this development to the mistaken idea that older workers lacked new-economy skills. "Changes in employment away from 'lifetime' company relationships," in her formulation corresponded to "making more room for younger employees to advance [and the] perception that older workers lack the skills needed for today's workplace." Having to perform more high-tech tasks also did not correlate with job satisfaction with, again, several LIS workers citing the chance to learn new skills and perform an array of functions as one of the principal draws of the profession. Some older workers cited the chance to work with technology as a motivating factor for entering the LIS field. "Library science looked like it was about to be revolutionized in the 1970s by the application of computer programs to the field," one recalled. "I wanted to be in on that revolution from the start." Another advised LIS workers to "Be prepared for constant change. No two days are the same and there's always new technology to learn."

There was some trepidation on part of older librarians not so much about learning new technologies as about the deleterious effects of a web-based information environment. "As a librarian… I'm worried about the influence of the Internet and computer technology in general. It seems as if it is out of control," on retired librarian commented. Her objection was not so much about the fact of new technology as the form it took. In her view, the internet and web 2.0 technologies, by giving equal or nearly equal weight to everyone's voice, debased public discourse and complicated the finding of reliable information. "So much Internet information is shallow and opinionated. We must, as a society, and as teachers, do more to stress critical thinking, research skills, and the value of criticism and review." The rapid onset of new technologies and the pressure of LIS to adopt them without waiting long enough to see how they affected information retrieval resided at the core of this librarian's complaint.

Many older librarians criticized their employers for not supporting technological training for older workers "It is important that those of us who took our MLS degrees prior to the present technology levels be afforded more free opportunities to increase our level of understanding in how to use the newer technologies," one such criticism went. "Librarians are not paid at the level that would provide them sufficient funds whereby to do such continuing education on their own. And employers do not offer the level of incentives nor provide the time on the job which would make it possible for their employees to do so." The combined of a lack of technological skills, salaries adequate to pursue continuing training independently, and employer-supported training left older workers in an unenviable situation. Because they came along when

they did, they sometimes did not have the skills to keep up with an evolving

profession, but neither was the profession supporting their acquisition of new skills.

Given this bind, some older workers could do nothing other than continue to fall

further behind.

4.19   Measurement: Wider Variety of Tasks

Given the similarity of the Wider Variety of Tasks variable to New Tasks and

More Difficult Tasks variables, it is unsurprising that it should have yielded the same

results. Namely, it correlated with advancing age but not with job satisfaction. As

with the other two variables, older workers' attitudes may be attributed to the

increasing workloads that accompany promotion. Wider Variety's failure to correlate

with JOBSAT is also attributable, no doubt, to task variety being attractive to

librarians and LIS workers. As one respondent put it, "I liked the variety provided by

library work[;] I had previously worked in book stores." Another mentioned going into

LIS because he "wanted a career with variety and some activity." It was a recurring

theme.

4.20   Measurement: Organization of Task Work

Delegate More was another variable that correlated with advancing age but

not with job satisfaction. Like the others, the fact that older workers have to delegate

tasks more than younger workers is unsurprising because only employees working

in some sort of supervisory capacity—usually implying some significant time

served—are in a position to delegate work in the first place.

Having to perform more routine tasks was one of the four new skills/proliferating tasks to correlate negatively with job satisfaction. When subjects complained about having to do routine tasks in the open-ended answers, the nub of their complaint was often that they were being disrespected for being asked to do work that they thought beneath them. "[B]ecause I am one of the younger members on the staff, I am sometimes relegated to tasks that are routinely performed by secretaries despite my advanced degree," one librarian sniffed. Another bristled that, at her workplace, there was a gendered component to having to do planning work. "As the highest ranking female in my office, I'm expected to be the office 'mama' and social planner. The men routinely refuse to take responsibility. There is an unspoken 'that's women's work' culture in the larger unit within which I work." This basic theme was echoed by another woman who noted that "Males outside of the library but within the larger institution tend to assume a leadership role in group activities; I end up doing a great deal of the work, though."

It is worth noting that More Routine Tasks also correlated with advancing age. It seemed likely, too, that LIS workers resented routine tasks because it was unrewarding work in the craft sense and because it took time away from performing what they thought of as their "real" work. This theory, if true, would be lent support if the craft and professional achievement variable proved significant in the final regression analysis.

As with More Routine Tasks, having to work harder both correlated negatively with JOBSAT and positively with advancing age. This may be another case where moving up the career ladder is actually one source of dissatisfaction to the extent

71

that increased responsibility means having to work harder. As with the previous variable, there may be an element of craft at work here if working harder or too much is getting in the way of doing the job properly in one's eyes. And as with the previous variable, this theory will either be supported or refuted by the final regression.

Having to perform more managerial functions was one more variable that did not correlate with JOBSAT but did with advancing age. This does not surprise as one would expect workers moving up in an organization to be reasonably satisfied in their job and because, again, assuming a more managerial role usually follows some time and experience.

Greater Leadership Role was the only one of the new variables added to this version of the model to correlate positively with job satisfaction, which makes sense for obvious reasons. It also correlated with advancing age, which is likewise no mystery.

That More Tasks Done by Assistants should correlate negatively with job satisfaction alongside the Work Harder and More Routine Tasks variables computes, since all point to a situation in which LIS workers are being asked to do more. The benefit of having added this variable into the model is that, as opposed to the others, it suggests a cause of LIS graduates having to work harder. It certainly sheds light on why they might be having to perform more routine tasks. What is most interesting, though, is that this is one of only three new skills/proliferating tasks variables not to correlate with advancing age, suggesting that a dearth of support staff is affecting LIS graduates at all levels and not only managers.

School librarians registered a disproportionate number of the complaints in the open-ended responses relating to lack of support staff. This too makes a certain amount of sense as they are disproportionately likely to be running one-person operations. "A big concern for school library media specialists is the lack of full-time clerical support. [T]hat is not shared with other offices in the school," one reported. "I spent time doing clerical jobs that took me away from teaching information retrieval skills and reading appreciation because there is no understanding of the need for full-time uninterrupted clerical support." In this librarian's telling, the problem of lack of support staff was exacerbated by administrators with no understanding of the problems facing media specialists, which could be an unusually large problem for school librarians and media specialists to the extent that they are more likely than other librarians to report to superiors with no LIS background. The same librarian confirmed that, in her view, this was increasingly the case. "There is also a disturbing trend of hiring people with no LIS (sometimes even without any educational) training as district supervisors, or putting media specialists under the supervision of an administrator whose primary responsibility is not school media programs. This leaves media specialists out on their own unless they are fortunate enough to have a strong district media association." What was more, in this respondent's opinion, there appeared to be precious little official response from professional organizations to this distressing tendency. "There seems to be no concern at the national level to the implications of this disturbing trend. How can a supervisor who has no training or experience in our field possibly conduct or construct appropriate district support or inservice experiences? How can they

understand the needs of our programs and represent us at the district level?" she concluded. Because of school administrators' fundamental incomprehension of the challenges that school media centers confronted, another respondent confessed that she was not hopeful that this circumstance would improve. "There is a shortage of funding for many public agencies and schools is in the center of that shortage," she lamented. "To save money in the future, because schools will continue to grow, I envision more cuts in 'libraries' but more expectations that the Media Specialist can do it all." Other school media specialists echoed the concern over the expectation that they could "do it all." "In too many school libraries, there is not enough clerical help for all the responsibilities that are required of the library/media coordinator," one reported. "School library/media coordinators are expected to collaborate and teach more and more, yet all the work in a library is their responsibility, consequently more clerical help is needed."

4.21 Results: Age and New Skills/Proliferating Tasks Variables

The main takeaway from the second regression was that, as a general matter, older workers felt they were having to take on more and more tasks, a phenomenon that may be attributed in part to moving up in their organizations and acquiring more responsibility. And yet librarians felt that more work was not solely the result of upward mobility, a theme that will be addressed in detail in the conclusions chapter (section 5.6). Job Security, More Tasks Once Done by Assistants, Work Harder, and More Routine Tasks all correlated negatively with JOBSAT, pointing up to a situation in which LIS workers simultaneously felt less

stability and more pressure to perform tasks that might have formerly been considered "staff work." Two variables that were significant in the first regression—Family Income and Retirement Plan—fell out of significance in the second regression. What to make of this? One perspective would be that both were barely significant in the first regression and just fell to the other side of the threshold in the second regression, and that certainly is the case. But given that job security was far and away the most significant of the new variables added in, one could also say that these variables were masking an overriding concern with the latter.

TABLE 7: CORRELATIONS: AGE AND NEW SKILLS/PROLIFERATING TASKS

Correlated with advancing age	Age had no effect
Job security	Learn new skills
New tasks	More high tech tasks
More difficult tasks	More tasks done by assistants
Wider variety of tasks	
Delegate more	
More routine tasks	
Work harder	
More managerial functions	
Greater leadership role	
More tasks once done by assistants	

4.22 Family Dynamics and Craft/Professional Achievement Variables

Through two regressions, the WILIS sample looked like those studied in past LIS job satisfaction studies. It showed that librarians were on balance rather pleased

with their work, and the same factors tended to correspond with job satisfaction as in past studies. With the notable exception of having to perform more tasks and more routine tasks than their predecessors, the WILIS group conformed to the overall pattern of LIS job satisfaction studies with regards to traditional work-related variables, which are the very factors that most job satisfaction surveys examine. There is a reason for that job satisfaction scholars have heretofore focused on work-related source of job satisfaction. Originating as it does from the wish of organizations to make their workers happy (and, it is hoped, more productive because of that), the job satisfaction literature tends to study those factors which employers can control. But of course factors outside the workplace could affect one's job satisfaction and the final regression's purpose was to concentrate on how family dynamics impacted the job satisfaction of a reasonably typical group where job satisfaction was concerned. Another purpose was to determine what impact a craft and professional achievement variable would have when added to the model.

TABLE 8: FAMILY AND CRAFT VARIABLES

Variable	Corresponding Question in WILIS I Survey
Marital Status	A21. What is your current relationship status? (Possible answers: Single (never married); Married or living with a partner; Divorced/Separated; Widowed)
Children	J1. How many living children do you have? Please include all children by birth, adoption, marriage, or partner.
Breadwinner	F39. Which of the following BEST describes your financial situation? (Possible answers: 1. I and/or my family depend completely on my paycheck; 2. I and/or my family can live better because of my paycheck; 3. I and/or my family do not depend on my paycheck to maintain desired standard of living) (Reference category=respondents indicating either answer number 2 or 3)
Livebetter	Same question (F39) except the reference category comprised only those respondents indicating answer number 3.
Craft and Professional Achievement	Summative variable comprising five questions: F10a. I have a lot of say about what happens on my job (Possible response spectrum for all five questions: Four-point Likert scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree") F35a. I have the opportunity to develop and apply the skills I need to enhance my career F35b. My employer does a good job of helping develop my career F35e. I generally have opportunities for creative input and innovation in my work F35f. I have opportunities to develop leadership skills

4.23 Family Dynamics Variables: Marital Status, Children, Breadwinner, Livebetter

All the family dynamics variables were treated together here because the results for each were the same: none correlated in any significant way with job satisfaction. This is a noteworthy but an unexpected finding. The reason for wanting to analyze these variables was sound. The impact of household dynamics on librarian job satisfaction has been little studied. In a traditionally feminized

77

profession, the thinking went, family factors might be likely more likely to factor in significantly. They did not.

The first family dynamics variable added into the model was marital status. Previous long-term studies of the phenomenon have found that marital quality has a significant impact on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was also found to have some influence on marital quality although the latter was far more predictive of the former than vice versa, and this was equally true for men and women (Rogers and May, 2003). Another study found that factors contributing to married women's job satisfaction have been found to include age, income, and a variable termed "life satisfaction" (van Sell, Brief, and Aldag, 1979). My analysis was rather simpler than these studies and would seek only to answer whether one's marital status correlated with JOBSAT. It turned out not to have any discernible impact on the sample's job satisfaction.

The second family dynamics variable examined was how many children respondents had, including those from marriage, partnering, and adoption. Here, also, it may have been expected that a feminized workforce would have had its job satisfaction adversely affected given the stress that inheres in "second shift" situations in which some women take on a disproportionate share of childcare in addition to their paid work. Existing literature on this topic suggested the data could break either way. On the one hand, Clark, Oswald, and Warr have shown that, among some workers, job satisfaction is "U-shaped in age." In other words, among their sample of British employees across economic sectors, mid-career workers reported the lowest levels of job satisfaction, a phenomenon the authors speculated

may be attributable to stresses associated with having to juggle career and children (1996). And yet the one study to evaluate directly the impact of young children on job satisfaction indicated that it had no measurable effect on either men or women (Hanson and Sloane, 1992). Having children likewise had no measurable impact on the job satisfaction of the workers in my sample.

The final aspect of family dynamics examined was whether and how being a breadwinner impacted job satisfaction. Because there were three possible ways to answer the question—one indicating one's family "completely depended" on one's paycheck; a second which said that one's family was able to "live better" because of their contribution; and a final choice that corresponded to one's pay being nonessential to the maintenance of the family's standard of living—this aspect was measured with two different variables. The first, "breadwinner," might more accurately have been labeled "primary winner"; for it, the first response the reference category while grouping the second and third responses together. The second, "livebetter," made the third response the reference category, thus bracketing respondents indicating one of the first two choices together. The point of this strategy was to tease out the effects of various levels of breadwinning on job satisfaction. Isolating primary breadwinners in the first variable would determine whether being the main source of income for the family had an impact on job satisfaction. The second variable could determine whether simply needing one's paycheck to maintain the family's standard of living factored in.

Existing studies on breadwinning and job satisfaction gave reason to think that it might have an impact. Witt (1988) found a pronounced positive correlation

between breadwinning and levels of satisfaction regarding pay and career opportunities among married women working in one private sector firm. Aryee reported that, among 255 Hong Kong professional and managerial employees, there was a significant relationship between pay and life satisfaction among "low breadwinners" while no such correlation existed among "high breadwinners." At all events, the third regression indicated no significant relationship between breadwinning at any level and job satisfaction for my sample.

4.24   Measurement: Craft and Professional Achievement

Given the WANE study results that show small IT firms concentrating on the intrinsic rewards with the erosion of stability, one might assume that craft might make up a larger part of librarians' job satisfaction in what would appear to be a less stable, more fraught jobs climate.. Job satisfaction studies have shown traditionally that good performance factored heavily in job satisfaction although job satisfaction seems to have little effect in motivating workers to perform better (O'Toole and Lawler, 2005).

At this point, it must be acknowledged that the author could just as easily have used other concepts, well-known among job satisfaction scholars, that could have stood in for craft. In particular organizational psychologists and management scholars Herzberg and Maslow wrote, separately, over decades about the importance of personal fulfillment to job satisfaction. In particular, Herzberg's two-factor theory expressed the idea that, in addition to satisfactory pay and sanitary working conditions, outside validation and the nature of "the work itself" were central

to job satisfaction (2008). Both two-factor theory and Maslow's idea of self-actualization could have stood in for *craft* without invalidating the results of the study.

As with job satisfaction, a summative scale was created to measure craft. There were initially nine questions in the WILIS1 study that seemed to highlight this quality best. They were chosen because, among the questions in the survey, they seemed to speak most directly to the issues of happiness derived from good job performance and the connection LIS workers felt to the products of their work. They were: F10A ("I have a lot of say about what happens on my job"); F10B ("I have too much work to do everything well"); F10D ("I never seem to have enough time to get everything done on my job"); F35A ("I have the opportunity to develop and apply the skills I need to enhance my career"); F35D ("It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done"); F35E ("I generally have opportunities for creative input and innovation in my work"); F35F ("I have opportunities to develop leadership skills"); F36A ("The daily choices I make on my job require little thought"); F36B ("There is not enough time to get required work done"). For reliability-optimizing reasons, F10B, F10D, F36A and F36B were subsequently dropped. The resulting measure (F10A+F35A+F35B+F35E+F35F)/5 had a Cronbach's alpha of .838.

As constituted, the resulting variable measured something more than just craft as defined here. LIS workers who agreed with these statements were saying more than that they just wanted to perform their job well for its own sake; they expected to be rewarded for doing so. They were not careerist, or not primarily, but in addition to wanting to perform their job well, they wanted to continually add new skills and were concerned with upward mobility in a way not covered by the concept

81

of craft as defined here. In the craft-careerism continuum (Table 14), persons

agreeing with the five statements making up the craft variable were certainly situated

somewhere on the craft end of the continuum, but they were not necessarily only

concerned with doing their job well for its own sake. They were also concerned with

professional achievement. The researcher therefore decided to term this

measurement the craft and professional achievement variable. One respondent

offered a good summation of this view of rewarding work: "Advancement and

promotion is not always represented by a specific position," she wrote, implicitly

allowing it sometimes was. In addition to advancement, though, "[s]uccess in

services and teaching techniques and creation of a unique library space may also be

considered as indicators for being successful at one's job."

TABLE 9: THE CRAFT-CAREERISM CONTINUUM

Craft	Professional Achievement	Careerism
• Performs work well for its own sake • Requires objective standards of excellence (i.e., the final product performs its function, looks beautiful, etc.)	• Concerned with doing work well • Unlike the pure craftsmen, expects upward mobility as reward for jobs well done	• Concerned with personal advancement above all else • Quality performance incidental to the main goal of moving up ladder

Of the five new variables added into the final regression, only Craft and

Professional Achievement correlated with job satisfaction (Table 15). More to the

point, Craft and Professional Achievement's beta was over three times as large as the variable that had the second greatest correlation with JOBSAT (Table 16). In short, Craft and Professional Achievement was far and away the surest predictor of job satisfaction for the sample.

4.25 Results: Family Dynamics and Craft/Professional Achievement Variables

There were two major new findings in the final JOBSAT regression. The first was the strong relationship of Craft and Professional Achievement with JOBSAT. The second was the failure of any of the family dynamics variables to correlate. Curiously, with the introduction of Craft and Professional Achievement into the model, three variables became significant which had been in the model all long but which had failed to correlate with job satisfaction in two previous regressions. They were Full Time, Work outside Office, and Professional Memberships. Although in each case the newly significant variables' betas were a fraction of that of Craft and Professional Achievement, there was concern that they were multicollinear with it. To ensure multicollinearity did not threaten the validity of the model, correlations were run between Craft and Professional Achievement, on the one hand, and the three newly significant variables (Appendix IX). They each correlated but not closely enough that the model as a whole would fail to give valid results about any individual predictor.

The importance of participation in professional organizations when Craft and Professional Achievement were added into the model also pointed up to an overlap between the two variables. One of the respondents' remarks best illuminates this

connection. "Although I have worked 30 of my 32 professional years for the same organization, I have stayed here largely because of the opportunities to grow and advance with my organization," she woman wrote by way of explaining the sources of her job satisfaction. The opportunity to "grow and advance" was in her case connected to activity in professional organizations. "I have had the opportunity to be innovative and implement changes to information services, so there has actually been quite a bit of variety to my job. Also, it has been extremely important that I have had support to be active in professional associations."

Just as interestingly, four variables which had registered as significant in the second regression became insignificant when Craft and Professional Achievement were added to the mix (Table 17). Those four variables were: Organization Size, Flexible Hours, Career Opportunities, and More Routine Tasks. This is interesting because it suggests that the variables significance in the previous regression(s) was masking an overriding concern with craft. Put another way, working in smaller organizations, having flexible hours, receiving opportunities for career advancement, and being relatively free of having to perform routine tasks contributed to librarians' job satisfaction in large measure because it allowed them to do their jobs better and see more clearly the results of their work. The fact that the first three of these variables have consistently predicted LIS job satisfaction in past studies suggests that librarians likely have been concerned with those issues to the extent that they interfered with the work itself. The fact that what appears most irksome about having to perform more routine tasks is that it gets in the way of craftsmanship sheds

84

considerable light on the real cost of lack of administrative support for the LIS management class.

4.26 Stepwise and Block Model Regressions

Two regressions were run to further test the strength and significance of the relationship between the independent variables and job satisfaction. The first of these two was a stepwise regression (Table 10) which was meant to remove all extraneous variables that did not contribute to the predictive ability of the models. Stepwise regressions allow the researcher to discern the most parsimonious model, removing all variables that are not significant predictors of the outcome. The second model is a block nested model which allows the researcher to discern the decomposition of effects between increasingly complex models. There were minor differences between what variables were significant in the stepwise model and in the third JOBSAT regression, but this appeared to mostly be a case of marginally significant variables in the third JOBSAT regression falling out of significance in the stepwise (work outside office, professional membership, car allowance/car loans) or, conversely, of previously marginally insignificant variables becoming significant (more high-tech tasks, more managerial functions). The majority of the predictors were confirmed as significant in both models including the major variable of interest – craft and professional achievement. Of note also is the fact that annualized salary, used in place here of family income, did not register as significant in the final model.

TABLE 10: STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION

	Standardized Coefficient	Std. Err.	Sig.
Job Satisfaction			
Constant	1.353	.096	
Craft and Professional Achievement	.522***	.024	.000
Job Security	-.109***	.028	.000
Coworker Support	.101***	.049	.000
Full-time Work	-.099***	.043	.000
Female	.058**	.030	.004
Delegate More	-.045*	.027	.045
Organizational Size	-.051*	.008	.011
Coworker Cohesion	.054*	.048	.034
More Managerial Functions	-.052*	.028	.021
More High-Tech Tasks	.045*	.030	.027

R^2=.365

Excluded variables: Job setting, Salary, age, minority race, employer provided health insurance, other health insurance, Conditions/Benefits (see measurement section), Supervise or not, Career Opportunities, Age and New Skills/Proliferating Tasks, Marital Status, Children, Breadwinner, Livebetter (Paycheck)

R^2=.363

*p<0.05, p<0.01,***p<0.001

The block model regression (Table 11) helps test constructs that have been deemed important conceptually or empirically in previous studies. This analytic strategy allows one to look at different sets of variables to see the strength and significance of each thematically organized set of indicators on the dependent variable. Like the stepwise, the block model jibed generally with the findings from the third regression. One notable feature of the block model was that it showed that, despite the feminization of the profession, or perhaps because of it, the family dynamic variables did not have the impact that they may have been expected to have. Further, the coworker support variables were shown to have an an impact on job satisfaction independent of the craft and professional achievement measure. Finally, the majority of the age and new skills/proliferating task (save job security)

were made non-significant in the final model when the craft and professional

achievement measure was entered. Here, again, annualized salary did not register

as significant.

TABLE 11: BLOCK MODEL REGRESSION PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION

Job Satisfaction	N=1833 R²=.015 Model 1 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)	R²=.020 Model 2 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)	R²=.049 Model 3 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)	R²=.147 Model 4 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)	R²=.205 Model 5 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)	R²=.381 Model 6 Standardized Coef. (Std. Error)
Constant (Std. Error)	3.177 (.105)	3.307 (.116)	3.096 (.126)	2.604 (.125)	2.720 (.126)	1.326 (.129)
Personal Characteristics						
Age	-.008 (.001)	-.011 (.001)	-.024 (.002)	.007 (.001)	.001 (.001)	-.003 (.001)
Female	.056* (.037)	.054* (.038)	.076** (.039)	.079* (.048)	.077** (.036)	.062** (.032)
Minority	-.046 (.049)	-.043 (.049)	-.039 (.051)	-.029 (.048)	-.011 (.047)	.004 (.042)
Married	.067* (.038)	.071* (.039)	.064* (.039)	.043 (.037)	.036 (.036)	.007 (.032)
Children	.037 (034)	.036 (.034)	.034 (.035)	.024 (.033)	.024 (.032)	.026 (.029)
Breadwinner	-.087 (.062)	-.062 (.063)	-.061 (.076)	-.049 (.072)	-.001 (.071)	-.001 (.063)
Livebetter	-.099* (.061)	-.081 (.061)	-.081 (.072)	-.084 (.069)	-.042 (.068)	-.023 (.060)
Organizational Characteristics						
School		-.032 (.043)	.095* (.054)	.110* (.053)	.089** (.052)	.025 (.046)
Public		-.006 (.024)	.057 (.027)	.010 (.026)	.009 (.026)	-.014 (.023)
Academic		-.026 (.043)	.028 (.047)	.005 (.046)	-.014 (.045)	-.041 (.040)
Special		-.016 (.052)	.002 (.055)	.000 (.052)	.006 (.051)	-.002 (.045)
Organization Size		-.060* (.010)	-.070* (.011)	-.087** (.010)	-.075** (.010)	-.039 (.009)
Compensation						
Annualized Salary			.053* (.000)	.037 (.000)	.037 (.000)	.023 (.000)
Fulltime			-.060 (.074)	-.067 (.071)	-.075* (.070)	-.084** (.062)
Employer sponsored health insurance			.043 (.054)	.023 (.051)	.022 (.050)	.020 (.044)
At least one other insurance (e.g. dental, life, disability)			.028 (.048)	.023 (.045)	.029 (.044)	.011 (.039)
Retirement plan			-.037 (.057)	-.031 (.054)	-.027 (.053)	-.030 (.047)
Car Allowance/Car loans			.068* (.076)	.057* (.072)	.053* (.070)	.043* (.062)

Vacation days			.014 (.067)	.004 (.063)	.005 (.062)	.018 (.054)
Sick or personal days			.019 (.090)	-.002 (.085)	-.007 (.083)	-.012 (.073)
Professional membership			.021 (.036)	.009 (.035)	.002 (.034)	-.039 (.030)
Flexible hours			.110** (037)	.096** (.035)	.085** (.035)	.020 (.031)
Home computer			.018 (.064)	.027 (.061)	.021 (.060)	.010 (.053)
Cellular phone			.054* (.057)	.042 (.055)	.035 (.054)	.030 (.047)
Work away from office			.002 (.041)	-.012 (.039)	-.011 (.038)	-.045 (.033)
Organized social activities			.052* (.032)	.035 (.031)	.034 (.030)	.016 (.026)
Working Conditions						
Supervise				-.003 (.032)	-.021 (.035)	-.028 (.031)
Career opportunities				.179** (.032)	.138** (.031)	-.023 (.029)
Coworker cohesion				.095** (.056)	.069* (.055)	.053* (.049)
Coworker support				.182** (.057)	.171** (.056)	.099** (.050)
Age and New Skills/Proliferating Task						
Learn new skills					-.027 (.032)	-.037 (.028)
Job security					-.160** (.033)	-.093* (.030)
New tasks					.046 (.046)	.035 (.040)
More difficult tasks					-.004 (.036)	-.006 (.031)
More high tech tasks					.038 (.039)	.040 (.034)
Wider variety of tasks					.005 (.046)	.016 (.041)
Delegate more					-.029 (.034)	-.045 (.030)
More routine tasks					-.058* (.031)	-.029 (.028)
Work harder					-.078** (.033)	-.044 (.029)
More managerial functions					-.028 (.041)	-.029 (.036)
Greater leadership role					.073* (.042)	-.009 (.038)
More financial tasks					.050 (.032)	-.019 (.028)
More tasks once done by assistants					-.062* (.035)	-.031 (.031)
Craft						
Craft/Professional						.523**

Achievement						(.027)

*p<0.05, *p<0.01

The researcher also used the two new models to ascertain more fully the effect of age, job duration, and job setting on both job satisfaction and, especially, craft. This shed some, though not much, new light on both variables. There was, for example, a moderate correlation between age and duration of current job (.44) so that the older a librarian is, the more likely they were to have been in their current job longer. Although this does not necessarily translate to the proposition that age correlates with cohorts, it suggests that it is at least probable. This lends some small bit of credibility to the idea that older librarians are not as satisfied as expected because of changes in working conditions over the previous five years. In both stepwise and the block models, duration of current job does not have a significant impact on job satisfaction, however. Looking at age cohorts, there is no significant differences based on the craft variable (per oneway ANOVA); there is a trend. The researcher ran a pearson correlation coefficient; no correlations emerged between craft and age or craft and current job duration. Looking at job duration (0-2, 3-10, 11+), there is no significant difference in craft/professional achievement. Again, the correlation coefficient is not significant. The only significant finding about craft was that academic librarians report higher craft scores than school librarians. Academic librarians and school librarians were not significantly different than public or special. Unfortunately, this additional information does not get the researcher very much closer to the answer to the question of what craft looks like in terms of specific tasks

or functions in LIS work. A more qualitative research approach likely will be required to tease out the nuances of that answer.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

Work in the last half of twentieth-century America was radically different than what had it had been before. It was, for one thing, extremely stable. The late twentieth century was the era of the Company Man; workers could, if they chose, expect to enter employment with a given organization at or near the bottom, work their way through a succession of job titles carrying increasing authority and responsibility, and retire after thirty or so years with a generous pension to see them through their golden years. Simultaneously, these years witnessed increasingly specialization in all kinds of work. Whether in the factory or the office, workers performed one step or several in large productions the full extent of which they often did not see. In the circumstance, job satisfaction for the average worker declined. The tradeoffs for loss of control over and satisfaction in one's work were historically high levels of pay and security (O'Toole and Lawler, 2005).

The old model does still exist and works for some people. One case in point came from a public librarian in the WILIS1 sample. "I have actually only 'left' a professional position with one organization prior to accepting a position with my current employer," he wrote. "I have been with my current employer 11 years and during that time I have advanced through 3 positions upward within the organization

92

to an associate director position. Over time my responsibilities in the organization have changed and grown more complex." Having a career that was both stable and fulfilling, this subject represented, increasingly, an exceptional case among respondents to job satisfaction surveys.

In some sense, though, that response was emblematic of LIS more generally. During the entire period stretching from the mid-20th century to the present, librarianship itself represented something of a happy aberration in an increasingly grim workplace landscape. Most notably, librarians were extraordinarily satisfied in their jobs, especially compared with other professions. What was more, their happiness might be attributed, in large measure, to the ways in which librarians were different from other professionals. They tended to work in small organizations, to enjoy their work, and to believe in its importance. Librarians also tended, overwhelmingly, to be women (Eva and McCormick, 2008).

The question asked here is why. Why have librarians constituted an anomaly in an otherwise steadily deteriorating situation? And what, if anything, can be gleaned from librarianship to make information work a more meaningful, more satisfying experience. The data analysis yielded twelve notable conclusions that help explain the current state of librarians' attitudes toward their jobs and that may suggest ways in which information work in general can be more profitably approached. They are as follows:

5.2 Craft and Professional Achievement

Craft and Professional Achievement emerged as the variable that most correlated with job satisfaction by a large margin. Not only that, but it was found that factors which had previously been found to best predict job satisfaction in this study actually masked Craft and Professional Achievement. In other words, "the work itself" has a primacy for librarians that supersedes all other factors. The fact that Craft and Professional Achievement kicked out More Routine Tasks—which had been significant in the second regression but not in the third—goes further to the point that librarians are concerned more with the work itself than with just advancement. So, too, does the fact that the Career Opportunities masked Craft and Professional Achievement.

This bore out something that had first come up in the looking at responses to open-ended questions on the importance of flexible hours. Respondents repeatedly claimed that flexible or reduced hours were crucial not primarily because they made it possible to set aside time for family and pursuits outside of one's job but precisely because they helped a librarian do her or his job better. Asked why she desired flexible hours, one respondent replied that "[i]n order to get the work done in an acceptable manner, there is very little time for an outside life." This is an extremely telling quote because it encapsulates the findings of the final model so well. The emphasis is on doing one's job well, but the subject claims that in order to do so, she needs flexible hours or her "outside life" will suffer. In this formulation, the need for flexible hours was about the worker's "outside life" secondarily. But what flexible hours primarily provided was the opportunity "to get the work done in an acceptable

manner" without compromising one's personal life. The work was going to be done right one way or the other; the question was whether doing so would permit sufficient free time for "outside life."

Other responses supporting this basic point abound in response to survey question F23, which asked "Why would you like to change the number of hours you work in a typical week?" A telling but by no means exhaustive sampling of such responses would include "Because I am getting tired but there is alot to do and I need to keep this Library integrated with the constant changes in our environment"; "Because it's very difficult to maintain the concentration needed for indexing, but to make money I have to work as much as possible"; "I am responsible to get the job done, not to work a 40 hour week, which in reality is usually 50 or 60 hours. There is simply too much to do"; "I would like to be able to finish all my responsibilities during the regular school day which is 7:45-2:45"; "We are expected to work whatever time is needed to complete assigned tasks but this routinely exceeds the hours we are scheduled and paid to work. There are inadequate staffing levels to support the desired level of services and the available"; and "I would like to have more time for exercise and family life and community service. But I like the work and I can live with these hours. It would be nice to have more help so we could do more of what needs to get done and do it better."

In each of these responses the emphasis is on the inability of LIS workers to get the work done well in the time allotted to them. In these quotes and others, respondents cite family and/or outside life as reasons for wishing for reduced hours. But an overriding concern was that there were insufficient time and resources to "do

more of what needs to be done and do it better." This squares with the fact that the Work Harder, Greater Leadership Role, and More Work Done by Assistants variables stayed significant in the final regression. LIS workers felt as if they were being asked to do too much and that this situation had changed for the worse over the previous five years. But they were not dissatisfied because their work was not being rewarded enough in the form of pay and benefits so much as they were put out by the fact that they could no longer do their work as well as they wished.

Organization Size likewise masked Craft and Professional Achievement. Large organizations can tend to obscure one's contribution, to change exceedingly slowly, and not to register quality of work as precisely as smaller ones. These tendencies do not, obviously, prevail in all large organization but they do in enough of them to have an impact. Nevertheless, the ways in which large organizations can disrupt work came through in several individual responses as in the case of the public librarian exasperated that her employer, owing to organization size, was neither lean enough to respond to the rapid changes confronting it nor sensitive enough to reward her for having performed her job well. "I'm frustrated with the slow pace of change in large organizations and the inability to impact my compensation," she wrote. "I can work really hard or not so hard and I would still get paid the same." For another librarian, working in a large library system meant being too frequently shuffled around to work in different branches, which in turn thwarted her forming a strong bond with any single patron base. "Restructuring in districts within large library system meant too much moving around for professional staff...wanted a position where I would work with the same patron-base on a long-term basis."

Another respondent provided an instance of libraries stymieing innovation and individual initiative, a circumstance that caused her to leave the profession temporarily. "The voluntary time off was largely caused by my frustration with the lack of innovation and resources devoted to innovation in libraries," she maintained. "This was largely caused by my frustration at how organizational structures moves too slowly to allow librarians to be innovators on the web."

What to make of the fact that the three variables—Full Time, Work outside Office, and Professional Memberships—correlated with Craft and Professional Achievement to a sufficient extent to become significant in the final analysis is an interesting question. At first blush, the fact that not being a full-time worker correlates with Craft and Professional Achievement appears counterintuitive. If one were committed to doing one's job well, it seems almost natural to assume that one would want to be able to do it more of the time. But the strong negative correlation between Full-Time Worker and Job Satisfaction when Craft and Professional Achievement are factored in—it had the third highest beta of any variable in the regression—does make sense in the context of librarians finding it increasingly hard put to complete all their work. A number of subjects made the connection between working fewer hours and doing a better job explicit. One claimed that, in addition to "provid[ing] a healthier home/work balance," working less would also "improve my overall job performance." The theme of having to work more hours as a detriment to satisfactory performance cropped up time and again. "Although formal overtime is not required, I nearly always work more than 40 hours a week," one librarian lamented. "I do this because I enjoy my job and want to get the work done, but I wish

I had more time for non-work activities." In this account, the wish to do a good job

led to more hours. That, in its turn, meant that the job began to impinge on "non-

work activities."

For these reasons, some respondents found more satisfaction in

paraprofessional or part-time work. "I decided to stay in my Paraprofessional job. I

prefer doing nuts and bolts work to endless meetings," one wrote. "I also have many

outside interests such a Mass Communications and have a Real Estate License."

This remark had the virtue of combining two oft-repeated concerns: that moving up

in an organization takes one away from the work they were originally trained to do

and that increasing job demands diminished the flexibility that made an LIS career

desirable in the first place. Echoing these themes, one librarian claimed that she

was only able to find fulfillment in librarianship upon taking it up part-time

employment in retirement.

> Since taking early retirement in 1999, I have enjoyed my part-time library-
> related pursuits much more than I ever enjoyed full-time academic
> librarianship with its paperwork, personnel issues, education-related goal-
> setting and assessment, budget cuts, hiring freezes, administrative
> indifference, and other institutional realities. I have been able to explore new
> areas (children's literature, distance ed., contract cataloging of special
> collections, reference service, archival work), balance different jobs, enjoy
> new colleagues and surroundings, while still having time for family and
> personal interests. None of this was possible until I attained that magic
> combination of age and years of service necessary to retire with full State
> benefits, but I feel fortunate in having survived those 33 years of full-time
> work to reach this much more rewarding stage of my career. In my
> experience, at least, less is truly more!

Still former academic librarian, admittedly exceptional in many ways and

occasionally incoherent, nevertheless reflected the surprisingly widespread wish to

work part time rather than full time. "Sometimes I feel like my responses to this survey have been a bit contradictory. I really like my work, and still enjoy research, helping patrons, learning new things and working with technology," she began. "However, I did not like the pressure of my former academic library work environment and the exceptionally poor management and working conditions I have experienced. (The nasty physical working conditions have led to a decided decline in health.)" Because of the pressure and her declining health, she was beginning to think about "changing careers, and have even considered retail work, in order to finally be able to get some experience in management." Ultimately, too, the lack of flexibility in her job factored in as well. "I had hoped that there would be more part-time (with benefit) professional opportunities, but I have not seen many at all where I have been working. The flexibility I thought was available just hasn't been there." The problem in this case and others was that full-time work often amounted to more than full-time work with no overtime pay. One respondent put this basic point succinctly. "I would like to be able to do my job within the number of hours of week that I am paid. I do not receive pay for overtime." Another was even more to the point: She wanted fewer hours "Because I work way more than I get paid for!!"

5.3 Technology and Craft

Even as new (and some not so new) pressures threatened to diminish craft in libraries, the fact remained that librarians in the WILIS1 sample were reporting high levels of satisfaction and that craft and professional achievement were largely determining those results. How had librarianship avoided the pitfalls of other

99

professions? This circumstance was, in part, the result of technology fundamentally affecting librarianship differently than it did other professions such as architecture.

Although the researcher has taken pains to define what craft is, it may at times remain a maddeningly vague and diffuse concept. What does it mean to practice craft in an LIS setting? How, precisely, are librarians deriving satisfaction through craft and professional achievement? What follows is an attempt to unpack that unwieldy idea further and to give it more precise meaning and to spell out how in librarianship technology served as an aid to craft rather than deskilling workers.

It is a common misconception that industrialization and the putting to work of machines meant the end, or at the least, the beginning of the end for craft. And in a certain narrow sense, there is a kernel of truth in this. In a couple of generations, machine production had rendered trades which had existed since ancient times obsolete. No longer was there widespread need, for example, for shoemakers, blacksmiths, or weavers. But this represented an elimination not of craft itself but of specific expressions of craft—in this example, the manual fabrication of shoes, metal wares, and cloth. At the same time that industrialization eliminated these traditional expressions of craft, it made possible new expressions, such as the mechanics who now practiced the repair of the new machines. It is telling that during this time, the word "mechanic" began it journey from its original meaning, someone who worked in a traditional trade, to its more common modern usage, which is someone who repairs machines.

Similarly, the advent of computers has eliminated the need for millions of office workers (themselves made possible by nineteenth and early-twentieth-century

advances in corporate structure and communication technology). But it replaced it with the need for armies of IT people. The point is that although there is some tension between mechanization and craft, the two are by no means mutually exclusive and they can be complementary; few would argue that today's computer technicians are less skilled than their Eisenhower-era office counterparts.

It is not, therefore, mechanization itself which threatens craft but rather a specific type of mechanization. One of the central threats to craft in the modern workplace is what Sennett describes as the "misuse" of machinery, by which he means machines which prevent workers from honing their skills through repetition. The example he uses to make this point is of the introduction of Computer-Assisted Design (CAD) into architecture in the decades since the 1960s. Sennett describes CAD, endearingly, as "the software program that allows engineers to design physical objects and architects to generate images of buildings on-screen." The problem was that CAD also served to de-skill architects. The repetition that inhered in an older mode of architecture demanded architects learn their trade inside and out. Here Sennett quotes the architect Renzo Piano to illustrate what was lost in the changeover to CAD. "You start by sketching, then you do a drawing, then you make a model, and then you go to reality—you go to the site—and then you go back to drawing. You build up a kind of circularity between drawing and making and then back again," Piano wrote by way of describing how architects worked before CAD. "This is very typical of the craftsman's approach. You think and you do at the same time. You draw and you make…. You do it, you redo it, and you redo it again." Piano despaired of younger generations of architects who had never known a world

without CAD because they were not craftsmen. They had not learned the trade through endless repletion. Much like the bakers in the Greek bakery Sennett cited in an earlier iteration of this argument, they manipulated an extremely user-friendly machine that effectively did the work for them. They had no skills (Sennett, 2008).

One way of understanding the importance of craft to librarians is to look at the way that technology has changed the profession. Unlike architecture, which was diminished by technology, librarianship has been enhanced and transformed by it. CAD effectively took over many of the functions formerly performed by architects, but the arrival of electronic databases and internet search engines has meant that librarians had access to whole universes of information previously unavailable (or only theoretically available) to them. Not only that, but the skills required to navigate the new universe of electronic information represented an expansion of the librarian's role. Many WILIS1 subjects made the point that learning new technological skills was a draw for deciding to enter LIS. One cited, as her reason, that she "[w]anted more computer knowledge and skills in the area of information research, data collection, statistics and reports." Another reported that she had "always enjoyed the process of research and helping others conduct research and wanted a position that matched my skills." A third described "want[ing] to work in school setting in Instructional Technology" as her impetus for choosing LIS. "At the time (1990) [there were] no jobs in the area. This was a good way to combine my interests with a paying job." I think it unlikely that architects would cite the chance to use CAD as a reason for choosing to enter that profession.

It is similarly telling that the types of librarians who have traditionally reported being happiest in their work are often those whose work one would expect to be augmented by technology. This makes sense of the fact that LIS workers whose job involves working with new technologies have traditionally had high rates of job satisfaction. It likewise computes that reference librarians' role would have been expanded by technology. After all, databases and the web have made possible the answering of all manner of previously difficult questions. Neither has technology robbed them of the repetition crucial to the honing of craft as they continue to have to conduct reference interviews.

On male librarian provided a particularly thoughtful response to the question of how librarianship was transformed by technology and how the latter contributed to his professional growth. "Being 58, I have seen information technology go from old main frames requiring hours of lead time to get an answer and move to the current 'instant' answer scenario," he began. "And I was able to grow with the technological changes which has enhanced my own professional growth." What made work meaningful for him and what defined librarianship was not what he did at a given point in his career. Instead, it was that librarianship, in this case special librarianship, constantly threw up new challenges to him and provided variety in his work. "In my 30 years in special libraries, no two days have ever been the same. Every day has offered new questions, projects, and challenges -- I have never been bored."

Matters were not always thus, he hastened to point out. "When I first received my BA-LS in 1971, I envisioned working in a school library forever." But the technology revolution that overtook librarianship over the course of his career had

given him opportunities to perform any number of different functions over the course of a 30-year career, and his specific job at the time of the survey was to write "specialized programs for library needs in several computer languages… [a] knowledge base has also enabled me to develop special programs for my clients to handle large bodies of information they must manage—one of the things I am able to do more of in my consulting capacity."

A reference librarian shared a similar experience of feeling her work measurably augmented by the "technology revolution" that started to change librarianship in the 1970s. "I feel I stretched my training and education in library science to the upmost during my career. I began my career when computers in libraries were rare," she wrote. Because of computers, she "had to continually learn new things and ways of doing library work due to the technology revolution that was manifest during the years I worked. I feel that I participated in the computer revolution in libraries and struggled to learn how to use new technology and databases for reference work." Other challenges occasioned for her by the increasing use of computers in library work included "automat[ing] a large card file of periodical article indexing and assisted in helping move from that card file to automated data entry for current indexing." In all, she reckoned that "[k]eeping up with automation as a tool to be used in the library during the years I worked took on a life of its own."

For some, then, technology expanded what the field could be while they were working as librarians. For others, going to an LIS program was a means of acquiring a more craft-oriented job. One recalled a pre-MSLS employment history than was "spotty," including "many part time jobs, many jobs that were not as interesting as i

[sic] would have liked, many clerical jobs, working below my level of education and training and competence." Before entering librarianship, "almost all of the jobs i [sic] held were boring and uninteresting and poorly paid."

5.4   Professional Achievement

Librarianship's technological transformation has not been an unmixed blessing. One untoward consequence has been that some supervisors who entered the profession under a different dispensation are insufficiently familiar with new technology. "Those that entered the field who are not able to retrain to use technology do not have the skills to do the basic jobs in some cases," one WILIS1 respondent complained. To another, it seemed that "More responsibility goes to older employees with less skills or abilities." This makes sense to some extent. In a profession as changed by technology as LIS has been, one would expect that employees who had been in the field long enough to ascend to management would not necessarily have to skills of a freshly minted MLS. And a certain amount of this difference between skills of managers and lower-level employees is necessary— they perform different jobs, after all, and it would hardly be a sign of a healthily functioning organization for a large library director to be generating cataloging records or updating the library website. But from a strict traditional craft perspective, a too-great variance between the skills of those higher and lower in an organizational hierarchy is problematic to the extent that part of the boss's job is knowledge transfer. Drawing on the metaphor of the medieval workshop, Sennett emphasized the need of authority grounded in skill. "In craftsmanship, there must be

a superior who sets standards and who trains. In the workshop, inequalities of skill and experience become face-to-face issues," he wrote. "The successful workshop will establish legitimate authority in the flesh, not in rights or duties set on paper." To illustrate what happened with the erosion of face-to-face authority based in skill, Sennett pointed to a study that attributed demoralization of British nurses to their having to report to National Health Service bureaucrats with no training in nursing. One could see a similar demoralization at work in the words of the respondents who complained that school librarians were being supervised by officials with no library training.

Most modern workplaces cannot aspire to the mentorship experience of a medieval workshop, of course; they are too large and heterogeneous. But that does that mean that organizations can ignore the need for skills acquisition and competent and attentive supervision on the part of their employees. This is one of the reasons that professions exist. In the absence of a master craftsman working in the same physical space as his or her charge, modern LIS workers must seek new skills in professional achievement opportunities with colleagues who likely work elsewhere. This was another reason for yoking craft and professional achievement together in one variable. In a modern work environment, they are inseparable as very few workers can hone their skills with just the tools they have on hand at their own workplace. The final regression testifies to the importance of professional achievement to librarian job satisfaction.

This finding was borne out by comments made in the survey. Most often, these remarks took the form of regrets that for some reason they were unable to get the

professional achievement they needed to improve their skills and advance their career. One subject deemed as crucial to performing her job well the "[n]eed more time to plan, market, project, network. And for professional achievement." Another rued the fact that a "[b]usy family life hinders or prevents me from devoting non-office hours to professional development." Elsewhere, an older respondent expressed dismay that the "best training [was being given] to younger coworkers with same position."

Yet to hear Sennett tell it, craft is not merely technical proficiency, although that is essential. In addition to making the best urn, bicycle, bomb, or cataloging record possible, the true craftsman in Sennett's formulation must concern himself with ends as well as means. ""[T]he craftman's ethos contains countervailing currents, as in the principle of using minimal force in physical effort," Sennett writes, expanding on his definition of craft. "The good craftsman, moreover, uses solutions to uncover new territory; problem solving and problem finding are intimately related in his or her mind. For this reason, curiosity can ask 'Why?' as well as 'How?'" Sennett has to expand his definition of craft to include ends in The Craftsmen because it is related to his larger philosophical argument that "making is thinking" and that the creation of things—the atomic bomb, for example—must not be divorced from consideration of their consequences. The author did not expand his definition of craft correspondingly, thinking the narrower, more circumscribed notion of concept more appropriate to a work of this scope. But both Sennett's expansion of his definition and my bracketing of professional achievement with craft point suggest something about just how difficult it is to separate craft out from other considerations. Of course

107

one must consider ends at some point in the making of anything; when one undertakes to create something in the first instance, it must be because it will have an application even if it is just so that it may be aesthetically admired.

5.5 Sex and Job Satisfaction

While the finding that women were happier in work than men might have been expected based on previous findings in the job satisfaction literature, it complicated the narrative of the dissertation. One of the assumptions of this study had been that, if LIS workers were more satisfied in their jobs than other information workers and, further, that if most new work being created was going to be information work of one stripe or another, then LIS work or librarianship may have something to teach other kinds of information work fields. But if a good portion of librarians' consistent job satisfaction can be put down to the fact that most librarians are women and women tend to report higher job satisfaction regardless of field, then whatever work-based lessons LIS has for other kinds of information work may be limited.

At least one female respondent tied her decision to enter the field to the fact that opportunities for advancement existed in a traditionally feminized profession that might not have been found elsewhere. Asked why she was drawn to LIS, she answered "Love of books and reading, liked public service aspect of previous work in a library, saw opportunities for women in the management of libraries, anticipated opportunities to work in training and professional development within libraries." And at least one subject professed feeling more comfortable working in the field because

there were so many women librarians: "I believe being a female has also added to feelings of camaraderie among myself and co-workers."

Despite the overall high level of satisfaction, respondents still reported cases of arrant sexism against women. One recounted having a "promotion postponed due to a male employee who was view needed it more than I since he was recently married and had a family to provide for" and claimed to have been "denied a recommendation for graduate school because 'I might get pregnant and leave.'" Another recalled having been "passed over for a new position which was given to a male co-worker, although I had much more experience in the area - job was not a posted one, it was created and bestowed on my co-worker." One woman stated that working in information technology, which is much more populated by men than librarianship generally, contained its own problems. "As part of the Information Technology Division, I was a rare female with a huge budget, and therefore often suspect," she wrote and then allowed that it "took awhile and a very supportive boss to get a comparable salary to others with similar responsibilities."

5.6   Older Workers

As stated in section 4.6, the most surprising finding of the first JOBSAT regression was that older workers did not report being happier than their younger colleagues as they had consistently done in other job satisfaction surveys. This led me to conduct a second regression to try to figure out why. The second regression attempted to isolate what may have changed about the profession in the previous five years. This it did admirably.

Together, the New Skills/Proliferating Tasks age correlations and the second regression paint a clear picture of older librarians moving into management positions in which they are not as well supported as their predecessors were (or a least as they perceived them to be). The fact that managers, at apparently all levels, were having to do more work once performed by assistants was of a piece with the fact that two of the other four factors negatively correlated with job satisfaction were "work harder" and "more routine tasks." That the "greater leadership role" variable was the only of the thirteen job satisfaction variables to correlate positively with job satisfaction showed that upward mobility per se was not the problem. Rather, it was that they were promoted and still had to perform tasks they associated with positions further down the chain of command. In the same way that previous generations of North Carolina textile mill owners introduced the "stretch-out" system to increase the number of tasks workers were expected to do, it would appear that circumstances— be they uncertain public funds or unsympathetic/incompetent superiors—were now forcing library managers to assume a greater workload. The result is a kind of managerial "stretch-out," wherein older librarians were being asked to take on new management functions even as they continued to perform other types of tasks.

This grievance was seen everywhere in the open-ended responses. But one respondent put the basic complaint most succinctly when he wrote that "due to the demands of the goals of the library, I wear too many hats, and that is what contributes to the number of hours I work. If we had adequate staffing, I would have fewer responsibilities." As in other areas, school librarians were particularly vocal on this point. Representative complaints of the "stretch-out" variety usually made a point

of the need for more support staff. "I was in the public school system for my entire career," one recently retired school librarian wrote. "As a media coordinator in an elementary school, my time was consumed by technology issues for the last 12 years or so. There is a great need for certified or support staff to help with the expanding area of technology. I didn't feel as if I were doing the job for which I had been hired and it was very frustrating." Part of the difficulty with too few support staff was that librarians were not only being asked to do more but also different kinds of tasks than the ones for which they felt they had been trained.

Some of the sources of work overload were surprising. Although in some respects automation was a boon for librarians, it also contributed to the stretch-out to the extent that it was used to justify the elimination of support staff positions. "I basically had the same job over the years. The titles just changed," one academic librarian commented, although subsequent remarks made it clear that it was not the same job quite. "The last title change to Coordinator was done to all middle managers since they thought budget cuts would cause those positions to be cut. As we became more automated we lost positions as people left." This eventuated in a situation in which she "was basically doing the cataloging of books, handling serials with non-professional help, and acquisitions." For one public librarian, the stress of moving into management was augmented by the fact that nothing in her education or training much prepared her for it. "I had all the right courses, including human resources management and library management, in library school, but nothing really prepared me to be a director." Ultimately she would enjoy success as a manger because, in her words, "I had common sense and knew how to get along with

111

people. There were about 30 full-time and 10 part-time people on the staff and I cared about them. I tried to be the sort of manager I would have liked to have myself."

Several librarians made a point of mentioning that they decided to opt out of management altogether. For the most part, interestingly, they did not cite work overload. For those deciding to forego management positions, the key concern was that they simply appeared not to enjoy management work. "After many years in library management, I realized I that, although I was respected and rewarded as a manager," a special librarian claimed, "my heart was really with information technology in a hands-on position so I left management and am very glad my last 10 years in the profession" have been free of any supervisory work. "My 2nd position provided me with ample opportunity to explore the management side of library work," another respondent reported, noting that "[f]or 4 years I was principle cataloger and head of cataloging, supervising 0.5 FTE professional cataloger, 4 FTE paraprofessional catalogers, and 4 FTE library clerks. I did not enjoy being a supervisor, and do not plan to seek out such responsibility again." A final refugee from management who worked as a part-time aide in a school library found that although that position "may be considered below my education and qualifications,… at my present stage of life it is perfect for me." In that capacity, she was able to "to put all my skills to good use. I especially enjoy recommending books to students and helping them find what they're looking for which is what led me to become a librarian in the first place. I enjoy this job much more than I did my manager position!"

5.7   Academic and School Librarians

One other curious fact emerged in the second regression which was worthy of mention. Namely, one of the work settings, academic libraries, emerged as significantly negatively correlated with job satisfaction. This, too, makes sense in the emerging picture. The kinds of librarians who might be most impacted by a stretch-out and have to take on more tasks would be those working in large organizations, since they have more support staff and therefore more potential for staff cuts. And an academic library is more likely to have a lot of employees than any of the other job settings in the model. In a model where larger organizations correlate with job dissatisfaction, the largest types of organization likewise did so.

There were several qualitative responses which illuminated the source of job stress that afflicted academic librarians uniquely, or at least disproportionately. "I enjoyed the first 10 years or so that I worked as a librarian. Cataloging was challenging and interesting, especially when as in my first position I was able to catalog German titles," went one answer to the final survey question, which asked respondents to voice any concerns or features of their careers not otherwise addressed in the survey. Soon enough, she found that she was being asked to perform functions other than those for which she had been hired. But in an academic setting, this included pressure to publish, acquire even more educational credentials, and otherwise become something of a quasi-academic to the detriment of her LIS role. "With the introduction of OCLC there was more flexibility in work hours. However, I think that with the continuing emphasis in college and university libraries on second masters, publishing, participation in professional organizations, etc. the

113

job responsibilities that librarians are supposedly hired to do are being deemphazied or ignored altogether. These responsibilities/jobs are left to the staff while librarians attend professional meetings, write articles, conduct studies (which actually would help improve library service, if anyone, especially administrators, read them and could apply the recommendations)." While the specific pressures mentioned in this account are peculiar to academic libraries, this trend crops up in other settings; as librarians take on more responsibilities, many of the core librarian responsibilities are taken over by persons without formal LIS education. She highlights where this is a bad idea. "Cataloging is extremely important in creating access to a library's collection. Yet most library administrators and many reference librarians seem to have little understanding of its importance or how to use it…. The last 10 years of cataloging in a university library were extremely frustrating and depressing. I was constantly correcting the poor cataloging records I found on OCLC."

As a balance to this last thought, it is worth pausing briefly to note that, for some academic librarians, the chance to use content knowledge contributed to their satisfaction. "My last position in the Art and Architecture Library was very satisfying," one wrote, claiming that it gave her a chance to work as an adjunct professor in a field in which she had expertise. "I was treated as an academic because I had both the information technology skill and my academic subject expertise. I really enjoyed my career."

Another part of the problem for academic libraries, though, was that there was often not adequate training to perform the more specialized tasks libraries are asking their workers to perform. "What I see going on in librarianship is more demand for

114

librarians with specialized skills," another academic librarian wrote. "There are very few pure 'reference librarian' positions out there anymore. Almost every library wants librarians who not only have the MLS degree, but librarians that have a specialized skill, such as instruction, or electronic access, or collection development, or technical skills. However, not many libraries are providing the training, or opportunities to train, in new jobs." The problem, in this librarian's view, was a systemic one. "Most libraries that I see have very formal, very rigid personnel structures, giving librarians few opportunities to develop new skills. Personally, one of the problems that I face is that I am at a small liberal arts university library with little turnover." This particular stress can be especially acute in small college libraries with limited staff but the same pressure to evolve with the profession.

> Although the library has increased demands on it in terms of usage and services, there is [sic] almost no opportunities for continuing education or advancement. People stay in positions here for years. I am having to seek educational opportunities elsewhere, on my own time. One of the things that really bothers me is that although I can take classes at my institution at no cost to myself, I have to make up the time that I will miss work.

A further challenge peculiar to academic librarians is that their jobs are just not as common, and are therefore not as transferrable, as those of school and public librarians. For academic librarians, one of the key selling points of the field, its flexibility, is considerably diminished. "I think the important thing to take from my narrative is that in the academic library field specialization can be very rewarding but also severely limits one's flexibility as to location," another academic librarian confessed. "My husband and I moved across country so I could take my dream library job, but when he finished his PhD we had to move (to Canada in fact) for the

115

tenure-track professorship he got." This caused anxiety because her highly specialized academic library skills were not likely to be in demand in her family's new location. "Now I'm not sure what my opportunities for employment will be - there's certainly no similar Arabic cataloging position anywhere nearby and in fact only the largest university libraries employ more than one full-time monographic catalog librarian, so there may be no chance to even work in technical services after my current part-time telecommuting position ends. I may have to try to get back into the profession from another angle, by volunteering in reference at a public library, for instance."

A final characteristic that often distinguishes academic from other types of librarianship is that college and university librarians were asked to collaborate with other units on campus. This could conceivably be either a net positive or a negative; in any case, it goes to the point that, in academic librarianship perhaps more than anywhere else, LIS graduates are called upon to do non-LIS jobs. "The one thing that I could not capture in the questions about my work history is the relatively new development represented by my appointment as the Associate Director of the university's new Center for Teaching and Learning," one former academic librarian reported. "This is not a library project—it reports directly to the Provost. I think it represents a trend in academic libraries to form collaborative partnerships or joint projects with other units on campus (such as Centers of teaching or information technology centers). I'm finding this responsibility requires both existing skills I have as a librarian and the development of new skills and abilities."

Academic librarians were thus subject to a number of pressures that other kinds of librarians are not, including the pressure to publish, to learn increasingly specialized new skills, and to collaborate with other university units. Further, their more highly specialized skill sets tend to limit their career flexibility. Finally, there is the fact that, in the academy generally, the tendencies of men and women are the reverse of what they are in the larger job satisfaction literature. That is to say that men working in academe consistently report higher levels of satisfaction than women. These factors would appear to be the best explanations for why academic librarianship alone correlated negatively with job satisfaction.

No negative correlation existed between being a school librarian and job satisfaction. But because job-related complaints were so much more prevalent from school librarians in the open-ended responses, I thought many of those grievances worthy of inclusion here. School librarians and media specialists were particularly vocal on having too many obligations to fit into a standard eight-hour work day, and feeling pressure to work more hours than required by their full-time jobs. Some felt unduly taxed by the extracurricular activities they supervised or otherwise worked with in addition to their proper jobs. "Some weeks I work five 12 to 15 hour days trying to catch up with my work because of clubs I work with," one wrote. "While these are not hours required by administrators, I feel that they are expected by some in my workplace and the parents of my students." Along these same lines, another respondent cited "[t]oo many other duties at school, such as bus duty, that are after school." Extended hours could result from the wish to be able to perform one's work better. "Even though it is my choice to stay later, I would like to go home on time

instead of working after normal school employee time," another lamented. "I get more of my work done after everyone else leaves for the day (less interruptions.)" Here is another instance where the links between craft, "full-time" work, and job satisfaction are laid bare.

5.8   Pay

Income did not show up as significantly correlated with job satisfaction in any of the three regressions. That pay should not figure unusually prominently into LIS workers' job satisfaction ought not to surprise to the extent that persons selecting into the field are presumably not those for whom money is among the most important career criteria. This tendency was borne out by open-ended responses that, while not typical, seemed to be the work of people who were impervious to material rewards to the point of perversity. "The school system pays librarians more than public libraries," one such response began. "I took a $8,000 cut in pay to return to public library work. (The school system was going to cut 300 teachers/librarians/employees; and I was one. I had 12 years experience in the system. I could have bumped another librarian at the elementary level with fewer years of experience.)" Despite the considerable pay cut, this respondent felt called to public librarianship by a sense of mission. "I chose to return to public library work because I like the diversity of the public library. The people who come to the public library need help and frequently do not know who else to consult. (Call me stupid if salary is the only criteria to judge success.)" Along these same lines, another subject conceded that while "Salaries are terribly low," she "believe[d] wholeheartedly in the field and plan[ned] to spend my career in it anyway."

118

It is useful to note that this was far from a unanimous view and that, for each

respondent who professed relative indifference to low pay, there was another to

whom it constituted a major problem. One located the source of salary woes in the

decision libraries had made to concentrate on technical resources to the exclusion of

human ones. "Libraries are becoming TOO tech-centric. They need to remember the

human element in who uses the library, and who STAFFS the library," she

complained. "Part of recognizing the human element in staff is FIGHTING FOR, not

just giving lip service to, pay equity. It's a sorry state of affairs when somebody with

an associate's degree (physical plant manager) is paid more than MSL degreed

librarians." For some, the problem of low pay was significant enough to cause them

to leave the profession altogether. "From the time I started library school till today I

believe librarians have failed to market themselves very well," another wrote. "They

allow themselves to be underpaid, undervalued and overlooked. I love libraries-using

them as a patron, what they provide for the community, especially public libraries.

But when I see what librarians are paid, I get sick. No more of that for me." So there

is the distinct likelihood that those who most disliked the profession's relatively poor

pay largely selected out of my sample of self-identified librarians.

5.9   Coworkers

Co-Worker Support correlated more closely JOBSAT in the final regression

than any other variable save Craft and Professional Achievement. Meanwhile, Co-

Worker Cohesion had the fifth largest beta. That librarians' relationship to their co-

workers is vital to their satisfaction came through time and again in the open-ended

responses. Asked why she or he entered the LIS field, one subject responded "the atmosphere, the camaraderie, the variety of responsibilities." Others expressed the idea that one's relationship to one's library co-workers was substantively different from those in other fields. One subject entered the profession because, as she wrote, "[l]ibrarians worked collaboratively rather than competitively." The theme of librarians' collegiality contributing to a healthy work "atmosphere"—the exact word used in no fewer than nine open-ended responses—recurred often. Librarianship "affords opportunities to learn continuously," one offered. "Pleasant, challenging, intellectual atmosphere. Work with motivated, intelligent, warm, funny, and generous colleagues." One respondent even cited having observed collegial working relationships among librarians as a motivation for deciding to attend LIS school. "I liked the librarians that I met," she remembered "and I thought that they would be excellent coworkers. Also, I found the library to be a nurturing environment for a new career."

One aspect of craft in the modern work life is teamwork because it takes place mostly within organizations. Per Sennett in *The Corrosion of Character*, "The modern work ethic focuses on teamwork. It celebrates sensitivity to others; it requires such 'soft skills' as being a good listener and being cooperative; most of all, teamwork emphasizes team adaptability to circumstances." The Sennett of 1998 took a dim view of the emphasis on teamwork. It was anathema to craft with its stress on the finished product. Teamwork was "an ethos of work which remains on the surface of experience. Teamwork is the group practice of demeaning superficiality." In contrast, "the old work ethic was founded on self-disciplined use of

one's time, with an emphasis laid on self-imposed, voluntary practice rather than merely passive submission to schedules or routine." The modern workplace devalued this self-discipline, which was among the best guarantors pre-modern societies had against social instability and chaos. Organizations replaced the sturdy craftsmen of yore with clock watchers who answered to the timesheet rather than to objective standards of quality. Discussing the modern workforce of the formerly Greek bakery discussed in my literature review, Sennett put the matter succinctly: "The work is no longer legible to them, in terms of knowing what they are doing" (Sennett, 1998).

But if, as Sennett also wrote in *The Corrosion of Character,* almost everything is made better when practiced as craft, could not the same also be said of teamwork? Could work within organizations with high turnover rates not be organized in a way that made the work more "legible" to its employees? LIS job satisfaction studies, including this one, have testified to the importance of co-workers. And while the co-worker support and co-worker cohesion variables may not map directly to "teamwork," I do not think it is an unwarranted logical leap to suggest that there is likely to be significant overlap between the categories. Librarians relish their co-workers, and it makes their working life happier and more meaningful. Part of the answer to what makes librarians less alienated than the Boston bakery workers is, of course, that they are members of a profession which has to certify that they are qualified to perform their jobs. Professions ensure that, in a high-turnover modern work environment, organizations can determine who is qualified to work for

them. Professional workers therefore do not have to be deskilled to the extent of their non-professional counterparts.

It is worth noting, too, that Sennett seemed to soften his stance toward teamwork 10 years after *The Corrosion of Character* in *The Craftsmen*. Without invoking "teamwork" specifically, Sennett did make a point of "the superiority of cooperation to competition in getting good work done." But cooperation had to be structured appropriately in order to be effective. Citing the work of economists Richard Lester and Michael Piore, Sennett argued that companies who succeeded in the race to become players in the initial mobile phone boom of the early 2000s did so because they adopted relatively unstructured collaborative spaces. Motorola, for example, created a "technical shelf," an open-access area where engineers could leave possible technical solutions that other teams or units might find useful in the future. It allowed these engineers to work on tools "whose immediate value was not clear" but which would be made available to everyone in the event that they did become useful. Similarly, Nokia fostered useful collaboration by holding something resembling focus groups that brought together engineers, designers, and salespeople. In contrast, a company like Ericsson, which maintained more rigid divisions between offices, had a harder time making the transition to mobile technologies as different units vied to protect professional turf. This circumstance naturally weighed against meaningful collaboration (Sennett, 2008). Sennett does not address how his veneration of collaboration jibes with his previous denigration of teamwork, or if he thinks a distinction exists between the two. One way of squaring the circle, it seems to me, is through reference to Sennett's expansive definition of

craft in which everything from parenthood to citizenship is improved when practiced as craft. In the same way that there are better and worse ways of repairing an engine, there would seem to be better and worse ways of running an organization—a vindication of management studies. It is not so much that teamwork is an innately pernicious idea as it is that it works better when organizations address specifically how units and individuals can best work with together than it does when they concern themselves with so-called soft skills.

But without having those soft skills being in place, Sennett seems to concede in another example, it can be difficult to promote fruitful collaborations. "Listeners may sometimes imagine that working with a superstar conductor or soloist inspires orchestral players, the virtuoso setting a standard that lift's everyone's game, but this depends on how the star behaves," Sennett writes in *The Craftsmen*. "A soloist withdrawn from collegiality can actually diminish the will of orchestra players to perform well." So in the case of the star soloist, it would appear that the structural components are in place for a productive collaboration. All the principals are in the room together and the work of the soloist is unimpeachably workmanlike but, because he or she cannot or will not deign to be an integral part of the larger unit, the optimal result does not obtain. It may be said then that soft skills are a necessary but not sufficient condition for teamwork. A charitable reading of Sennett in this case would say that what he objected to in the first book was not soft skills in themselves but an emphasis on them to the near exclusion of more structural concerns.

In the WILIS1 data, there were examples bearing out the importance of both sound soft skills and structural thinking to the proper functioning of LIS workplaces.

"Skills in working with people are as important as the technical or subject areas of one's job," one respondent commented, adding that "COMMUNICATION and more COMMUNICATION" were essential to her library's effective operation. Another added that "tech skills etc are seen as the most important thing, when in fact reliability and people skills are just as important."

"People skills" were not all that good co-workers brought to the table. Co-worker help was often indispensable to being able to do one's own job well as was the case for a youth services librarian in a rural public library system. After a brief career layoff, she needed to re-skill. "If it had not been for the on-the-job training and mentoring there, I would not have the job I do today, "she claimed. "In 1993, the online catalog hadn't come to our system; by the time I wanted to return to public service in 1997, it was in full swing. So my co-workers in my on-call job were invaluable in assisting my searching skills and familiarity with the software." But the value of good co-workers could be effectively canceled by an unfairly demanding boss. "Co-workers in and outside department were fine," wrote an academic librarian. "Department Head was a tyrant who intimidated all of her staff. Not a team environment at all."

Lack of supportive co-workers who could aid librarians in their everyday work could beget problems. One librarian spoke to the problem of being a "lone wolf" in her department/skill area, and how the lack of effective teammates alienated her from her work. "I disliked being pigeonholed as a cataloger and I disliked supposedly being the tech person who knew all the cutting edge stuff," she wrote. "One of my projects was to put together an image database. This was 1994 and

software was just coming out for this. I was supposed to spearhead this, but I just didn't know how to make it happen. I liked my co-workers, my boss (on a personal level), and the organization that I worked for. But I felt isolated, without good support and direction from my boss, and lonely." There were aspects of the job that she liked she conceded but they could not make up for the isolation she felt. "I hated going into my office (no windows in the middle of an office building) and facing a day of just me and the computer. I worked on committees and really liked training people on Internet, but that was a small part of my time. I hoped at one time to share some of the reference duties, but my boss wasn't open to that. I did what I could in the job, but in the end, it wasn't the right place for me."

The "lone wolf" problem seemed especially widespread among school librarians whose supervisors often do not understand their work. "I have found my major problem as a school librarian is that I have been and am supervised by a principal who is ill informed of my training and skill set, and who has many expectations unrelated to my job description," one explained. This situation had untoward consequences as the respondent "received my first below standard rating on an appraisal and was, as a result, denied tenure and forced to resign. The principal had never been trained on the appraisal instrument and did not perform all the observations or the interview the instrument requires." She was, fortunately, able to find new employment "I was able to find a new position" but, she added, "with a fully fixed schedule and no media assistant for over 400 students at a Title I school," which she described as an "untenable situation." In the end, the overall lack of effective support offered school media positions eroded her commitment to the

profession. " In both districts the central office personnel in media services have been supportive but able to actually do very little. The need for school librarians to do so much site-based advocacy on top of what is already a demanding job may very well drive me out of the school setting."

Finally, there were several complaints of prejudice or lack of respect on the part of co-workers, leading to adverse work situations. These included: "I have experienced anti-gay bigotry in the form of comments by co-workers"; "problems with co-workers- left the position"; "Don't get respect from co-workers when I am the librarian-in-charge"; and "My religious beliefs are often attacked by co-workers. I do not volunteer conversations about religion, but am drawn into them by questions."

5.10   Family Dynamics

One of the aspects of this study to set it apart was to be that, unlike previous LIS job satisfaction studies, it would also focus on the effect of non-work-related variables on job satisfaction. For that reason I added the four family dynamics variables in the final regression. It developed that, although respondents frequently spoke of family-related stresses and issues in the open-ended data, neither marital status, having children, nor one's breadwinner status had any impact on job satisfaction.

Nevertheless, since one of the advantages of so large a data set is the ability to portray diversity as well as central tendencies, I thought it worth exploring the ways in which family dynamics impacted LIS workers' career choice and work life. In the first instance, there were numerous respondents for whom the decision to enter LIS

was predicated on the fact that it allowed more time for family. Typical of these types of responses were the librarians claiming the profession "allowed time to pursue other interests and care for family" and "provide[d] flexibility for me and my family." A couple former teachers mentioned having made the room from the classroom to the library for this same reason. "Teaching made it difficult to spend time with my own family because I was always correcting papers," one explained. "I wanted to work where grades were not the driving force of my job and where I could really affect a change by helping children find great books and learn to read for a life time!" The other noted that "[l]eaving the classroom allowed me to have more time for my family and I had different responsibilities in the media center that allowed me to be less controlled by classroom structure." In fact, there may be a historical component to librarianship's accommodation of family since the profession must have evolved to accommodate the needs of its female workforce. As one subject explained, she opted to enter librarianship because "[i]n the 70's few options for women, esp w/ a family."

With its plentiful opportunities for part-time and contingent work, librarianship also seems to have offered a chance for workers who wanted to take some time off to raise their family to keep their toe in the field so that they could come back to it later. In this respect, librarianship offered something different from most other professions. It would be a far more difficult trick to, for example, wangle a 20-hour nursing, teaching, or attorney job while one's children were young than to get a part-time librarian job. This fact was reflected in the plans of one recent mother: "I have JUST gone back to work part time almost exactly 6 months after the birth of my son.

I currently plan to have another child within the next two years, and I will likely take another break from employment at that time," she wrote. She further "envision[ed] working part time for the indefinite future, as my husband's salary is enough to support us and my family is more important to me than a career," and she expressed a wish "to continue working part time, though, both because I enjoy it and because it keeps my foot in the door in case I should need to go back to work full time down the road."

Of course the abundance of part-time work available to those with families could be cast in a less charitable light. "I chose to become a librarian because I thought it would fit my family's lifestyle," one-part-timer explained. That lifestyle included not only children but also moving "every 2-4 years for the last 23 years." While claiming "never [to have had] trouble finding a job when we move," she also noted that there was "less flexibility in moving from one type of library to another than I had imagined." Frequent moves also meant the respondent was never able to bank enough years in one place to advance her career and the part-time positions she could find offered pay rates not at all commensurate with her experience:

> I am also frustrated that with my years of experience, I can only convince employers to pay me an entry-level wage. In my experience, they will not pay permanent part-timer librarians a wage that is consistent with years of experience. They get a real bargain by not having to give me benefits. Employers seem to think it's a fair trade when I get part-time hours. However, as an example, I signed on with my current employer for 15 hours/week. That quickly became 18, then 20, then 25, and now 29 hours per week to accommodate their needs. It is very difficult to get the work done in fewer hours. They won't pay for more people and I can't keep the job if I don't raise my hours.

For all the benefits that librarianship offered workers with families, there were those for whom families represented an impediment to their advancement or on-the-

128

job performance. "Because I set aside evening family time, I am not material for upper management," one respondent wrote. "Family responsibilities were assumed to limit my availability for some professional activities," another cautioned. A third admitted that "[a]lthough I had good positions early and mid-career, in hindsight, I was distracted from setting and achieving clear career goals and professional certifications by a difficult family situation."

There is the possibility as well that the picture of librarianship's family friendliness that mostly prevails in the WILIS1 data is partly illusory. Some portion of those for whom work would interfere with their family life may be selecting out of my sample. "I resigned my position when I had my first daughter because I did not feel the hours and work level were compatible with family commitments," one former librarian wrote. "Currently I am not employed but volunteer in a tutoring program." And there were others whose experience belied the idea that libraries accommodated working parents. One problem in this respect could be irregular working hours. "It was not so much the number of hours, but that you were expected to work two or more nights a week, alternate Saturdays, and one Sunday a month, one former employee of a large East Coast urban public library system complained. "This destroyed a lot of family time." Along these same lines, another former librarian griped that "I don't know how it is in the field now -- but there needs to be more compassion for hours, days, and weeks for leave for caring for family, for aging and dying relatives, for having a 'life' and not being owned by the library itself; for allowing you to disagree without feeling you will lose your job." Clearly, librarianship

enjoys in some quarters a reputation for being a family-friendly career choice; just as clearly, there are significant exceptions that complicate that image.

5.11   Tensions between Age Groups

The fact that fully nine of the 12 New Skills/Proliferating Tasks variables correlated with advancing age more than suggested that older workers experienced a fair amount of tension and anxiety surrounding the issue of changes to the field. As stated before, one of the sources of anxiety appeared to be that many older workers were entering management at a time when libraries were being asked to stretch their resources. The theme of libraries being asked to do more with less, especially as concerns staff, also makes sense of the fact that a perceived lack of job security correlated negatively with satisfaction. As with most of the New Skills/Proliferating Tasks variables, older workers were more concerned about job security than younger ones. Some of this was due to the feeling that they were being put out to pasture. Some mid- and late-career professionals confessed to feeling pressure to retire as their libraries tried to update their images. One cited "statements by various coworkers that the library needs a younger image" as a reason for feeling pressure to retire. "The director is certainly promoting this in the new hires," she added. At all events, there did appear to be some disconnect, and some significant antipathy, between older and younger librarians.

Part of it had to do with disillusion with the broader trend of diminishing obligations of organizations to employees. There is some suspicion that the focus on younger workers has to do with a wish not to pay more experienced workers who

command higher salaries. "My organization in particular values younger workers more highly on the basis of the enthusiasm, new skills and knowledge they bring from library school over the experience of older workers (and perhaps the expense of covering their retirement costs)," one librarian commented. Another decried "[c]hanges in employment away from 'lifetime' company relationships; making more room for younger employees to advance; perception that older workers lack the skills needed for today's workplace"

A certain amount of this age-based antipathy cut both ways. While older workers in particular admitted to being asked to perform more work than they could reasonably be asked to do well, certain of their younger coworkers complained of being dismissed for their youth and lack of experience. "Early in this job some coworkers assumed I couldn't possibly know what I was talking about because I was much younger than they were," one exasperated academic librarian wrote. Another complained of coworkers who were "reticent to trust me with large tasks," and claimed she "needed to work three times as hard to prove that I could do as good a job as a 40 year old." Still another thought that her "youth was interpreted as lack of experience; a few of my direct reports would go over my head to consult with the UL on some matters." Meanwhile, one of the younger cohort chimed in with this complaint that seemed to fly in the face of stereotypes about the tension between the generations: "Older co-workers can take on a condescending or mocking tone when addressing technology-related topics. I find it inappropriate and unprofessional."

But as a general matter, older and experienced workers were not more anxious because they feared not being sufficiently skilled to work in new-economy information environments. Fear of technology did not figure prominently at all in older workers' stated reasons for being dissatisfied in their position. Two of the only three new skills/proliferating tasks variables not to correlate with advancing age were "Learn New Skills" and "More High Tech Tasks." Bottom line: Nothing in the data indicated aging workers feared technological change, as I admittedly had suspected, and a there was rather a lot that suggested they greeted it enthusiastically. If this data suggests anything about why older LIS workers did not express the satisfaction levels that previous studies indicated, it is that they have sunk years into a profession which is changing structurally in unwelcome ways. After investing years in LIS, both for education and as professionals, many were still unsure of their job security. And in cases where they were moving up in the profession, it was not at all clear that the field would look remotely like the one that they were initially attracted to and in which they had often worked decades. They were ascending to management positions at a moment when support staff were disappearing and managers were newly encumbered with more mundane tasks. And just maybe, they were finding that with the crush of new tasks, they were not able to do what they saw as their main job as well as they would have liked. If this last theory were true, one would expect it to have been confirmed by the third regression. And indeed it was when the Craft and Professional Achievement variable registered as the surest predictor of job satisfaction.

Where older workers did express suspicion of technology, they did so because they feared it was debasing research or because an overweening focus on technological resources obscured a former focus on customer service, not because they feared learning new high tech tasks. "It saddens me to realize that libraries are no longer valued for book and print collections, and true research seems to relegated only to searching the Internet without attention given to the reliability of Internet sources," one complained. "I enjoy curling up with a good book--from computer use, I do not enjoy carpal tunnel syndrome and eyestrain. My age is shining through." Other older workers felt that the rush to ensure new hires had good technical skills tended to shortchange the value of customer service. "Many libraries want to appeal to and attract younger customers," another said. This resulted in

> a move toward placing younger professionals in public service desk positions, and then moving these workers into managerial roles as technology increases. While some mature workers show reluctance to learn new technologies, I don't believe all older workers should be categorized in this way and passed over for advancement. Great customer service takes patience and wisdom along with technical skills these days in reference work. These are more likely to be qualities that mature reference professionals have.

Other older librarians expressed frustration that being labeled "old" in some instances seemed to disqualify them from working more closely with technology. "Sometimes my ideas concerning uses of technology or new ways to go about outreach are overlooked, until a 'young' person (ie, usually not much younger and could even be the same age, just a more recent graduate) is able to present the same idea and gain support." In this subject's case, the problem was exacerbated, he said, by having just moved to a new job in an area with more recent LIS graduates and an apparently concomitant emphasis on tech. "I seem to be

considered 'too old' to do such things in my new position, but I personally believe this situation is the result of living in an area with many new LIS graduates and an emphasis on already knowing the latest technology skills before employment, not training after employment."

One mid-career librarian felt that pressure on Boomers to retire combined with a tight job market for freshly minted LIS graduates combined to create a potentially toxic situation. "I read more about pressure to retire in the library literature and on the blogs; I think there is a very large Gen Y generation coming up who will need jobs and I think the library leaders have really overestimated the financial ability of the boomer generation to actually be able to retire 'on time,'" she wrote. Adding to this tension was the fact that "technology skills have also changed, and some older librarians are trying to keep up and some aren't. I don't actually see much of that pressure at work, but older coworkers tell me that they have experienced pressure from management when they are just a few years (5 or so) away from retirement." In such a situation with older and younger workers competing for diminishing resources, some tension between generations of librarians appears inevitable.

5.12 Task Variety and Continuous Learning

Another theme to emerge in reading through individual written responses within the WILIS1 survey was that LIS workers were very keen on task variety and learning new skills on the job. As a result of these characteristics, their skills were highly transferrable to other careers.

One librarian's account of her career testified to the varied nature of her work. "I have done everything from typing and filing catalog cards to telling a story at story time," she wrote. "I have helped researchers find their family history and assisted health care professionals find needed information to help patients." The diversity within her career extended to the library settings in which she worked. "I have worked in special, academic and public libraries as both a paraprofessional and professional, and also for a[n] integrated library system company." Another characterized his variegated career history thusly: "Two years were spent teaching social studies and English in a jr. high school, one year teaching speech and drama in high school. Following a period of a year working in a small college library, I got my MSLS and worked in many different libraries - public, elementary, university, boys' preparatory." He then added that the "last 25 years were spent as media specialist in an elementary school. I never met a job I didn't like."

Yet task variety did not necessitate having worked in a variety of different settings. "My professional positions have all been in the same library, I have worked managing the Circulation Dept., as Reference/Govt. Documents Librarian, as Head of Cataloging and now as Assoc. Univ. Librarian for Tech. Services," an academic librarian attested. "Although my entire professional career has been in the same library, the changes in technology, especially the rapid changes in the past 10 years, have given me a wide range of experience and has kept the work challenging and interesting." Similarly, a former marketing executive found that "[l]ibrarianship challenges me daily to expand my knowledge and skills. I have learned to manage

people, facilities and budgets and to provide reference services and assistance with technology in a branch library setting."

Task variety seems to have been one reason why workers preferred small settings. It allowed to perform different functions within the library and gave them time and space to figure out in which direction they wanted to go if and when they specialized. One academic librarian wrote of spending "6 yrs in a small rural community college library; except for lack of technology, was great experience because we did both public and technical services; was a great chance to learn which side of the library we preferred to work."

Many of the librarians in the sample, and those professing an affinity for lifelong and on-the-job learning especially, were able to use their LIS skills in other professions after they left the field. "A degree in library and information science prepares individuals for many opportunities outside traditional libraries," one career information professional wrote. "I have been able to move into three separate but related fields -- organizational development, teaching and learning within universities (with emphasis on use of technology in teaching), and consulting (within & outside libraries). I have also been able to take a long period (15 yrs) to do part-time paid work and to spend a large amount of time in various civic volunteer positions while being the primary care-giver for our three children."

Others went into greater detail on the issue of how their LIS training had fed into a new career. "When I founded and ran the non-profit group (and later developed a web site) I used what I had learned in lib. school on documenting everything, researching facts, networking, etc.," wrote one former Virginia public

librarian. "When I became a writer and editor for various things including the Almanac of Virginia Politics (and put it on the web until my retirement), again I drew on what I had learned about reference work, documentation, organization." A career military intelligence officer was likewise able to adapt his LIS skills for use in that field. "My MSIS education has greatly aided me as I worked in highly decentralized operations which required optimum information organization and the application of decisive technologies to communicate across disparate locations," he wrote. Another former librarian explained in some detail the specific LIS skills he was able to apply to tasks in his research job. "I also use my Computer Interface Design (IS class) methods in creating slide decks to present my research results, he explained. "Client interviewing skills (the reference interview training) are vital in developing good surveys for our customers." Finally, a woman who enjoyed a long legal career after having left librarianship because of lack of opportunities for advancement claimed to "often tell people that the information management skills I got in my MSLS program, including experience with old-time mainframe programming, have been as important to my success as anything else I've done -- so much of work is about understanding, evaluating, organizing and effectively using critical information."

LIS skills could not only be applied to other careers but also to non-work-related aspects of life. "My most important accomplishment has been my family, but I feel my LIS training really honed my skills in information and data management," one public librarian winningly remarked. "I became more of a 'detail person' through the program. I use these skills today in all aspects of my life. And, of course, I love to

read more than ever and am always visiting the public libraries. Thank goodness for them!" In this she seemed to echo what Sennett said about craft being applicable not only to work but to other areas of life such as parenthood and citizenship. And she raises the intriguing possibility that the practice of craft at work may aid one in deploying it elsewhere in one's life. Certainly, that would dovetail nicely with the finding that job satisfaction positively impacts life satisfaction.

5.13   The LIS Risk Economy

In all of the discussion of managerial stretch-outs, one potential source of stress for aging librarians went unmentioned. Namely, while most of the data collection for WILIS1 took place prior to the onset of the 2008 financial crisis, much of it did not. More to the point, there were no shortages of signs of future trouble in the economy at large when the data were collected, and this fact certainly may have played some role in the apprehension managers felt about having sunk so many years into the field at a time that it and the economy seemed to be entering a precarious phase. In other words, the fact that the LIS field appeared to be entering a risk economy after they had essentially wed themselves to this career may have represented a source of dissatisfaction for managers because they had no professional fall back plan.

An unaccustomed lack of stability within the profession manifested itself in a couple other ways in the WILIS1 data. One way was when anxiety over job security registered as the fifth largest determinant of job satisfaction. Another was in the way subjects talked about an emergent risk economy in words reminiscent of the findings

of the WANE study. Written comments were peppered with subjects bemoaning the state of the job market upon leaving LIS school, the difficulty of finding new jobs after a move, and the need to work multiple part-time jobs to make ends meet.

One recent graduate bemoaned the grim reality of post-program job market folding in a complaint about the lack of job placement aid from her program. "I just wish that my program would've been active in finding me (and other graduates) employment upon graduation, instead of just cutting us loose to find employment on our own," she wrote. "I also wish active recruitment would've been performed within my LSIS program. I'm happy with my education, but highly disappointed with the job market and employment opportunities in North Carolina for information science / technology job-seekers." Another respondent maintained that it was "very difficult for me to find a job after graduating, especially since I moved to a different area. I was unemployed for almost a year." Here again, an LIS school's lack of a good job placement program was partly to blame. "The resources offered by my school were not very helpful—I eventually found a job by networking with students and alumni from another library school where I live now," but ultimately it proved not quite a fit. "My current job is mostly satisfactory and I am glad to at least be working in the field in which I have a degree, but it is not what I really wanted as a library professional and it is not something that really suits my talents--I am adequate at it, but not really good."

Confronting an unpromising job market was not a burden new graduates bore alone. Notably, for those who have to move for family reasons, finding a new position could be tough. "I moved 2 times to follow my spouse's career path, since

139

his career pays significantly more than mine," one trailing spouse wrote, further explaining that she had chosen to stay home with children for some years. Unfortunately, she found that, for a profession with a reputation for accommodating family commitments and which further was expecting a large number of its older workers to retire in coming years, there was not a lot on offer for her, and that even the part-time, "substitute" position she landed was not flexible enough.

> I would gladly work a few (5-10) hours a week in a professional librarian capacity if that seemed to be an option. Unfortunately even public library professional-level part-time positions tend to be 'substitute' positions that require availability at a moment's notice (not an option for many stay-at-home-moms). In my prior substitute position you it was frowned upon to block off too much time each week as 'unavailable', if you really only wanted to work on a couple specific days of the week. For a profession that has been afraid of the bulk of the workforce retiring I don't understand why there aren't more opportunities for people like me and also for people who want to retire but still assist others for a certain number of fixed hours per week. Also, although I didn't feel I was treated badly when I became a mom, there was definitely an awareness that I was different. 3 out of 4 of the other librarians were either unmarried/no children, or married/not having children. The 4th had adult children / no grandchildren. Out of the entire library staff of about 20 people I was the only person with a small child. One other person had a child around 10; all others had children who were close to college age or older. Before my son was born I would often work 10-13 hour days during heavy instruction times of the year, sometimes working both weekend days as well. Other librarians did this as well. I was not able to keep these hours once my son was born, especially with a commute (and my husband's lack of flexibility in his higher-paying job). My co-workers were understanding, but there was definitely a divide.

Those who do find jobs were often entering into a fraught financial situation. "I was without a full-time paying job for nearly 3 years. During most of this time, I was a full-time student which working as a graduate assistant or at a part-time job," one respondent began, by way of describing the trajectory of her career. But she found

that, even with a job, paying down the loans she incurred to pay for her LIS education was problematic at best. "It is unfortunate that LIS careers do not pay better because I am now struggling to pay back the loans that I relied upon to live during my graduate program. It is also unfortunate that grants and other types of financial aid that do not have to be paid back for LIS students are not readily available." One reason for situations like this one seems to be that LIS students are eligible for student loans that are out of proportion to the entry-level jobs they are likely to enter into upon graduation. "My financial aid seemed to be based on the salary that I made at the job that I left to go to school and therefore was not nearly enough on which to survive. The interest alone on my loans is approximately 20% of my monthly take-home pay."

One upshot of the combination of a grim job market is that, like many of the IT employees surveyed in the WANE study, increasingly LIS graduates are forced to cobble together their livelihood with numerous provisional and freelance jobs. One former public librarian spoke of a professional period in the wilderness that lasted for two years before landing another full0-time job "I also worked part time for an educational video and film distributor but that was short lived since it was strictly a commission only job. I settled for hourly wage employment for the two years before I joined the world of special libraries and served as a circuit librarian for small hospitals who needed a librarian for JCAHO compliance." Another noted that "[f]or a period of 9 months, I held two part time jobs, one of which I still have (my Librarian 1 position in the public library). The other part time job I had was in a small corporate library where I did serials work (checkin, ordering, weeding), copy cataloging,

141

acquisitions work, and some archives work for 15 hours per week." However, the corporate "position was temporary" and she "was eventually let go." Another confessed that she "work[ed] at three part-time positions cataloging for two libraries and one library network, I do some of this from home. I didn't see any question addressing if you work at more than one job." This represented another case in a wish to spend more time raising a family contributed to a more provisional work situation. "I originally started working full-time at the cataloging job I answered questions about in this survey and then after 7 years had a baby and went to part-time, so basically continued my same job there but in less time and more dependence on volunteers to help get the work done."

In general, there is a sense among some that, while LIS skills are valuable and readily adaptable to other fields, much of what attracted librarians to LIS work in the first place is going by the boards. As workplace flexibility erodes, the job market grows more specialized, and provisional jobs become more prevalent, librarians are looking for employment in other information fields. This represents, conceivably, an existential threat to the profession.

To combat this threat, some librarians expressed the opinion the profession needs to define professional boundaries and generally make the case for itself more actively. One public librarian in a rural library system felt the profession in general and herself in particular ill-served by the lack of a more formal division of labor between paraprofessionals and support staff, on the one hand, and holders of the MLS, on the other. "My current position was once held by someone without an MLS. The job description was re-written so it would require the MLS and so that I could be

hired." But even then the job description was not re-written, in her view, in a way to reflect her status as an LIS graduate. "[T]he primary duties" remained "those of a technician. My boss at the time actually did me a disservice as a result. I have been unable to progress in my career or find employment elsewhere because I lack the experience required by MLS positions, unless I take an entry-level position. This would mean a significant salary decrease." Lack of a clear boundary between work appropriate to support staff and that suitable to those with formal LIS training led to a situation in which she had not been able to re-skill to keep up with developments in the profession.

As a result her possibilities for advancement had been severely limited. "In my current work environment, some professional responsibilities are given to those with no degree at all, such as cataloging and bibliographic instruction. I feel that roles are reversed. The only opportunity I will have for advancement is when my director retires in another three years, and I have already been waiting for that position for eight years. However, I feel unprepared to step into the position since I have had no opportunity to gain any supervisory experience." This situation was not the fault, or not only the fault of this librarian's particular context; the profession also bore a responsibility for not insisting on a more rigorous definition of what it meant to be a holder of an LIS degree, especially in terms of which workplace tasks that qualified one to perform (and which tasks from which it ought to provide exemption). "I feel that the profession should more clearly define job roles, specifying which duties should be performed by someone with an MLS, and which duties should be performed by paraprofessionals and support staff without degrees." She concluded

143

by saying that "Otherwise, it hurts those of us with an MLS who can't progress in their careers if we are doing work that should be done by support staff. We also have a problem in our area of not finding qualified staff if we have a job opening. Very few people in my area have an MLS."

5.14   Limitations/Future Research Opportunities

The power of this study's central insight that craft is of central importance to librarian job satisfaction is undercut somewhat by the fact that what constitutes craft in LIS work remains something of a black box. Some conditions which encourage craft are known, such as smaller organization size, having flexible hours, and having to perform fewer routine tasks. This fact can be instructive in providing specific recommendations to augment librarian worker satisfaction. And this and previous LIS job satisfaction studies do provide some insight as to the kinds of work that have a greater craft component. That reference librarians would make on balance for happier workers than their counterparts in technical services makes sense from a craft perspective. Whereas reference librarians often work on discrete, whole problems (patron questions) the resolution of which may be readily seen, cataloguers are working on a much smaller piece of a much larger project, and their contribution to the whole must be harder to discern. Similarly, craft makes sense of why working with new technologies might correlate with job satisfaction as it has in previous studies. As with Sennett's Greek bakery parable, when machines are constructed to remove task difficulty, craft work migrates from rank-and-file workers to those workers who design and repair the machines.

144

But in terms of being able to describe the specific types of work that librarians find most "craft-like" and rewarding, it is difficult to be more specific and craft remains something of a black box. Similarly, the ways in which technologies displace of librarians does not emerge clearly from the WILIS data and could be the topic of future qualitative research. is sufficiently This research has shown that craft and professional achievement is the single most important factor in librarian job satisfaction, but craft work in an LIS setting appears only in outline. This is largely a consequence of the use of survey research, the author would contend, and it represents a blind spot of the study, but also a significant opportunity for future research. Statistical analysis was necessary to establish the importance of craft, and that fact almost necessitated a survey. That accomplished, future studies with more appropriate qualitative research methods, such as semi-structured interviews and focus groups, may be undertaken to drill down and answer the question of what craft work looks like in an LIS context. In addition, future research should include a more rigorous breakdown of craft by function/setting/job title as a way of better isolating sources of craft in LIS work. The researcher very much views this dissertation as a first step in a larger project examining craft in LIS.

The bluntness of the survey as a research tool is likewise responsible for another shortcoming of the present study, alluded to in the race/ethnicity section of the data analysis chapter (4.8) Namely, with LIS having a problem attracting ethnic minorities to the field, more research needs to be done into their experience in LIS. And a job satisfaction survey with 1,700 variables cannot go very deep into the

specific concerns of special populations. This represents another major opportunity for future qualitative research efforts.

The study is necessarily geographically limited as well. Although North Carolina LIS graduates scattered around the country and the world, three-quarters settled in the southeastern United States with fully 57 percent working in North Carolina and nine percent in Virginia (which boasts no ALA-accredited LIS graduate program). One could not, therefore, generalize nationally from this sample.

5.15   Discussion

This study built on previous LIS job satisfaction by examining both work-related and non-work-related variables impact on job satisfaction and by the introduction of craft into the conversation. The overall picture that emerged was simultaneously encouraging and disconcerting. It was familiar to the extent that librarians, by and large, remain a very satisfied in their jobs. It was disconcerting to the extent that it showed a profession very much in transition and librarians' increasingly anxious about their future. On the one hand, increasing workloads including more niggling administrative tasks appeared to be keeping librarians away from the higher order tasks they thought of as their real work. The overwork problem was real enough that full-time work actually correlated negatively with job satisfaction. Worse than being overworked was the prospect of having to eke out a living with part-time or contingent jobs.

In a study with so many variables and findings, it can be hard to isolate a central theme or themes. In this case, however, the primacy of the work itself to

librarians had so much explanatory power that it could not be ignored. Starting with the fact that Craft and professional Achievement was the best predictor of job satisfaction, this basic fact could also go a long way toward explaining such diverse phenomena as why full-time work contributed to unhappiness with work; why pay did not register as significant; why academic librarians reported being uniquely alienated; and even why co-workers mattered to the extent that they did. If there is any lesson to be taken from this study for the future of LIS workplaces, then, it is this: Librarians are happy in their work almost precisely to the extent that they are connected to it and can see its results. Anything that takes away from this outcome threatens to deprive librarians of what made them enter the profession in the first place and what has constituted contentment in their work.

The central insight of this dissertation that craft is the best predictor of job satisfaction suggests some practical measures that LIS managers can take to improve their worker's happiness in their work. The first among these is that managers need to make sure librarians know how they are contributing to the overall operation of the organization. This appears to be easier to do in smaller libraries, in which workers are performing a larger part of a smaller operation and are therefore better able to discern their contribution. In larger organizations, it may be necessary for managers to make explicit—say in a semi-annual informal meeting—to individual units and workers on a regular basis why exactly the work they are doing is important and how it contributes the organization's overall goals. It is likely that this exercise would be useful to managers for other reasons since spelling out exactly why and how a given worker is useful could be helpful in eliminating slack and

providing workers with more meaningful roles in instances where their usefulness to operations was not readily apparent. Such a strategy, it seems, would make an organization more efficient in addition to making workers more satisfied.

One situation in which workers seem especially prone to feel disconnected from their work is when they feel their immediate supervisors do not adequately understand what they do and cannot provide useful direction. This problem was especially acute in primary and secondary schools where librarians are rarely supervised directly by other LIS professionals. In a situation in which an LIS professional finds him or herself supervised by a non-LIS professional, or by an LIS professional unfamiliar with their particular area of practice, it may be well for the librarian to take the initiative. In the case of the school librarian, such action could take the form of spelling out how specific tasks contribute to their fulfilling their role in the school and proposing to one's superiors concentrating on those tasks. In such a case, of course, there would need to be evidence, either in the form of scholarly literature or an ad hoc study conducted at the library, that the proposed tasks actually performed the function they are supposed to.

Another typical instance in which LIS graduates report a sense of disconnection from work is when they feel they are unable to perform the job for which they were trained/signed on for. This is a particularly acute problem in the cases of academic librarians who have very specific training they feel is not put to use and of library managers who feel they must keep performing routine tasks even as they move up the career ladder. In the case of librarians who feel removed from their area of expertise, there would appear to be no easy solution beyond either

seeking a more suitable fit or retooling with new skills more suitable for their present job. In the case of managers, it does seem that a more meaningful distinction could be made profession-wide for what constitutes professional versus paraprofessional work. Although given the exigencies of work in large and small organizations alike, it is hard to see how such a rigid distinction could be enforced.

There is, truthfully, no end to the number of more or less practical recommendations one could make for librarians based on just the conclusions found here. But given the diversity of LIS workplaces, experiences, and practices, it is hard seeing any of them implemented in any kind of systematic way. In the end, what seems most important in this study is the fact that information workers need not all become mechanics, per Crawford, in order to realize their potential in their work. Information work can be practiced as a craft, and librarians apparently do so all the time. And loath though the researcher is to suggest that those LIS workers who are dissatisfied with their job take responsibility for their happiness, it does seem like the best recommendations that could come from this study are those that could be made at the individual rather than at the organizational level. One need not become a plumber. One can find meaning in information work. This is great news. And it can be a useful exercise, if not a cure-all, for individual librarians to take stock of where they see the results of their work most clearly and to communicate to superiors what would make their work more meaningful. It is hoped, meanwhile, that further research into what constitutes craft in an LIS context should make such assessments easier in the future.

APPENDIX I: KEY DEFINITIONS

Academic Librarian: Librarians working in a university setting.

Breadwinner: One whose earnings contribute to the maintenance of her or his family's desired standard of living.

Craft: The definition of craft employed here comprises two parts. The first is the wish to perform one's work well independent of extrinsic factors or influences. The second defining feature of craft is the desire of the worker to create a quality final outcome or product which can be certified as such by objective standards.

Information Worker: One whose primary job is to create, edit, write, retrieve, or otherwise process data.

LIS: The field of Library and Information Science, inclusive of archival science.

Job Satisfaction: The level of contentment with one's employment. As a way of organizing thinking about job satisfaction, this dissertation follows the widely used Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) devised by Industrial/Organizational Psychologist Paul E. Spector. The JSS recognizes nine discrete components of job satisfaction: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication (Spector, 1985).

Professional achievement: The realization of one's potential in one's work career. A concept related to craft but one which also encompasses career advancement and continuing education. The distinction with craft is that craft relates to mastering a specific skill or trade whereas professional achievement also emphasizes upward mobility through a profession or organization.

Primary Breadwinner: One whose earnings are the main source of support for their dependents.

School Librarians/Media Coordinators: Librarians working in primary or secondary schools.

Special Librarians: Those librarians who do not work in university, school, or public libraries; especially those working in legal, business, museum, or cultural heritage settings.

APPENDIX II: BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARIANSHIP IN NORTH CAROLINA

A unified theory of North Carolina librarianship—one that explains the state's high numbers of library schools, libraries, and acknowledged library leaders–seems more likely. And this is certainly relevant to this dissertation insofar as it is based on data generated by the alumni of North Carolina library schools. The components of this theory would include, first, a state self-image as the "progressive" southern state. Through no virtue of its own, North Carolina was not as heavily implicated in the plantation economy as its neighbors, South Carolina and Virginia. Poor soils, poor ports, and impassible rivers rendered the eastern half of the state a swamp until the 20th century. Having few physical advantages, NC placed an early premium on "internal improvements," early republic parlance for roads, canals, railroads, swamp drainings, etc., and state-funded economic development.

This approach paid dividends in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as North Carolina became an industrial powerhouse. It was the worldwide center for textile, tobacco and, to a lesser extent, furniture manufacture (Hall et al., 1988). In the 1920's, North Carolina became the Good Roads state, which it remains: Lavishly paved and maintained road brought the market to every corner of the state.

From the 1880s to the 1920s, the state undertook a graded-school revolution which transformed the state's education system into a petit bourgeois incubator. What had prevailed in North Carolina, and indeed the rest of the nation, prior to 1880 was the so-called common school, the sort of one-room schoolhouse made familiar to later generations of Americans by television shows such as Little House on the

152

Prairie. As their name suggested, common schools were very much schools created for and by their communities. In the first place, it was the local townsfolk who contracted the schoolmaster. Furthermore, the rhythms of the school day and year were those of the community. Inconsistent attendance was less of a hindrance to education because what schools taught was different then. There was no progress from one grade to the next. Children of every age shared the same room. And the emphasis was less on the acquisition of critical faculties than on rote memorization and moral lessons. Basic literacy and numeracy aside, the central purpose of common schools was the formation of upstanding members for the community. In the words of one common-school advocate, their goal was to make good citizens. Unhappily for its advocates, such a program was not exactly designed with the New South man in mind. If the New South were to realize the promise of its name, it needed to build different types schools to turn out a different type of Southerner, one geared toward acquisition and focused on the main chance. The schools that evolved to fill this need were so-called graded schools. Several hundred such schools were built in North Carolina from 1880 to 1920, and they inculcated students with a whole different range of values. First, there was the notion that a student is supposed to advance through the grades in the same way that an ideal New South man was to advance through the ranks of society. The skills that one acquired were different, too. Gone were the moralistic teachings of the old primer. In their place came new lessons emphasizing math and "real life" skills. Corn and tomato clubs within the schools taught students how to turn a profit and become "business farmers." And home demonstration clubs taught boys and girls the virtues of canning

foods, digging latrines, and wearing shoes to avoid ringworm. Whereas common

schools had been about duty to kin and community, the new schools were all about

personal advancement and individual self-sufficiency (Leloudis, 1996).

Public and school libraries are part and parcel of the Progressive political

program, the manifest success of which gave generations of North Carolina

policymakers an approach that could be described as "Build it and they will come."

Got a backwards region? Build a road into it, give them some schools. Give people

the means by which they may pull themselves out. The people who ruled the nation

and the state were a group radically different from their fathers. This was a

generation that had an unshakable belief in the possibility of progress, a generation

with an almost scary confidence in their power to bring about something close to a

utopia. Having been educated in graded schools and at the reorganized UNC to

believe in individuals' power to shape their own destiny as well as that of the world in

which they lived, Louis Round Wilson, patron saint of North Carolina librarianship,

perfectly embodied this ethos. In Wilson's conception, libraries were no mere

repositories of knowledge. They were forces for change. Public libraries were the

"people's university," in Wilson's phrase. Through their proliferation, "the people,"

through dint of sheer will, could better their existence. Today, one still sees this kind

of exuberant optimism from the more strident information-age evangelicals, but most

people with any understanding of twentieth century history are more wary of the

unintended consequences of "progress" in its various guises. Wilson and his

generation had not been infected with that cynicism. In libraries, Wilson saw

people's universities which would free the masses from ignorance and give them the

154

means to conquer their circumstances. In this context, the need to establish libraries and therefore library schools became a moral imperative.

The inadequacy of such solutions for more intractable problems like ending Jim Crow became evident as the state tried to integrate in the 1960s and seventies. Throwing people a lifeline a la the Pupil Assignment Act and the Pearsall Plan was not, to say the least, equal to the task of leveling the playing field for people who have been systematically and historically excluded from access to the perquisites of citizenship for centuries (Chafe, 1981).

If the Progressive impulse defined southern librarianship, so too did race and sex in obvious and non-obvious ways. First, because of Jim Crow, black libraries and librarianship unfolded on a parallel track to white libraries and librarianship. One unintended consequence of this exclusion was that it allowed cultural space for African-American librarianship to develop that might not have been there had librarianship been monopolized by whites (Cecelski, 1994).

White supremacy also played a critical role in the origins of Southern state archives. Counterintuitively, perhaps—given a nearly unblemished centuries-long record of not doing things first—southern states were the first to establish state archives. What was more, Alabama (!) led the way in 1902. North Carolina followed four years later. How could this be? According to Fitzhugh Brundage in The Southern Past, it was because white southerners wanted to put the imprimatur of the state on a specific version of southern states' pasts which included but was not limited to: A view of slavery as (at worst) a necessary evil, of the Civil War as a noble anti-imperialist struggle, and of Reconstruction governments as hopelessly

155

correct and ineffective (rationale for Jim Crowism). Happily, the archives have outgrown their original function. But their evolution points up to the (always relative) blessing of African-American librarians being able to enshrine their own narratives of the past (Brundage, 2005).

It is no secret that librarianship has been a feminized profession in the South and elsewhere. As with teachers, there were economic reasons for this. North Carolina, needing an army of teachers to run the thousands of new state schools constructed at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries yet short of funds, settled on women teacher in part because they could be paid less. School and public libraries followed the same logic. Likewise, state-funded hospitals in need of nurses. Nevertheless, libraries were often an avenue of empowerment for women and not just a feminized professional ghetto. Anastasia Sims in the Power of Femininity in the New South argued that in North Carolina, clubwomen were often the prime movers behind the establishment of community libraries. An affinity for literature, arts, and what Sims terms (for reasons unclear to me) "Culture with a capital 'C,'" moreover, comported with Progressive-Era ideals of womanhood, which deemed the stewardship of civilization—usually through the proper raising of future (male) leaders but it also extending to librarianship—women's work. So it comported with the mores of the day, and it allowed women who might otherwise not to play a public role (Sims, 1997).

APPENDIX III: JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY ITEMS

	JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology University of South Florida Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly
	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.					
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	6	1	2	3	4	5
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	6	1	2	3	4	5
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	6	1	2	3	4	5
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	6	1	2	3	4	5
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	6	1	2	3	4	5
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	6	1	2	3	4	5
7	I like the people I work with.	6	1	2	3	4	5
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	6	1	2	3	4	5
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	6	1	2	3	4	5
10	Raises are too few and far between.	6	1	2	3	4	5
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	6	1	2	3	4	5
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	6	1	2	3	4	5
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	6	1	2	3	4	5
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.		1	2	3	4	5

157

			Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	6	1	2	3	4	5
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	6	1	2	3	4	5
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	6	1	2	3	4	5
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	6	1	2	3	4	5

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	6	1	2	3	4	5
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	6	1	2	3	4	5
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	6	1	2	3	4	5
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	6	1	2	3	4	5
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	6	1	2	3	4	5
24	I have too much to do at work.	6	1	2	3	4	5
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	6	1	2	3	4	5
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	6	1	2	3	4	5
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	6	1	2	3	4	5
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	6	1	2	3	4	5
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	6	1	2	3	4	5

30	I like my supervisor.	6	1	2	3	4	5
31	I have too much paperwork.	6	1	2	3	4	5
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	6	1	2	3	4	5
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	6	1	2	3	4	5
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	6	1	2	3	4	5
35	My job is enjoyable.	6	1	2	3	4	5
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	6	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX IV: PEARSON CORRELATIONS: JOB SATISFACTION AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Correlations

		jobsat	school	public	academic	special
jobsat	Pearson Correlation	1	.009	-.002	-.040	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.700	.942	.082	.456
	N	1899	1899	1899	1899	1899
school	Pearson Correlation	.009	1	-.173	-.221	-.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.700		.000	.000	.000
	N	1899	2638	2638	2638	2638
public	Pearson Correlation	-.002	-.173	1	-.166	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.942	.000		.000	.000
	N	1899	2638	2638	2638	2638
academic	Pearson Correlation	-.040	-.221	-.166	1	-.146
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.082	.000	.000		.000
	N	1899	2638	2638	2638	2638
special	Pearson Correlation	-.017	-.153	-.115	-.146	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.456	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1899	2638	2638	2638	2638

		Annualized Salary	F1c. How many people work at your company or institution (not just your library	Age	Duration of Current Job	female	A19.2: What is your race: minority?
Annualized Salary	Pearson Correlation	1	.037	.071	.139	-.170	.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.111	.002	.000	.000	.618
	N		1859	1856	1854	1249	1859	1851
F1c. How many people work at your company or institution (not just your library	Pearson Correlation	.037	1	-.109	-.012	-.109	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.111		.000	.657	.000	.012
	N	1856	1985	1979	1336	1985	1976
Age	Pearson Correlation	.071	-.109	1	.435	.066	-.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000		.000	.001	.000
	N	1854	1979	2597	1378	2596	2585
Duration of Current Job	Pearson Correlation	.139	-.012	.435	1	.022	-.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.657	.000		.412	.066
	N	1249	1336	1378	1384	1384	1376
female	Pearson Correlation	-.170	-.109	.066	.022	1	-.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.412		.151
	N	1859	1985	2596	1384	2612	2600
A19.2: What is your race: minority?	Pearson Correlation	.012	.057	-.116	-.050	-.028	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.618	.012	.000	.066	.151	
	N	1851	1976	2585	1376	2600	2602

Correlations

		fulltime	hlthinsemp	otherins	f28fr	f28hr	f29fr
fulltime	Pearson Correlation	1	.526	.457	.511	-.014	.532
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.549	.000
	N	1983	1983	1983	1931	1916	1929
hlthinsemp	Pearson Correlation	.526	1	.743	.496	.014	.440
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.538	.000
	N	1983	2638	2638	1931	1916	1929
otherins	Pearson Correlation	.457	.743	1	.493	.006	.428
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.807	.000
	N	1983	2638	2638	1931	1916	1929
f28fr	Pearson Correlation	.511	.496	.493	1	-.033	.485
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.151	.000
	N	1931	1931	1931	1931	1916	1927
f28hr	Pearson Correlation	-.014	.014	.006	-.033	1	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.549	.538	.807	.151		.710
	N	1916	1916	1916	1916	1916	1914
f29fr	Pearson Correlation	.532	.440	.428	.485	-.009	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.710	
	N	1929	1929	1929	1927	1914	1929

Correlations

		f29gr	f30dr	f30er	f31br	f31cr	f31dr
f29gr	Pearson Correlation	1	.114	-.121	-.064	-.065	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.005	.005	.000
	N	1930	1925	1924	1919	1919	1919
f30dr	Pearson Correlation	.114	1	.129	.124	.164	.112
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	1925	1925	1923	1918	1917	1918
f30er	Pearson Correlation	-.121	.129	1	.173	.183	.521
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	1924	1923	1924	1917	1917	1917
f31br	Pearson Correlation	-.064	.124	.173	1	.293	.246
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	1919	1918	1917	1919	1918	1919
f31cr	Pearson Correlation	-.065	.164	.183	.293	1	.274
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	1919	1917	1917	1918	1919	1918
f31dr	Pearson Correlation	-.080	.112	.521	.246	.274	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1919	1918	1917	1919	1918	1919

Correlations

		f31fr	supervise	careeropp	coworker1	coworker2	F51A: I feel more pressure to continually learn new skills
f31fr	Pearson Correlation	1	.008	.118	.056	.076	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.716	.000	.015	.001	.668
	N	1919	1919	1890	1918	1918	1887
supervise	Pearson Correlation	.008	1	.064	.121	.092	.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.716		.005	.000	.000	.000
	N	1919	1983	1895	1978	1978	1893
careeropp	Pearson Correlation	.118	.064	1	.133	.148	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005		.000	.000	.970
	N	1890	1895	1895	1895	1895	1880
coworker1	Pearson Correlation	.056	.121	.133	1	.653	.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.000	.000		.000	.096
	N	1918	1978	1895	1978	1978	1893
coworker2	Pearson Correlation	.076	.092	.148	.653	1	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000		.501
	N	1918	1978	1895	1978	1978	1893
F51A: I feel more pressure to continually learn new skills	Pearson Correlation	.010	.095	-.001	.038	.015	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.668	.000	.970	.096	.501	
	N	1887	1893	1880	1893	1893	1893

Correlations

		F51B: I am more concerned about my job security	F52A: To perform more new tasks	F52B: To perform more difficult tasks	F52C: To perform more high tech tasks	F52D: To perform a wider variety of tasks	F52E: To delegate more of my tasks to assistants
F51B: I am more concerned about my job security	Pearson Correlation	1	.099	.127	.067	.076	-.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.003	.001	.173
	N	1893	1886	1886	1885	1885	1882
F52A: To perform more new tasks	Pearson Correlation	.099	1	.521	.397	.522	.190
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	1886	1886	1886	1885	1885	1882
F52B: To perform more difficult tasks	Pearson Correlation	.127	.521	1	.353	.393	.185
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	1886	1886	1886	1885	1885	1882
F52C: To perform more high tech tasks	Pearson Correlation	.067	.397	.353	1	.421	.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	1885	1885	1885	1885	1885	1882
F52D: To perform a wider variety of tasks	Pearson Correlation	.076	.522	.393	.421	1	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	1885	1885	1885	1885	1885	1882
F52E: To delegate more of my tasks to assistants	Pearson Correlation	-.031	.190	.185	.119	.192	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.173	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1882	1882	1882	1882	1882	1882

Correlations

		F53A: To perform more routine tasks	F53B: To work harder	F53C: To perform more managerial functions	F53D: To assume a greater leadership role	F53E: To perform more financial tasks	F53F: To perform more tasks once done by assistants
F53A: To perform more routine tasks	Pearson Correlation	1	.151	.023	-.079	.054	.369
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.312	.001	.019	.000
	N	1871	1870	1869	1869	1869	1869
F53B: To work harder	Pearson Correlation	.151	1	.297	.273	.234	.160
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	1870	1871	1869	1869	1869	1869
F53C: To perform more managerial functions	Pearson Correlation	.023	.297	1	.623	.428	.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.312	.000		.000	.000	.030
	N	1869	1869	1870	1869	1869	1869
F53D: To assume a greater leadership role	Pearson Correlation	-.079	.273	.623	1	.384	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000		.000	.972
	N	1869	1869	1869	1870	1870	1870
F53E: To perform more financial tasks	Pearson Correlation	.054	.234	.428	.384	1	.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	1869	1869	1869	1870	1870	1870
F53F: To perform more tasks once done by assistants	Pearson Correlation	.369	.160	.050	-.001	.103	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.030	.972	.000	
	N	1869	1869	1869	1870	1870	1870

Correlations

		married	children	breadwinner	livebetter	craft
married	Pearson Correlation	1	.377	-.490	.457	.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2605	2223	1894	1894	1894
children	Pearson Correlation	.377	1	-.282	.231	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.511
	N	2223	2226	1804	1804	1799
breadwinner	Pearson Correlation	-.490	-.282	1	-.865	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.680
	N	1894	1804	1898	1898	1888
livebetter	Pearson Correlation	.457	.231	-.865	1	.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.181
	N	1894	1804	1898	1898	1888
craft	Pearson Correlation	.101	.016	-.009	.031	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.511	.680	.181	
	N	1894	1799	1888	1888	1898

APPENDIX V: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: JOB SATISFACTION WITH TYPE OF LIBRARY, AGE CATEGORIES, AND CURRENT TENURE CATEGORIES

Descriptives: Job Satisfaction by Age Categories

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
under 50 years of age	937	3.1871	.62215	.02032	3.1472	3.2270	1.00	4.00
between 50-62	837	3.1920	.60020	.02075	3.1512	3.2327	1.00	4.00
over 62 years of age	119	3.2969	.55369	.05076	3.1964	3.3974	1.00	4.00
Total	1893	3.1962	.60867	.01399	3.1687	3.2236	1.00	4.00

Analysis of Variance (oneway): Job Satisfaction and Age Categories

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.299	2	.650	1.755	.173
Within Groups	699.637	1890	.370		
Total	700.937	1892			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:jobsat

	(I) agecat	(J) agecat	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	under 50 years of age	between 50-62	-.00483	.02894	.985	-.0727	.0630
		over 62 years of age	-.10980	.05921	.152	-.2487	.0291
	between 50-62	under 50 years of age	.00483	.02894	.985	-.0630	.0727

		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	over 62 years of age	-.10496	.05961	.183	-.2448	.0348
over 62 years of age	under 50 years of age	.10980	.05921	.152	-.0291	.2487
	between 50-62	.10496	.05961	.183	-.0348	.2448
LSD under 50 years of age	between 50-62	-.00483	.02894	.867	-.0616	.0519
	over 62 years of age	-.10980	.05921	.064	-.2259	.0063
between 50-62	under 50 years of age	.00483	.02894	.867	-.0519	.0616
	over 62 years of age	-.10496	.05961	.078	-.2219	.0119
over 62 years of age	under 50 years of age	.10980	.05921	.064	-.0063	.2259
	between 50-62	.10496	.05961	.078	-.0119	.2219

Descriptives: Job Satisfaction by Current Job Tenure

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
less than 5 years	653	3.2190	.62459	.02444	3.1710	3.2670	1.00	4.00
5-10 years	368	3.1540	.62287	.03247	3.0901	3.2178	1.00	4.00
10-15 years	124	3.1882	.63508	.05703	3.0753	3.3011	1.00	4.00
15-20 years	72	3.2083	.51712	.06094	3.0868	3.3298	2.00	4.00
20 or more years	83	3.2610	.61606	.06762	3.1265	3.3956	1.00	4.00
Total	1300	3.1997	.61905	.01717	3.1661	3.2334	1.00	4.00

Analysis of Variance (one way) Job Satisfaction and Current Job Tenure

jobsat

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.346	4	.337	.878	.476

Within Groups			496.454	1295	.383		
Total			497.800	1299			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:jobsat

	(I) tenurecat	(J) tenurecat	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	less than 5 years	5-10 years	.06500	.04036	.491	-.0452	.1752
		10-15 years	.03082	.06065	.987	-.1349	.1965
		15-20 years	.01066	.07689	1.000	-.1994	.2207
		20 or more years	-.04205	.07215	.978	-.2391	.1550
	5-10 years	less than 5 years	-.06500	.04036	.491	-.1752	.0452
		10-15 years	-.03419	.06429	.984	-.2098	.1414
		15-20 years	-.05435	.07979	.961	-.2723	.1636
		20 or more years	-.10706	.07524	.613	-.3126	.0985
	10-15 years	less than 5 years	-.03082	.06065	.987	-.1965	.1349
		5-10 years	.03419	.06429	.984	-.1414	.2098
		15-20 years	-.02016	.09174	.999	-.2708	.2304
		20 or more years	-.07287	.08781	.921	-.3127	.1670
	15-20 years	less than 5 years	-.01066	.07689	1.000	-.2207	.1994
		5-10 years	.05435	.07979	.961	-.1636	.2723
		10-15 years	.02016	.09174	.999	-.2304	.2708
		20 or more years	-.05271	.09972	.984	-.3251	.2197
	20 or more years	less than 5 years	.04205	.07215	.978	-.1550	.2391
		5-10 years	.10706	.07524	.613	-.0985	.3126
		10-15 years	.07287	.08781	.921	-.1670	.3127
		15-20 years	.05271	.09972	.984	-.2197	.3251
LSD	less than 5	5-10 years	.06500	.04036	.107	-.0142	.1442

years	10-15 years	.03082	.06065	.611	-.0882	.1498
	15-20 years	.01066	.07689	.890	-.1402	.1615
	20 or more years	-.04205	.07215	.560	-.1836	.0995
5-10 years	less than 5 years	-.06500	.04036	.107	-.1442	.0142
	10-15 years	-.03419	.06429	.595	-.1603	.0919
	15-20 years	-.05435	.07979	.496	-.2109	.1022
	20 or more years	-.10706	.07524	.155	-.2547	.0405
10-15 years	less than 5 years	-.03082	.06065	.611	-.1498	.0882
	5-10 years	.03419	.06429	.595	-.0919	.1603
	15-20 years	-.02016	.09174	.826	-.2001	.1598
	20 or more years	-.07287	.08781	.407	-.2451	.0994
15-20 years	less than 5 years	-.01066	.07689	.890	-.1615	.1402
	5-10 years	.05435	.07979	.496	-.1022	.2109
	10-15 years	.02016	.09174	.826	-.1598	.2001
	20 or more years	-.05271	.09972	.597	-.2483	.1429
20 or more years	less than 5 years	.04205	.07215	.560	-.0995	.1836
	5-10 years	.10706	.07524	.155	-.0405	.2547
	10-15 years	.07287	.08781	.407	-.0994	.2451
	15-20 years	.05271	.09972	.597	-.1429	.2483

APPENDIX VI:COLLINEARITY DIAGNOSTICS: JOB SATISFACTION AND CRAFT AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT(FINAL STEPWISE MODEL DIMENSIONS

Collinearity Diagnostics

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Craft (Variance Proportions)
10	1	8.743	1.000	.00	.00
	2	.765	3.380	.00	.00
	3	.579	3.886	.00	.00
	4	.245	5.980	.00	.00
	5	.197	6.666	.00	.00
	6	.188	6.825	.00	.00
	7	.120	8.519	.00	.00
	8	.068	11.315	.00	.00
	9	.043	14.195	.03	.18
	10	.040	14.733	.03	.12
	11	.011	28.420	.93	.70

REFERENCES

Abbott, Andrew. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

----------------. "Professionalization and the Future of Librarianship," *Library Trends* 46 (Winter 1998): 430-43.

Albritton, Rosie L. " The Founding and Prevalence of African-American Social Libraries and Historical Societies, 1828-1918." M.T. Tucker (Ed.), *Untold Stories: Civil Rights, Libraries, and Black Librarianship*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Graduate School, 1998.

Aryee, Samuel. "An Examination of the Moderating Influence of Breadwinner Role Salience on the Pay-Life Satisfaction Relationship." *Human Relations* 52 (1999): 1279-90.

Bartlett, C. 1998. "The relationship between superiors' self-disclosure, offers of help, offers of cooperation, frequency of contact, trust, and subordinates' job satisfaction" [study at Wake County Public Library]. *North Carolina Libraries* v. 56 no. 4 (Winter): 155-7.

Barley, S. R. and G. Kunda. "Itinerant professionals: Technical contractors in a knowledge economy." in J. O'Toole and E. E. Lawler, Eds. *America at Work: Choices and Challenges*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Beer, Michael. "Organizational Size and Job Satisfaction." *Academy of Management Journal* 7 (1964): 34-44.

Beniger, James R. *The Control Revolution: Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Society.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Berry, John N., III, "Great Work, Genuine Problems," *Library Journal* 26 (October 2007).

Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America.* New York: Norton, 1976.

Braverman, Harry. *Labor and Monopoly Capitalism: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Brooks, Terrence A. "The Model of Science and Scientific Models in Librarianship." *Library Trends* (Fall 1989):237-49.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005. Chapter 3, "Archiving White Memory," 105-137.

Carmichael, James V., Jr. "Southern Librarianship and the Culture of Resentment," *Libraries & Culture* 40 (Summer 2005): 324-52.

Cecelski, David. *Along Freedom Road: Hyde County, North Carolina, and the Fate of Black Schools in the South.* UNC Press, 1994.

Chafe, William. *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom*. Oxford Press, 1981.

Churchwell Charles. "Racial Integration at the University of Houston: A Personal Perspective, II," in John Mark Tucker, ed. *Untold Stories: Civil Rights, Libraries, and Black Librarianship* (Champaign: Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1998), pp. 1136-140.

Chwe, Steven S. "A comparative Study of Librarians' Job Satisfaction: Cataloguers and Reference Librarians in University Libraries." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4 (1978): 139-43.

Clark, Andrew E. "Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why are Women so Happy at Work?" *Labour Economics* 4 (1997): 341-372.

Clark, Andrew, Andrew Oswald, and Peter Warr. "Is Job Satisfaction U-Shaped in Age?" *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 69 (1996): 57-81.

Collins, R. *The Credential Society*. New York: The Academic Press, 1979.

Crawford, Matthew B. *Shop Class as Soulcraft: An Inquiry into the Value of Work*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2009.

Crowley, Bill. *Rethinking Professional Librarianship: A Fundamental Rethinking*. Westport, Conn., 2008.

Curry, James P., Douglas S. Wakefield, James L. Price and Charles W. Mueller. "On the Causal Ordering of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment." *Academy of Management Journal* 29 (1986): 847-858

Day, Mark Tyler. "Humanizing Information Technology: Cultural Evolution and the Institutionalization of Electronic Text Publishing." In B. Sutton (ed) *Literary texts in an electronic age: Scholarly implications and library services* [papers presented at the 1994 Clinic on Library applications of Data Processing, April 10-12, 1994]: 67-92.

Doeringer, Peter B. and Michael J. Piore. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1985.

Drucker, Peter. . *People and Performance: The Best of Peter Drucker on Management*. Harper and Row, 1977.

-----------. *Peter Drucker on the Profession of Management*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing, 1998.

----------. *The Effective Executive*. New York: Harper, 1967.

Ellig, Bruce R. *The Evolution of Employee Pay and Benefits in the United States*. Arlington, Va.: Kirby Lithographic Co., 2005.

Eva, Nicole and Nancy McCormack, "How Happy are You?" White paper, 2008.

Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How it's Transforming Work, Community and Everyday Life.* New York: Basic Books, 2003.

Garrison, Dee*. Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876-1920* 2nd ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Glasgow, Bonnie Jean Loyd. "Job Satisfaction among Academic Librarians" Ph.D. dissertation. North Texas State University, 1982.

Gordon, Rachel Singer, and Sarah Nesbeitt, "Who We Are, Where We're Going: A Report from the Front," *Library Journal* 36 (15 May 1999).

Goulding, A. 1991. Managing the job satisfaction of public library paraprofessionals in a
changing climate [bibliographical essay*]. Public Library Journal* v. 6 (July/August): 93-9.

_____. 1995. I want to work with books and people: the job satisfaction of public library support staff [survey in nine public libraries]. *Public Library Journal* v. 10 (May/June): 71-4.

Graham, Patterson Toby. "Segregation and Civil Rights in Alabama's Public Libraries, 1918-1965," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Alabama), 1998, 309 pp.

Gutman, Herbert. *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History*. New York: Vintage, 1977.

Haber, Samuel*. The Quest for Authority and Honor in the American Professions, 1750-1900.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Hanson, Sandra L., and Douglas M. Sloane. "Young Children and Job Satisfaction." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 54 (1992): 799-811.

Herzberg, Frederick. "One more time: how do you motivate employees?" Harvard Business Review, vol. 46, iss. 1, pp. 53–62: 1968.

-----------. *One More Time: How do You Motivate Employees*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Classics, 2008.

Hodson, Randy. "Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Dissatisfied?" *The Sociological Quarterly* 20 (1989): 385-99.

Huseman, R., Hatfield, J., and Miles, E. "A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct. Academy of Management Review. 1987. 12(2). pp. 232-234

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. Research in Organizational Behavior, 19, 151–188.
Kimball, Bruce A. *The True Professional Idea in America: A History*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1996.

Kuo, Y.-F., & Chen, L.-S. "Individual demographic differences and job satisfaction among information technology personnel: An empirical study in Taiwan.*" International Journal of Management*, 21(2004): 221-231.

Lasch, Christopher. "Technology and its Critics: The Degradation of the Practical Arts," in S.E. Goldberg and C.R. Strain, eds., *Technological Change and the Transformation of America.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Lim, Sook. "Job Satisfaction of Information Technology Workers in Academic Libraries." *Library & Information Science Research* 30 (2008): 115-21.

Lipscomb, Carolyn E. "Race and Librarianship," *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 92 (July 2004): 299-301.

Mahoney, Joseph T. "The Relevance of Chester I. Barnard's Teaching to Contemporary Management Education." *Integrated Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior* 5 (2002): 159-72.

Maslow, Abraham. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Pearson, 1997.

McGregor, Douglas. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

McMullin, Julie Ann, and Victor W. Marshall (Eds.) *Aging and Working in the New Economy: Changing Career Structures in Small IT Firms.* Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2010.

Mirfakhrai, Mohammad. "Correlates of Job Satisfaction among Academic Librarians in the United States," *Journal of Library Administration* 14, no. 1 (1991): 117.

Mizrachi, Y. "The knowledge smiths: librarianship as craftsmanship of knowledge." *New Library World*, 99 (43) (1998): 176-84.

O'Brien, Gordon E., and Peter Dowling. "Age and Job Satisfaction." *Australian Psychologist* 16 (1981): 49-61.

O'Toole, James and Edward E. Lawler III. The New American Workplace. Palgrave McMillan: New York, 2005.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Professions and Social Structure," *Social Forces* 17 (May 1939): 457-67.

Pedhazur, E.J. *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1997.

van Reenan, J. (1998). "Librarians at Work: Are We as Satisfied as other Workers?" *Information Outlook*, 2(7) (1998): 18-27

Rogers, Frank Bradway. "Down on the Farm*." Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 73 (January 1985): 15-20.

Rogers, Stacy J., and Dee C. May. "Spillover between Marital Quality and Job Satisfaction: Long Term Patterns and Gender Differences." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65 (May 2003): 482-95.

St. Lifer, Evan. "Are You Happy in Your Job? LJ's Exclusive Report," *Library Journal* 44 (1 November 1994).

Schneider, M.S. 1991. "Stress and job satisfaction among employees in a public library system with a focus on public service*." Library & Information Science Research* v. 13 (October-December): 385-404.

Sennett, Richard. *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2000.

----------. The Craftsman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Sims, Anastasia. *The Power of Femininity in the New South: women's Organizations and Politics in North Carolina , 1880-1930*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1997.

Spector, P. E. "Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey*." American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13 (1985): 693-713.

Spooner, G. "Establishment of African American Public Library Service in Louisiana," *Louisiana Libraries* 63 (Winter 2001): 23-25.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage, 1966.

Valentine, Patrick. "Mollie Huston Lee: Founder of Raleigh's Public Black Library," *North Carolina Libraries* 56 (Spring 1998): 23-26.

Van Sell, Mary, Arthur P. Brief, and Ramon J. Aldag. "Job Satisfaction among Married Working Women." *Journal of Employment Counseling* 16 (March 1979): 38-42.

Waite, William. "Compiler Construction: Craftsmanship or Engineering." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 1060 (1996): 151-59.

Wheeler, Maurice and Debbie Johnson-Houston. "A Brief History of Library Service to African Americans," *American Libraries* 35 (February 2004): 42-45.

Wiegand, Wayne. *Politics of an Emerging Profession: The American Library Association, 1876-1917* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986).

Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Witt, L. Alan. "Breadwinner vs. Non-Breadwinner Differences in Married Women's Job Satisfaction and Perceptions of Organizational Climate." *Human Relations* 41 (1988): 483-91.