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Introduction
Job satisfaction plays a vitally important role in any employee’s success in a profession. This paper presents results and analysis of a study involving job satisfaction among University System of Georgia academic librarians relative to organizational classification status. One interesting conclusion induced from the research was confirmation of Frederick Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory. While many USG librarians are classified as faculty at their respective institutions, a great percentage of these librarians regarded such status as secondary to their overall job satisfaction. Intrinsic enjoyment of their profession and sense of involvement with the educational mission to their institution counted much more significantly. In addition to reviewing the findings in my research, I will discuss the implications relative to Herzberg’s theory, and offer elucidation as to what ultimately motivates academic librarians in their work.

Literature Review
Adapting Abraham Maslow’s theories of motivation and hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954), Herzberg theorized that job satisfaction is bimodal (Herzberg, 1966). An employee is not satisfied by fulfillment of lower-level needs (e.g., good salary, decent working conditions, and pleasant coworkers): meeting these needs merely decreases dissatisfaction. To truly satisfy employees, higher-level needs must be met. These higher-level needs include responsibility, recognition of achievement, and the nature of the work itself (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). What Herzberg (1966) posited was a theory where satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not points on the same line, but rather distinct attitudinal entities. A variable that tended to increase worker satisfaction did not, necessarily, decrease dissatisfaction. The presence of a variable that tended to increase a worker’s dissatisfaction may have no effect on that same worker’s satisfaction. A library-relevant example may help illuminate this. A librarian may be very happy (satisfied) with her chosen profession and enjoy the challenges and responsibilities of her job. If this librarian is paid a lower-than-expected salary, this would tend to increase the librarian’s dissatisfaction, but the librarian’s overall satisfaction with her chosen profession would be unaffected (Iiacqua, et al., 1995). Herzberg labeled those factors that fulfilled higher-level needs as “motivation” attributes and those factors that related to lower-level need fulfillers as “hygiene” attributes (Herzberg, 1966). Attributes that raised or lowered worker satisfaction (higher-level need fulfillers), in theory, have no relevance to dissatisfiers, those attributes that only affected lower-level needs. A worker may have a great salary, great working conditions, and a fun-loving boss. This environment would have the affect of reducing the worker’s dissatisfaction in employment, but the worker may still have a low level of satisfaction in the nature of the job itself insofar as higher-level needs are not being met (Gaziel, 2001). Satisfaction and dissatisfaction, thus, are not points on the same continuum but are on different planes entirely.

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

The two factors in Herzberg's theory, thus, are motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators include the challenge and nature of the job, the intrinsic pleasure one gets in performing it, and the self-realization that results from its successful performance. These factors give positive satisfaction. The hygiene factors would include salary, benefits, general working conditions, and status – all extrinsic aspects of employment. The hygiene factors are considered maintenance attributes for avoiding dissatisfaction but, in and of themselves, do nothing to promote satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1959). It will be seen that the hygiene factor ‘status’ will have particular bearing on the study at hand.

Despite Herzberg's (1968) assertion that the research underlying his two-factor theory had been replicated 16 times, there has been criticism of his theory since its origin. In particular, some argue that the placing of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on separate conceptual planes is not accurate in light of greater attention paid to individualistic personality traits and the overt assumption in Herzberg's theory that satisfied workers make for more productive workers (King, 1970). Another criticism contends that it is, traditionally, conventional behavior for workers to blame extrinsic factors for their dissatisfaction and credit themselves for their satisfaction. This might lead to viewing the two-factor theory as somewhat a self-fulfilling prophecy (King). Herzberg contended, through his research studies, that factors causing satisfaction and dissatisfaction in workers were dissimilar and, as such, the concepts of satisfaction and dissatisfaction cannot be functional opposites even though they are linguistic opposites (Herzberg, 1966). In regard to worker motivation, the opposite of ‘satisfaction’ is not ‘dissatisfaction.’ The opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction. Correspondingly, the opposite of ‘dissatisfaction’ is not ‘satisfaction’ but no dissatisfaction.

Issues relating to librarian organizational classification, levels of job satisfaction, and role in the educative mission of their institution are prominent topics in academic library literature. Academic librarians are a unique group of employees on a college or university
campus. They are prominently involved in the educative mission of their institution but there is often a “disconnect” between their involvement in that mission and that of their teaching and research faculty colleagues (Christiansen, Stombler, & Thaxton, 2004). As technology has increased and changed, the role of the librarian, particularly the public-service reference librarian, has had to change to keep up with shifting student and teaching faculty needs. These changes can cause greater levels of stress and, concomitantly, lower levels of job satisfaction and motivation (Cardina & Wicks, 2004; Lynch & Verdin, 1983).

Academic librarian job satisfaction and levels of motivation, in themselves, are a topic of many articles and studies through the boom and bust eras of the late 1960s to the 1990s. Generally, librarian satisfaction remains high and as management styles have changed with times to incorporate team-based approaches and participative interaction at all administrative and functional levels in the library organization, librarians’ job satisfaction has risen accordingly (Bengston & Shields, 1985). Self-image, as related to work environment, is another key indicator of job satisfaction, motivation, and sense of place. Librarians who feel respected and appreciated for what they do tend to have higher levels of satisfaction and motivation than those who feel belittled, minimized, or treated as unimportant, ancillary staff (Benedict, 1991; Buschman, 1989; Slagell, 2005).

Larry Hardesty (1995), writing about university culture and the disengagement between teaching faculty and librarians notes, “part of the problem of the acceptance of bibliographic instruction is that it comes from a group that many faculty do not view as peers – librarians” (p. 356). As a general rule, librarians tend to feel underappreciated in the scheme of the university. There tends to be little common ground between teaching faculty and librarians regarding the specific nature of job duties, nature of schedules, and often the nature of their egos (White, 1996). For example, academic librarians, usually, work 12-month contracts with little or no release time for professional development or research. Teaching faculty, as a rule, work 10-month contracts with sabbatical or other leave available for professional development, research, and publishing. This contractual difference often is a catalyst for disengagement between librarians and teaching faculty. Merely mirroring teaching faculty by attending professional meetings and serving on university committees often is not sufficient to overcome lingering stigmas. Robert Hauptman and Fred Hill, two practicing academic librarians, make the point regarding intra-university respect rather pointedly, “academic pariahs whom legitimate faculty may denigrate or merely tolerate but do not generally completely embrace, librarians continue to wage an uphill battle for intellectual respect among colleagues in other departments” (as cited in Hall & Byrd, 1990, p. 93). The push for faculty status, often, becomes a last resort on the part of academic librarians to garner the respect, recognition, and privileges they feel they deserve yet do not receive (Weaver-Meyers, 2002). At one extreme, some librarians maintain a cowed, inhibited posture, performing their jobs acceptably (or admirably), but never actively seeking or believing justified the respect they properly deserve. At the other extreme, librarians maintain a posture of arrogance and standoffishness, refusing to be intimidated by the research or teaching faculty, and ready to fight for their rights and respect (Kempcke, 2002). It should be noted that most academic librarians fall comfortably between these extremes.

It is also important to recognize that satisfaction can be a nebulous concept, defined in different ways by different people, and quantitatively measuring satisfaction can be problematic (Plate & Stone, 1976). For many librarians, the mere pleasure garnered in executing their duties successfully is tantamount to being satisfied with their jobs. For others, hygiene factors such as salary, working conditions, and relations with administration weigh heavily on surveyed librarians’ satisfaction. This might seem counter to Herzbergian theory, but it falls back on how any given individual connotes the term “satisfaction” (Lahiri, 1988). However, in analyzing existing literature reviews on the broad subject of library job satisfaction, Johann Van Reenen (1998) found more generalized confirmation in Herzberg’s theory insofar as the greatest “satisfiers” were supervisory autonomy, sense of responsibility, and commitment to the profession. The most frequent “dissatisfiers” were poor pay, poor working conditions, and a lack of opportunity to work in a public service area.

Methodology
The research employed in this study was mixed methods with a primarily quantitative component. A 36-question survey instrument was employed (see Appendix 1) yielding data allowing quantitative and some qualitative analysis. Most of the data obtained through the survey were quantitative. Qualitative data were obtained through two
Table 1
Frequency Counts for Selected Variables (N = 253)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range &lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 or over</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Professional Librarian &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Age: Mdn = 48 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Years: Mdn = 15.5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public services manager</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical services manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty with Faculty Titles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty with Librarian Titles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public services manager</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical services manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty with Faculty Titles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty with Librarian Titles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
open-ended survey questions, one in the demographic section of the survey and the other in the attitudinal section. The intent of the open-ended questions was to elicit richer detail regarding (a) how academic librarians came to that career choice, and (b) how academic librarians perceive their role in the educative mission of their institutions.

The target population was Master’s of Library Science (MLS or MLIS) degreed academic librarians in all 35 colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia. This was a purposively chosen population with the intent of attaining a broad swath of opinions from librarians at two-year colleges, small state colleges and universities, larger regional universities, and the largest research institutions in the state. After attaining the requisite permissions, 372 librarians at 31 colleges and universities were emailed a letter of invitation to participate in the survey. The relevant substantive research questions were:

1. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to sense of involvement in the institution’s educative mission.
2. How does having the organizational classification status of faculty relate to one’s sense of place?

Results

Basic demographic findings from the survey are displayed in Table 1. With regard to attitudinal variables, on a “1-5” Likert scale with “5” representing the highest level of agreement, librarian job satisfaction, level of motivation and initiative, belief in the direct involvement of librarians with the educational mission of their institution, and happiness in choosing a career as an academic librarian all ranked at a greater than “4” average.

However, the numbers begin to drop when questions regarding the relation of satisfaction and status appeared. When asked if they felt there was a strong relationship between job satisfaction and classification status, the average response was “3.” When asked specific questions regarding whether satisfaction would increase if classification status changed or having a titular rank (assistant, associate professor, etc.) response averages dipped into the “2’s.”

Regarding research question #1, Table 2 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of involvement scale with the three faculty classification variables. None of the resulting three correlations was significant at the p < .05 level (Table 2). Regarding research question #2, Table 2 displays the Pearson product-moment correlations for the sense of place scale with the three faculty classification variables. None of the resulting three correlations was significant at the p < .05 level (Table 2).

Qualitative data, received through several open-ended survey questions elicited consistent results. Most comments suggested a strong belief in the correctness and importance of faculty classification for academic librarians, but simultaneously denied that any particular classification was a primary motivating factor in morale, performance, or general job satisfaction. One respondent wrote:

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

Another respondent commented:

Simply put, I ensure that faculty, staff and students have the knowledge to do research effectively and efficiently. This is central to *every* discipline we grant degrees in, and even if faculty perhaps don’t respect me before they’ve had a session with me, they certainly do afterwards! And no, I don’t use rubber hoses to do that.... I’ve always been rather bemused by older librarians who seem to feel the need to get respect by having faculty rank. I get respect by being a good librarian and striving to be great at my job; a title or tenure isn’t going to do that and personally, most of the librarians who put a lot of stock in that sort of thing are pretty crappy librarians (have no interest in learning new resources/ideas/technologies, refuse to learn how to do simple things like unjam a printer, monitor our chat reference service, etc. etc.).

Conclusions and Commentary

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

Thus, a key personal inference I draw regarding the main theme of this study would be: Faculty status is important (and, I believe, absolutely appropriate) but only as a secondary factor in an academic librarian’s employment. I contend the wealth of collected published evidence as well as the results of my own study were confirming of Herzberg’s two-factor theory insofar as classification status was clearly an extrinsic (hygiene) factor for most librarians. What provided librarians the most happiness or satisfaction was responsibility, the pleasure in performing a desired job with reasonable autonomy, and the intrinsic contentment in being an academic librarian. Faculty classification, like pay, benefits, relationships with colleagues, and general working conditions, was important but secondary. It was a factor that, if present, helped ease dissatisfaction but, in itself, did not augment satisfaction.

Table 2
Correlations for Selected Variables with the Sense of Place and Sense of Involvement Scales (N = 253)

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

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

a Coding: 0 = No 1 = Yes.
b Gender: 1 = Female 2 = Male.

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

Variable                                                                 | 1       | 2       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLS/MLIS degree a                                         -.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Master’s degree a                               -.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification                                              .04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree a                                         .16**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness as an academic librarian c                       .35****</td>
<td>.54****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather be an academic librarian than teaching/research faculty c</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.27****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a Coding: 0 = No 1 = Yes.
c Coding: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.
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Also, don’t forget that everyone is welcome to submit GLA-oriented news items to our blog, which feeds onto the GLA home page and our Facebook page. Please submit items to Tessa Minchew at tessa.minchew@gpc.edu or Sarah Steiner at ssteiner@gsu.edu for posting.
Appendix 1

Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

1. Demographic and Classification Information

1. Gender:
   - Female
   - Male

2. Age range:
   - Under 30
   - 30-40
   - 41-55
   - 56 or over

3. Years as professional librarian:
   - 0-3
   - 4-10
   - 11-20
   - More than 20

4. Present job (choose that which best applies):
   - Public Services (Circulation, Reference, Media Services, Archives)
   - Public Services Department Manager
   - Technical Services (Cataloging, Serials, Acquisitions, Collection Development)
   - Technical Services Department Manager
   - Administration
   - Automation
   - Other (please specify)

5. Level of your education (choose all that apply).
   - MLS/MLIS degree
   - Additional Master's degree
   - Certification (e.g., School Library Media, Archives, Medical Library Association)
   - Doctoral Degree
   - Other (please specify)
6. Career choice of librarianship (choose all that apply)

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

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

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No
12. Do you have the opportunity to receive professional development money (to help fund travel or research, for example)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No
2. Attitudinal Information

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

18. Faculty rank and status is the appropriate classification for academic librarians.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

19. Academic librarians should have the same tenure opportunities as teaching/research faculty.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

20. Faculty status has the potential to enhance the career of an academic librarian.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

21. Having the institutional title of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, etc. is more important than being identified as a librarian.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
Librarian Classification, Educative Mission, and Sense of Place

22. I am satisfied with my present job.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

23. I have a strong sense of commitment to my institution.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

24. There is a strong relationship between my job satisfaction level and my classification status.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

25. I feel I am an equal to teaching/research faculty at my college or university.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
26. I feel that teaching/research faculty perceive me as an equal at my college or university.

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

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

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

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

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

29. I have no desire to seek employment elsewhere.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
30. I am happy that I became an academic librarian.

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

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

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

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

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

Please describe what you see as your involvement in your institution’s educational mission.
33. Classroom teaching is the essence of my college's or university's educational mission.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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