

# The Impact of Affirmative Action on Academic Libraries

---

BARBARA B. MORAN

NINETEEN SEVENTY-TWO was an important year for the development of equal opportunity and affirmative action programs in institutions of higher education. In that year, for the first time, federal equal opportunity law was made applicable to institutions of higher education and to all their component parts including academic libraries. The intent of this equal opportunity legislation was to increase the representation and improve the status of women and minorities in educational institutions.

Now more than ten years have passed since equal opportunity/affirmative action law was made applicable to academic libraries. What have been the results of this federal legislation? Have women and minorities made substantial progress in gaining equitable representation in library administration during this period or is their status approximately the same as it was prior to the enactment of these laws?

## **Purpose and Background**

This study attempts to assess the impact of equal opportunity/affirmative action law on academic libraries. Although these laws apply to both women and minorities, this study will focus only on their effects on women. It is also limited because it examines only the effects of these laws on professional librarians.

Affirmative action refers to a set of specific procedures designed to insure an equitable distribution of women and minorities within an

---

Barbara B. Moran is Assistant Professor, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

institution. Despite the belief of some, affirmative action

does not require fixed quotas, preferential hiring, or the employment of unqualified people. Affirmative action does require an organization to determine whether there are fewer minorities and women working in particular jobs in the organization than would reasonably be expected by their availability in the workforce and to establish specific goals and timetables for remedying any underutilization that might be identified.<sup>1</sup>

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the federal agency that monitors many of the affirmative action regulations, has left little room for doubt about what it expects of employers.

The most important measure of an Affirmative Action program is its results.

Extensive efforts to develop procedures, analyses, data collection systems, report forms and file written policy statements are meaningless unless the end product will be measurable, yearly improvements in hiring, training, and promotion of minorities and females in all parts of your organization.<sup>2</sup>

The equal opportunity/affirmative action laws that pertain to women in academic institutions are found in four separate sets of federal laws and regulations. The first legislation was the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which demanded equal pay for equal work. The Equal Pay Act was the first sex discrimination legislation passed, but as originally stated, this law exempted executive, administrative, and professional employees. It was not until it was amended by the Higher Education Act of 1972 that this law covered professional librarians in academe.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was amended in 1972 by the Equal Opportunity Act to cover educational institutions, and this law applies to any institution, public or private, whether or not it receives any federal funds. Title VII prohibits discrimination, not only discrimination in hiring but in compensation, terms, conditions, and privileges of employment. The 1972 amendments extended coverage to all educational institutions, state and local governmental agencies, and political subdivisions with more than fifteen employees, thus including all academic libraries.<sup>3</sup>

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 forbids discrimination on the basis of sex in employment and recruitment in any federally assisted education program. Although this is one of the landmarks in the fight against sex discrimination, its primary focus has been interpreted to be treatment of students and not employees.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, Executive Order 11246 of 1965 as amended by Executive Order 11375 in 1968 covers all those institutions that have more than

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

fifty employees and federal contracts in excess of \$50,000, and most of the nation's higher education institutions are thus included. The most significant section of the law is that the contractors must have a written plan of "affirmative action" to remedy the effects of past discrimination.<sup>5</sup>

The enforcement agencies for each of these laws vary. Title VII is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The Equal Pay Act of 1963, which was originally enforced by the Wage and Hour Division of the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor, is now also enforced by the EEOC. Executive Order 11246 of the Education Amendments had been enforced by the Office of Civil Rights until 1978 when responsibility for reviewing the affirmative action plans of institutions of higher education shifted to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCCP).<sup>6</sup>

According to Dickinson and Myers's comprehensive overview of affirmative action and libraries, academic libraries and large public libraries have been the types of libraries most heavily involved with affirmative action because of the pressures exerted by centralized university and municipal affirmative action offices.<sup>7</sup> Most academic libraries are covered by the umbrella plan of their parent institution. For instance, in 1974 almost all members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) were participating in an affirmative action plan, but only ten indicated the existence of a separate library affirmative action plan. The others were covered by the parent institution's plan.<sup>8</sup>

Acceptance of affirmative action was not easy for institutions of higher education. Affirmative action caused these institutions to be subjected to a type of scrutiny and regulation that they had avoided before. The problems that higher education has had in establishing workable and effective affirmative action plans have been well publicized. As Astin and Snyder write:

It must be noted that most changes in the status of women in higher education have emerged within the context of confusing federal guidelines, individual and bureaucratic resistance, and a strong commitment on the part of the many women and men who believe in the goals of affirmative action. When it was clear that institutional compliance was mandatory, institutions across the country had to plan for action. After first assessing the comparative status and treatment of their women and men employees and students, they then had to undertake affirmative action steps to eliminate discrimination in recruitment, admissions, hiring, and promotion practices. To achieve these goals positions had to be created and budgets had to be revised to comply with affirmative action. These initial planning efforts have accounted, in part, for delayed positive results.<sup>9</sup>

Studies that have been made of the effects of affirmative action on the composition of teaching faculty at institutions of higher education show that the results so far achieved by these regulations have not reached the level hoped for in attaining equity for females and minorities. Elise Boulding has described the situation as follows:

Academe has not in fact been fulfilling that broader contract [commitment to equal opportunity] even in a decade characterized by a highly vocal, if controversial, commitment to affirmative action. The proportion of minorities in the tenured ranks has changed little over this decade, that of women hardly at all. Salary differentials also remain, particularly for women compared to men.<sup>10</sup>

Astin and Snyder provide evidence of some small gains for women during the last decade. In 1972 women accounted for 14.4 percent of the academic personnel at the ninety-two institutions studied; by 1980 their representation had increased to 18.1 percent. Astin and Snyder also found that between 1975 and 1980 women constituted nearly one-quarter of the new hires at these institutions. Women earned only 77 percent of men's salaries in 1980, although Astin and Snyder state that women have made considerable progress in reducing the salary gap between themselves and their male colleagues.<sup>11</sup> Overall, it appears that females and minorities are now represented on the teaching faculties of institutions of higher education in only slightly higher proportions than they were before affirmative action.

As would be expected, the libraries associated with these institutions of higher education also experienced difficulties in instituting affirmative action plans and guidelines. The literature of librarianship contained accounts of the difficulties and hardships libraries encountered in living with affirmative action law. Libraries reported that affirmative action laws turned hiring into a long, rigid, expensive process which produced an adversary relationship between job seekers and employing libraries.<sup>12</sup> There was also discussion in the literature about "reverse discrimination"—i.e., the hardship that affirmative action would cause white male librarians.<sup>13</sup>

Despite all the uproar about affirmative action law there have been no systematic studies made to assess the effects of all these laws upon the status of females in academic libraries, and it is hard to gather enough solid information to answer even the most basic questions about the effect affirmative action has had on the status of these females. On one hand, there seems to be feeling on the part of some that it is easier for women to become academic library administrators than ever before. The individuals who feel this way generally point to such well-publicized figures as the increase in the number of women directing

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

Association of Research Libraries libraries as an indication that affirmative action laws are succeeding. On the other hand, many librarians feel that affirmative action laws have been of little use. The sentiment is often expressed that administrators spend a great deal of time trying to "get around" affirmative action regulations and finally hire and promote whom they wish. Recent surveys show that women in academic libraries still hold many fewer administrative positions than their male counterparts, but these surveys provide little information about any progress women may have made since 1972.<sup>14</sup>

Examining the literature of librarianship for the effects of affirmative action law provides little evidence of its success. There have been reports of suits being filed, but many fewer than might have been expected. Some representative accounts follow: In 1976, eighteen female librarians were awarded \$50,000 at Stanford University after a university survey showed inexplicable differences between the salaries of male and female senior librarians.<sup>15</sup> In 1977, a class-action complaint was filed with the EEOC by Temple University librarians charging that librarians were paid lower salaries because they work in a "woman's profession."<sup>16</sup> In one of the most dramatic victories for women in librarianship, the University of Minnesota in 1983 agreed to pay thirty-seven female librarians with faculty rank over \$900,000 in compensation for over a decade of discriminatory salaries.<sup>17</sup> In a recent ruling pertaining to the same institution, however, a federal magistrate reversed an earlier decision and refused tenure to a librarian who charged she had been the victim of unlawful sex discrimination.<sup>18</sup> Although there have been a few success stories reported as a result of affirmative action, the bulk of the literature consists of overviews of affirmative action, advice to libraries about implementing affirmative action programs, and opinion pieces.

It is surprising that so few objective studies have been made to assess the effectiveness of affirmative action law. Much time is consumed, and much money spent in implementing affirmative action programs, and, if these programs are not effective, this time and money is wasted. But even more important, with the passage of affirmative action laws a promise was made to women and minorities to end discrimination. It is time to see if this promise is being fulfilled or if the laws were merely legislative rhetoric. If affirmative action laws are not working to end discrimination, it is an indication of the weakness of the current laws or of their implementation and of the need to develop more effective programs. If, on the other hand, affirmative action laws have improved the position of women in academic libraries, that evidence is support for

the position that legislative programs designed to lessen discrimination can be successful.

It is likely that one of the reasons that there have been so few attempts to measure the overall impact of the law is that it is almost impossible to ascertain if the changes that have occurred in the status of women during the period of time that affirmative action laws have been applicable to academic institutions have been the result solely of the laws themselves and not the result of some other factors. Greater awareness of organizational discrimination and general consciousness-raising brought about by the women's liberation movement may have led to a greater assertiveness on the part of female librarians and caused them to seek and achieve more administrative positions. The downward trend in financing institutions of higher education which commenced about the same time as the implementation of affirmative action laws could be responsible to some degree if the status of female librarians were unchanged despite the implementation of the various equal opportunity laws. The tight labor market in academic libraries may have contributed to fewer people being hired in general and to incumbents in positions being reluctant to try for positions elsewhere, and thus for fewer opportunities in hiring.

Although it is impossible to control for all the possible intervening variables, it is possible to provide a rough assessment of the progress women have made in academic library administration since the implementation of affirmative action law. This assessment will be made by looking at the position of women in academic libraries in 1972, the year affirmative action law became applicable to institutions of higher education, and comparing their status in that year with the position of women in the same libraries in 1982, a decade later. Legislative remedies to social problems do not work overnight, but, if affirmative action were effectively improving the status of women in academic libraries, some changes should be evident with the passage of ten years' time.

This assessment of affirmative action law focuses on the number of women who have attained administrative positions in academic libraries and not on the number of women hired for entry-level positions because, unlike many other professions including university teaching, women seem to have little difficulty being hired for lower-level jobs in academic libraries. As Kronus and Grimm wrote in 1971: "Although [women] are not bypassed when it comes to filling routine library positions, they are clearly rejected in favor of men as promotion candidates."<sup>19</sup> Study after study of female academic librarians has upheld that observation.

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

This research attempts to show whether there has been a change in the promotion possibilities for women in academic libraries since 1972. Although affirmative action laws also apply to salary, and although there is ample evidence that many women in comparable positions are paid less than men, this study will not examine the effect of affirmative action law on the salaries of female academic librarians.

### **Methodology**

To address the question of whether the status of women improved in academic libraries in the ten years after affirmative action requirements became applicable to academic libraries, the libraries in three different types of institutions were studied. The first group of libraries studied consisted of all U.S. academic libraries that were members of the Association of Research Libraries in 1982. The second group consisted of all libraries that did *not* belong to ARL but were from institutions designated as Research I, Research II, Doctoral Granting I, or Doctoral Granting II universities according to the Carnegie Foundation's Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. The third group consisted of all libraries from those institutions designated as Liberal Arts I Colleges by the Carnegie Foundation's Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.<sup>20</sup> These libraries were chosen because they represented the type of libraries where, in the past, women have found it most difficult to achieve administrative positions since the higher the prestige of the library, the fewer the number of women who have traditionally been found in administrative positions.

The Association of Research Libraries as a group needs little introduction. These large prestigious libraries are the most often studied group of libraries in the country. The next group, the non-ARL member libraries from the Research I and II and Doctoral Granting I and II institutions as defined by the Carnegie Foundation's classification, are the libraries of the remainder of the large, doctoral-granting universities. According to the latest edition of the Carnegie Foundation's classification, there are 184 universities classified as Research I, Research II, Doctoral Granting I, or Doctoral Granting II universities. Of this group, in 1982, ninety libraries were members of ARL. The libraries of an additional ninety-two institutions of higher education constituted the non-ARL Research or Doctoral Granting University libraries group. There is a discrepancy of two here because one institution was counted twice in the Carnegie Foundation's classification because of its endowed colleges and its statutory colleges and because another institution on the list does not operate a separate library.

The last group of libraries studied were those from institutions designated as Liberal Arts I colleges in the Carnegie Foundation's classification. These institutions are the most elite of the liberal arts colleges; they are those which according to the Carnegie Foundation's classification "scored 1030 or more on a selectivity index developed by Alexander W. Astin or they were included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving Ph.D.s at 40 leading doctorate-granting institutions from 1920 to 1966."<sup>21</sup> There are 123 schools in this group and all are private. One hundred and thirteen libraries constituted the Liberal Arts I group in this study. The discrepancy between the two lists occurred because six of the colleges could not be found in the *American Library Directory*, and a group of five colleges are served by a single library.

After the institutions comprising each group had been established, the administrative component of each library was recorded for the years 1972 and 1982 by using the listing provided by each library in the *American Library Directory*. These listings usually provided the names of the library director, any associate or assistant library directors, and the department heads. Any individual who was listed in the *American Library Directory* who did not fall into these categories was excluded. For instance, assistants to directors and bibliographers were not included in the analyses. Acting incumbents in any of the positions were included.

Gender of the incumbent in each position was established by his or her first name. Because in some instances the first name could have belonged to either a male or a female, and in a few cases only initials were provided, there was a group of individuals whose gender could not be identified by their first names. Attempts were made to establish the gender by checking biographical directories, asking colleagues who were familiar with various libraries, or, in the case of initials, checking other editions of the *American Library Directory* to see if full names had been included in some other year. Despite these attempts, the gender of some of the librarians listed as administrators in either 1972 or 1982 could not be established, and these individuals had to be eliminated from the analyses.

After the administrative roster from the three sets of institutions had been established, two types of analyses were done. Both of these types of analyses commonly are done in affirmative action studies; however, this research examines the gender distribution in administrative positions in a group of institutions, while most affirmative action analyses are confined to the staffing patterns in just one institution. The first type of analysis done was a *workforce utilization or stocks analysis*.

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

This type of analysis provides a static picture of the composition of the individuals employed in specific job categories at one point in time, and "represents, in essence, a 'balance sheet' or a 'stock' approach in that it focuses on a 'snapshot' of the state of employment in an organization at a particular time."<sup>22</sup> In this particular study the 1972 analysis provides a baseline against which to measure the changes in the composition of the library administrators in 1982.

The second analysis was an analysis of the "flows" into the directors' positions from 1972 to 1982. This analysis provides an indication of the amount of turnover in the directors' positions in the ten years studied, and how often males and how often females moved into vacant positions. Although the positions may have changed more frequently than is indicated by the analysis, at the least it provides a rough approximation of how many directors' positions became vacant and were refilled during the ten years being studied. If, for instance, it was learned that most of the directors in 1972 were still holding the same jobs in 1982, it would mean that there were fewer opportunities for libraries that might have filled a vacancy with a female to do so.

These analyses are not without obvious flaws. In the first place their accuracy is dependent upon the listings supplied by academic libraries to *American Library Directory*, and there are differences in the entries submitted by various libraries. Some libraries' entries are much more complete than others, and the analyses were based solely on the data available from that source. Second, position titles vary from library to library, and, lacking additional information, the classification was made on the basis of job title alone; whereas in different libraries, the duties, responsibilities, and statuses of incumbents holding a position with the same title are likely to vary. Finally, although epicene names were excluded from classification, there are probably instances where an individual's name may have resulted in him or her being classified into the wrong gender group. Johnny Cash's "boy named Sue" would have been classified as a female by the methods used in this study.

Even with the above caveats, the data provide important information that was not previously available, especially about the position of women in specific types of academic libraries in 1972. There are scattered and noncomparable data available about the status of women in academic libraries before 1966. The best evidence of the status of women in academic libraries before 1972 comes from the data collected by Anita Schiller in 1966 which showed that 64 percent of all academic librarians were female. Chief librarians' positions were held by 21.6 percent of the men and 11.8 percent of the women, associate/assistant librarian positions were held by 11.4 percent of the men and 9.7 percent of the females,

and the department and division head positions were held by 36.9 percent of the men and 35.5 percent of the women.<sup>23</sup> A very comprehensive report of the status of women in one specific institution was prepared by the Library Affirmative Action Program for Women at the University of California at Berkeley in 1971. That study found that while 64 percent of the university's librarians were women, 84 percent were concentrated at the lower professional levels.<sup>24</sup> There is clear indication of the lower status of women before affirmative action. What is lacking, however, is longitudinal data that would allow comparison of the present-day status of women to their status prior to 1972. The task is hindered by the fact that little data collected before the mid-1970s provided breakdown by gender. For instance, the first year sex was examined as a variable in the annual survey of ALA-accredited library schools' placements was in 1973, and ARL did not analyze data by sex in its salary surveys until 1977. Before the progress of women since affirmative action can be measured, it is necessary to have a baseline of where they began. This analysis begins to provide that baseline.

## Results

The first type of libraries studied were the libraries of the Liberal Arts I colleges. It has been documented that women who have achieved directorships in the past have usually done so at small, private colleges; and it has also been shown that the directorships of the more prestigious small colleges are more difficult for women to achieve than the same positions at the less elite liberal arts colleges.<sup>25</sup> The representation of women in the administrative ranks of the Liberal Arts I college libraries can be seen in table 1.

In 1972, the directorships of 66 percent of these institutions were held by males. The lower administrative ranks were more hospitable to women, though. Because of their relatively small size, few of these libraries listed either assistant or associate library director positions, but of those that did, 59.6 percent of these positions were held by women. If it is assumed that the professional workforce of these small libraries is the same as in academic libraries overall, then women are overutilized at the department head level, holding 78 percent of such positions. The changes in proportion of males and females in these positions between 1972 and 1982 were not great. Women held a few more directorships in 1982; their representation in the total was up 5 percent to 38.9 percent. At the assistant and associate level, their representation was virtually the same, and it had decreased 5 percent at the department head level to 73.9 percent.

*The Impact of Affirmative Action*

TABLE 1  
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS  
LIBERAL ARTS I COLLEGE LIBRARIES

	1972		1982	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Directors*	74 (66.1%)	38 (33.9%)	69 (61.1%)	44 (38.9%)
Assistant and Associate Directors	21 (40.4%)	31 (59.6%)	15 (40.5%)	22 (59.5%)
Department Heads	88 (21.7%)	317 (78.3%)	120 (26.1%)	340 (73.9%)

\* One directorship was open in 1972

Next, the libraries of the large research university libraries—the type of institution where women have traditionally found it most difficult to be hired as administrators—were examined. Looking first at those large libraries which are *not* members of ARL, the discrepancy between males and females in the achievement of administrative positions is great. As is shown in table 2, in 1972 only slightly over 5 percent of these libraries were headed by a woman. At the assistant/associate director's level, 22.5 percent of the positions were held by women. Women had achieved by 1972 a proportion of department head positions almost identical to the proportion of women in the total academic professional workforce; they held 63.7 percent of these positions. By 1982, the number of women holding administrative positions had increased in these libraries. By then, 17.6 percent of the libraries were headed by women, a more than three-fold increase. At the assistant and associate director's rank, there had been an approximately 20 percentage point increase, up to 43 percent, while the number of women department heads decreased slightly to 61.8 percent.

As expected, the Association of Research Libraries presented the greatest disparity between males and females holding administrative rank, as can be seen in table 3. Of the ninety U.S. academic library members of ARL, only two employed women directors in 1972. The numbers of women increased somewhat at the assistant/associate rank, but still fewer than 20 percent of these positions were held by women. At the department head level, the positions were almost evenly divided between males and females. By 1982, there was some improvement in the representation of women as administrators in these libraries. By that

TABLE 2  
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS  
NON-ARL RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL GRANTING  
INSTITUTION LIBRARIES

	1972		1982	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
Directors*	85 (94.4%)	5 (5.6%)	75 (82.4%)	16 (17.6%)
Assistant and Associate Directors	62 (77.5%)	18 (22.5%)	55 (56.7%)	42 (43.3%)
Department Heads	210 (36.3%)	369 (63.7%)	234 (38.2%)	378 (61.8%)

\* Two directorships were open in 1972, 1 in 1982

time, twelve of these libraries were headed by women. Women had almost doubled their proportion as assistant or associate library directors, and had gained an additional 6 percent of the department head positions, holding 56.9 percent of such positions.

TABLE 3  
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS  
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

	1972		1982	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
Directors*	87 (97.8%)	2 (2.2%)	77 (86.5%)	12 (13.5%)
Assistant and Associate Directors	164 (80.4%)	40 (19.6%)	101 (61.6%)	63 (38.4%)
Department Heads	370 (49.3%)	381 (50.7%)	347 (43.1%)	458 (56.9%)

\* One directorship was open in 1972 and 1 in 1982

### Flows Analysis

On the basis of the previous analyses it would appear that in most types of administrative positions in the three groups of libraries studied,

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

the position of women improved slightly during the decade after affirmative action was made applicable to institutions of higher education. In only the department head positions in Liberal Arts I colleges, though, were women found in as great a proportion as they constitute in the academic library workforce; but they came close to that proportion in the department head level of the ARL and non-ARL university libraries, and in the assistant and associate director level rank at the Liberal Arts I colleges. Women were still seriously underrepresented at the director level, especially in the large research universities. But in comparing the proportion of women in the various administrative ranks between 1972 and 1982, it would appear that some progress has been gained in working toward equality between males and females in academic library administration, despite the fact that there is still a long way to go before parity is achieved, particularly at the level of library director.

Before any conclusions can be drawn about why these disparities continue to exist, it is useful to examine the way that openings at the director level have been filled during the period that is being studied. As Churchill and Shank state in arguing for flows analysis in affirmative action plans for businesses: "It takes a considerable period of time for large numbers of competent people to move up in a company and for those who have held positions to move out to make room for the new arrivals."<sup>26</sup> They add:

The phrase "equal employment opportunity" should be defined in terms of current hiring rates and current promotion rates rather than in terms of the current management mix. In many businesses, it takes 25 years or more to train a senior-level manager. If a company is committed to hiring and promotion policies that will eventually produce parity in the management mix, management cannot be chastised for the dearth of women and minorities in the top slots now.<sup>27</sup>

As they point out, many business firms had not had any women in administrative-track positions in the past, and individuals cannot be transformed into top managers overnight. In contrast, in the libraries being examined in this study, women already made up a goodly proportion of the department heads in 1972, so, even before affirmative action, there were a large number of women who had reached middle-management status. The flows analysis allows us to examine the number and percentage of women who were promoted into available directors' positions during the ten years after 1972. In an ideal situation it would be expected that "flows" would be fair when the percentage of males and females promoted to available directors' positions corre-

sponded to the percentage of males and females working in academic libraries. According to the latest figures from ALA's Office of Library Personnel Resources (OLPR), 62.3 percent of the professional staff in all types of academic libraries are female and 37.7 percent are male.<sup>28</sup> There may, however, be differing percentages of males and females working in the various types of academic libraries. The only type of libraries for which the exact breakdown of the professional library workforce is available is the ARL group, which reported that in fiscal year 1982 their workforce was 63 percent female, a figure that corresponds fairly closely to the OLPR figure.<sup>29</sup> If flows into directors' positions were at parity, approximately 62 percent of available directors' positions would be filled by women. As the analyses demonstrate, parity has not yet been achieved in promotions to directors' positions in academic libraries.

Looking again first at Liberal Arts I college libraries, as table 4 shows, there were thirty-five libraries that had the same director in 1982 as in 1972, and one library where the directorship was open. Thus there were at least seventy-seven opportunities (possibly more, since this analysis does not examine any of the years between 1972 and 1982) for a directorship to be filled. Of the directorships that changed hands, 58.6 percent ( $n = 45$ ) were filled by males and 41.4 percent ( $n = 32$ ) were filled by females. If 60 percent were accepted as the proportion of directors' positions that should have been filled by women to attain fair flows because women constitute approximately 60 percent of the workforce in academic libraries, then males were overrepresented in library director positions filled by a position filled/availability in the workforce ratio of  $58.4/40$  or 1.46, while women were underrepresented by a ratio of  $41.6/60 = 0.693$ . If flows had been fair, each group's ratio would have been one.

TABLE 4  
LIBRARY DIRECTORS' POSITIONS  
LIBERAL ARTS I

<i>Director's Position</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Same Male 1972-1982	23	20.4
Same Female 1972-1982	12	10.6
Vacated by Male/Filled by Male	32	28.3
Vacated by Male/Filled by Female	20	17.7
Vacated by Female/Filled by Male	13	11.5
Vacated by Female/Filled by Female	12	10.6
Directorship open either in 1972 or 1982	1	0.9
TOTAL	113	100.0

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

The underrepresentation of women in promotion to directorships becomes more conspicuous in the larger research libraries. In the non-ARL university library group, thirty-one libraries retained the same director between 1972 and 1982; and three directorships were open either during 1972 or 1982, providing fifty-eight opportunities to hire a new director. As can be seen in table 5, 77.6 percent ( $n = 45$ ) of those openings were filled by males and 22.4 percent ( $n = 13$ ) were filled by females. This results in a ratio of 1.94 ( $77.6/40$ ) for males and a ratio of 0.36 ( $22.4/60$ ) for women. Thus these directorships were filled by males nearly twice as often as they should have been if flows were fair and only approximately one-third as often by females as they would have been if flows were fair.

TABLE 5  
LIBRARY DIRECTORS' POSITIONS  
NON-ARL RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

<i>Director's Position</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Same Male 1972-1982	29	31.5
Same Female 1972-1982	2	2.2
Vacated by Male/Filled by Male	43	46.7
Vacated by Male/Filled by Female	12	13.0
Vacated by Female/Filled by Male	2	2.2
Vacated by Female/Filled by Female	1	1.1
Directorship open either in 1972 or 1982	3	3.3
TOTAL	92	100.0

The flows pattern of the ARL institutions are shown in table 6. Here only twenty-one directors remained in place during the period studied, leaving sixty-seven openings to be filled. Males filled 83.6 percent ( $n = 56$ ) of the available directors' positions and females 16.4 percent ( $n = 11$ ). The ratio of positions filled to percentage in workforce is 2.09 ( $83.6/40$ ) for males and 0.273 ( $16.4/60$ ) for females—the most disproportionate ratios of all.

### **Conclusion**

As stated earlier, affirmative action is likely just one part of a whole series of separate yet interrelated factors which have influenced the status of women within academic libraries. The conclusions drawn

TABLE 6  
LIBRARY DIRECTORS' POSITIONS  
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

<i>Director's Position</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Same Male 1972-1982	20	22.2
Same Female 1972-1982	1	1.1
Vacated by Male/Filled by Male	55	61.1
Vacated by Male/Filled by Female	11	12.2
Vacated by Female/Filled by Male	1	1.1
Vacated by Female/Filled by Female	0	0.0
Directorship open either in 1972 or 1982	2	2.2
TOTAL	90	99.9

from the figures above point though to several probable effects of affirmative action law.

In the first place, the initial ten years of affirmative action laws do appear to have brought some changes to the administrative staffing patterns of institutions of higher education, although the administration of these libraries still does not reflect the composition of their workforce. The greatest numerical gains for women have been found in the mid-level administrative positions, especially the assistant and associate directors' positions in both types of university libraries and in the department head level of the ARL group. The composition of both these positions is virtually unchanged from 1972 to 1982 in the Liberal Arts I college libraries.

There are a few more women directors, but the gains on that level are disappointing. The smallest increase is found in the liberal arts college libraries where there are only six more directors in 1982 than in 1972—a 5 percent increase. The number of women directing the larger university libraries was low in 1972 and remains low in 1982. In the non-ARL group, there were, in 1982, sixteen female directors (17.6 percent) up from five (5.6 percent) while in the ARL group there were twelve female directors (13.5 percent) in 1982 compared to two (2.2 percent) in 1972.

The flows analyses show that women's rate of entry into directors' positions lags far behind that of men. If those rates of entry remained constant, women would never be represented at the directors' level in proportions equivalent to their numbers in the workforce.

Of course there is no reason to think that these rates will remain constant in the future. Women have made gains in the decade since

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

affirmative action was imposed, and if these gains can be continued, we can hope that parity will be achieved in the future. Perhaps the most encouraging part of this study is the evidence it provides of the larger number of women who are now at the department head and assistant/associate director level in the university libraries. These women should be both qualified and ready to move into directors' positions as they become available during the next decade. We must not become complacent, though, and assume that these advances will occur automatically.

It is the opinion of some that affirmative action law has fulfilled its purpose and that less outside intervention will be required to insure the continued progress of women and minorities in libraries.

We can view the 1980s as the era of government moderation, perhaps indicating that the teaching function is nearly completed and that the institutions within government purview have accepted affirmative action and equal employment opportunity goals, are convinced of their merit and are themselves monitoring and revising the policies and procedures necessary to reach them.<sup>30</sup>

That statement may be true of specific, individual libraries, but, if the results of this study reflect the gains made by women over the past ten years, one cannot take that sanguine a view. It is worthy of reemphasis that this is an early assessment of the impact of affirmative action laws, and that truly fundamental changes could not perhaps realistically have been anticipated in such a brief period of time. Still the results of this study indicate a need for academic libraries to continue to work for affirmative action in the future.

Unfortunately, the Reagan administration seems to be backing away from the goals of affirmative action. For instance, the requirements for affirmative action plans now apply to all institutions employing fifty or more people and receiving \$50,000 or more in federal contract grants. The Reagan administration first suggested that these cutoff points be raised to 250 employees and \$1 million—a proposal that would eliminate all but the largest public and university libraries from written affirmative action plans.<sup>31</sup> Later, a compromise proposal was advanced by OFCCP that revised these cutoff points downward to 100 employees and \$100,000 in federal contracts but, to date, these revisions have not been issued in final form. Thus, at the time of this writing, no major changes have yet been made in the affirmative action guidelines, but the present administration with its antiregulation bias causes many to fear for the future of affirmative action programs.

The American Association of University Professors' report on affirmative action contains a statement that well might be heeded by academic librarians:

Members of the academic community frequently regard affirmative action as a bureaucratic intrusion and respond with merely cosmetic formal compliance. We ought instead to recognize that outside pressure, though at times intrusive and insensitive, is sometimes required to stimulate the reform of long-standing discriminatory policies and procedure.<sup>32</sup>

Even if the federal government's enforcement of affirmative action is relaxed, the library profession should continue as Richard Dougherty wrote, "to strive for fairness in appointments, promotion, and salaries...[so] that when we review the decade of the 1980's we can say that the profession's commitment to affirmative action and equal opportunity begun in the 1970's remained firm throughout the 1980's."<sup>33</sup>

## References

1. Myers, Margaret, and Lynch, Beverly P. "Affirmative Action and Academic Libraries." *Directions* 1(Sept. 1975):13.
2. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment: A Guidebook for Employers*, vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: EEOC, 1974, p. 3.
3. Dickinson, Elizabeth, and Myers, Margaret. "Affirmative Action and American Librarianship." In *Advances in Librarianship*, vol. 8, edited by Michael H. Harris, pp. 81-133. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
4. Mitchell, Robert, and Phipps, Shelley. "The Legal Basis for Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action." In *Librarians' Affirmative Action Handbook*, edited by John H. Harvey and Elizabeth M. Dickinson, p. 70. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1983.
5. Ibid.
6. VanderWaerdt, Lois. *Affirmative Action in Higher Education: A Sourcebook*. New York: Garland, 1982, pp. 39, 78-79.
7. Dickinson, and Myers, "Affirmative Action and American Librarianship," p. 125.
8. Association of Research Libraries. *Affirmative Action in the ARL Libraries* (SPEC Flyer No. 4). Washington, D.C.: ARL, Jan. 1974.
9. Astin, Helen S., and Snyder, Mary Beth. "Affirmative Action 1972-1982: A Decade of Response." *Change* 14(July/Aug. 1982):26, 27.
10. Boulding, Elise. "Minorities and Women: Even Harder Times." *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 69(Jan./Feb. 1983):27.
11. Astin, and Snyder, "Affirmative Action 1972-1982, A Decade of Response," pp. 28-30.
12. See, for example, Christofferson, Rea. "The High Cost of Hiring." *Library Journal* 102(15 March 1977):677-81; and Caruthers, Robert Lee, and Demos, John T. "Affirmative Action and the Hiring of Professional Librarians." *Kentucky Library Association Bulletin* 40(Winter 1976):5-9.
13. Nyren, Karl. "Affirmative Action and Charges of 'Reverse Bias.'" *Library Journal* 101(15 April 1976):985-87.
14. See for example, Heim, Kathleen M., and Estabrook, Leigh S. *Career Profiles and Sex Discrimination in the Library Profession*. Chicago: ALA, 1983.

## *The Impact of Affirmative Action*

15. Weibel, Kathleen. "Status of Women in Librarianship." In *ALA Yearbook*. Chicago: ALA, 1977, p. 328.
16. Griffen, Agnes M. "Personnel and Employment: Affirmative Action." In *ALA Yearbook*. Chicago: ALA, 1978, p. 225.
17. "University of Minnesota Librarians Win Sex Bias Case." *Library Journal* 108(1 June 1983):1072-74.
18. "Court Reverses Librarian's Tenure Award at U. of Minnesota." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 29(16 Jan. 1985):3. (Both Minnesota cases were part of a larger class action suit, *Rajender v. University of Minnesota*.)
19. Kronus, Carol L., and Grimm, James W. "Women in Librarianship: The Majority Rules?" *Protean* 1(Dec. 1971):8.
20. For a complete list of the institutions included in these three groups, see, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, rev. ed. Berkeley: The Foundation, 1976.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. xvi-xvii.
22. Churchill, Neil C, and Shank, John K. "Affirmative Action and Guilt-edged Goals." *Harvard Business Review* 54(March-April 1976):112.
23. Schiller, Anita R. "Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries. Final Report." Urbana: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, Library Research Center, May 1968 (ED 020 766).
24. University of California—Berkeley, Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee. "A Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley, With Recommendations for Affirmative Action." Berkeley, Dec. 1971 (ED 066 163).
25. See for example, Blankenship, W.C. "Head Librarians: How Many Men? How Many Women?" *College & Research Libraries* 28(Jan. 1967): 41-48; Metz, Paul. "Administrative Succession in the Academic Library." *College & Research Libraries* 39(Sept. 1978):358-63; and Moran, Barbara B. "Career Patterns of Academic Library Administrators." *College & Research Libraries* 44(Sept. 1983):334-44.
26. Churchill, and Shank, "Affirmative Action and Guilt-edged Goals," p. 112.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
28. American Library Association. Office of Library Personnel Resources. *The Racial, Ethnic, and Sexual Composition of Library Staff in Academic and Public Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1981.
29. Association of Research Libraries. *ARL Annual Salary Survey*. Washington, D.C.: ARL, 1981.
30. Marshall, Jane E. "Affirmative Action in Academic Libraries." In *Librarians' Affirmative Action Handbook*, p. 134.
31. Harvey, and Dickinson, *Librarians' Affirmative Action Handbook*, p. 1.
32. "Recommended Procedures for Increasing the Number of Minority Persons and Women on College and University Faculties." *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 68(Jan./Feb. 1982):17A.
33. Dougherty, Richard M. "Affirmative Action: Will the Commitment Hold Firm?" *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 7(March 1981):3.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank