

2-5-2007

Connecting Diversity to Management: Further Insights

La Loria Konata

Georgia State University, llkonata@gsu.edu

Tim Zou

University of Arkansas - Main Campus, tzou@uark.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ_lib_facpub



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Konata, La Loria and Zou, Tim, "Connecting Diversity to Management: Further Insights" (2007). *University Library Faculty Publications*. 1.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ_lib_facpub/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Georgia State University Library at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Connecting Diversity to Management: Further Insights

Tim Zou

La Loria Konata

This research and resulting manuscript were made possible by a 2003 ALA Diversity Research Grant. A review of the research was presented at the ALA 2004 Annual Conference in Orlando, FL, 26 June 2004.

Abstract: It has long been noted that libraries need more diversity in the professional ranks. This situation is now critical with baby boomers soon to retire leaving millennials, who are more racially and ethnically diverse, as the next majority population. The profession will need to recruit a more significant number of millennials to the profession if libraries are to resemble the communities they serve. To get an idea of the current status of management diversity in libraries, managers/supervisors of ARL libraries—in states that contain the highest number of minorities in population—were randomly selected for a survey. Participants in ARL's LCDP were also selected as a comparative group since they are minorities identified with leadership potential. Both groups were asked about diversity in their libraries as well as what skills are needed to reach a managerial position. This data in combination with a survey of the literature of diversity in libraries and the business sector allow the authors to present recommendations for increasing the number of minorities in the profession as well as integrating diversity in management.

Since the early 1970s, establishing a diverse workforce has been a pressing issue for libraries due to the drastic demographic shift in prospective clientele. A report from the National Center for Education Statistics indicates that in the states of Hawaii, New Mexico, California, Texas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, plus the District of Columbia (1st tier of states), nonwhite populations in public elementary and secondary schools have become the majority. In eight other states (2nd tier)—Arizona, Florida, Maryland, Georgia, New York, South Carolina, Nevada, and Illinois—nonwhite students in elementary and secondary schools range from 40 to 49 percent of total population(ACE 2002) (NCES 2000-2001).

INSERT [Figure 1: Percentage of Public School Students of Color, 2000-01] HERE

Texas, California, New Mexico and Hawaii now have majority-minority total populations. That is, the ethnic minority population is now over 50 percent of the total population. Not far behind

are Maryland, Mississippi, Georgia, New York and Arizona with a minority population at approximately 40 percent (Caldwell 2005). It has also been estimated recently that by the year 2010, there will be more than 110 million minorities out of a total population of 309 million(Alonso-Zaldivar 18 Mar 2004).

The makeup of the millennials make these numbers even more drastic. The millennials are those born between 1977 to 1994. Their age range is 12 to 29 years of age. After the Baby Boomers, this is the second largest population group, 28 percent to 26 percent respectively. Millennials are much more racially and ethnically diverse than Baby Boomers or Generation Xers.(*The millennials : Americans born 1977 to 1994* 2004,1). In many metropolitan areas, they are the majority and will grow up being in a majority group rather than a minority group. Thirty six percent of Americans who identify themselves as being multiracial are millennials (*Generation x : Americans born 1965 to 1976* 2004, 221).

Frey's (2006) analysis of the 2000 Census further demonstrates this point. "A strong multi-minority presence characterizes 18 large 'melting pot' metro areas, and 27 large metro areas now have 'majority minority' child populations....In nearly one-third of the nation's largest metropolitan areas at least half of all people under age 15 are racial and ethnic minorities....Among the 27 large metro areas with 'majority-minority' child populations, there are 15 where the same can be said of their total population" (Frey March 2006, 16-18). These data underline the strategic imperativeness of establishing a diverse workforce in the library profession that will reflect the needs of the diverse populations in the United States.

THE BUSINESS CASE FOR DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

Library as a profession has been known for its homogeneity in its workforce and lagged behind many business sectors such as the service industry, the telecommunication industry, or

the manufacturing industry in diversifying its workforce although they all serve the same increasingly diverse population. There seems to be a lack of a sense of urgency for library administrators to recognize the business case of diversity other than considering it a politically right thing to do. A review of literature on diversity of the past ten years indicates that much emphasis has been placed on recruiting and retention—that is, recruiting minorities to library schools and retaining them in the profession. Applying Thomas and Ely's(2001, 33-66) articulation of three paradigms for managing diversity, efforts in diversifying the workforce in the library profession, so far, fall mostly into the first and second paradigms but should begin to shift its focus onto a third paradigm.

The three paradigms defined by Thomas and Ely stress the connection between the shift from affirmative action to diversity management. The first paradigm, based on affirmative action, addresses the “discrimination-and-fairness” issues in business management and measures success in diversity initiatives in terms of how well a company does in recruitment and retention of minority employees. This paradigm aims to increase the number of minorities employed and correct any discrimination and unfairness in the hiring and promotion process. The second paradigm focuses on the aspects of “access-and-legitimacy” of workforce diversity. This paradigm is a necessity because we live in an increasingly multicultural society, and companies need a more demographically diverse workforce to help gain legitimacy with different ethnic groups. Companies need employees with multicultural skills in order to understand and serve those populations better. In this paradigm, however, minorities are sometimes pigeonholed into minority-related issues on the job. This specialization often proves fruitless because it recognizes minority employees only for their understanding of the language, the culture, and the needs of the clientele from minority ethnic groups. This narrow application of diversity hinders

advancement opportunities for the minority employees. The third paradigm includes the first and second paradigms but goes beyond those two widely accepted approaches. The third paradigm connects diversity to management and personnel development perspectives and seeks to integrate cultural backgrounds and skills as necessary strategy for organizational development in order to maintain competitiveness in an economy of globalization.

Nowadays, many business organizations view affirmative action and diversity management as two different but interconnected processes. Affirmative action is generally accepted as compliance to government mandate when a company does business with government. However there is no direct linkage to the company's business. Diversity management, on the other hand, has direct linkage to the competitiveness and effectiveness of a company, especially in a global business environment. Philip Morris defines diversity management as necessary "management strategies and actions that effectively recognize, accept, and utilize all employees. It creates and maintains an environment where employees can contribute creative ideas, seek challenges, assume leadership, and continue to focus on meeting and exceeding business and personal objectives" (Hart 1997, 11). Since the 1990s, many business organizations have moved from strictly functionally organizational structures to cross-functional teams. Research has documented that when a cross-functional team is also demographically diverse, productive gains increase. Research has also found that companies with two or more women and two or more "minority" directors on their boards were much more likely than other companies to be named to Fortune magazine's "Most Admired Companies" list (Hayles and Russell 1997, 4-5). The Society For Human Resource Management (SHRM) Survey of Diversity Initiatives reports that top executives at 84% of Fortune 500 companies think diversity management is important. Of the non-Fortune 500 organizations surveyed, 67% of human resource professionals said diversity

management is important to their companies' high level executives (*Women and Diversity Wow! Facts_2002*, 459). For today's business executives, diversity management has gone from being a reactive function of compliance to a proactive one of business growth.

DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT IN LIBRARY PROFESSION

Efforts to recruit minorities into the library profession began as early as the 1970s. Starting in the 1980s and continuing through the 1990s, several large academic libraries initiated residency programs offering scholarships and post-graduate internships for perspective minority librarians (Acree et al. 2001, 47). In 1998, ALA began its Spectrum Initiative to recruit more minorities to the library profession by granting fifty annual scholarships to minority students enrolled in a library school graduate program. The program cost 1.3 million dollars and included an annual leadership development institute (Acree et al. 2001, 57). Today most library administrations work closely with their parent institution and follow the affirmative action policies and regulations in their hiring and promotion processes. However, progress has been limited to the paraprofessional level.

There has been some emphasis on the third paradigm in ALA; however, additional emphasis and focus are needed in this area. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has developed a "Leadership and Career Development Program" (LCDP) that prepares members of underrepresented racial or ethnic groups who have demonstrated potential leadership ability to become more competitive in the promotion process (ARL 2004).

A review of the literature also shows that there has been many discussions on the scarcity of minorities entering the profession. Unfortunately, there are still only a handful of minorities entering library schools. In 1984/85, the total number of minority graduates with a Masters in Library Science (MLS) was only 6.8%. The minority graduate rate reached the 10% threshold in

1994/95 before jumping to a historical height of 14.9% in 1999-2000, after which it settled back to 10.8% in 2000/01. For the academic years 2002/03 (NCES Master's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex, racial/ethnic group, and major field of study: 2002-03 2004) and 2003/04 (NCES Master's degrees conferred by title iv institutions, by race/ethnicity, field of study, and gender: United states, academic year 2003-04 2004), the minority graduation rate was on the rise again at 12%. However, these gains have not kept up with the increase in minority populations as the general population rate for minorities in 1995 was 26.4% and has increased since then to approximately 30.8% (CensusBureau 2000). According to de la Pena and Lippincott (1997, 4-5), in order to achieve parity of minorities in the profession and in the population, there will need to be a 162% increase of minorities in the profession.

De la Pena and Lippincott (1997, 31-32) also identified ten accredited programs that account for 41% of all minority graduates:

- University of Puerto Rico
- Clark Atlanta University
- University of Hawaii
- North Carolina Central University
- Pratt Institute
- San Jose State University
- Queens College
- University of Louisiana
- University of South Florida
- University of Michigan

Why are these schools more effective in recruiting minorities? One of the obvious reasons is the location of the school itself. Schools like Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Clark Atlanta have a higher concentration of minorities in the general population. Note: Clark Atlanta's library school has since been closed (Albanese 2005). Is that the only reason or is there something more? In a survey by de la Pena McCook and Lippincott (1997, 15), schools achieving at least a 5% graduation rate of minorities were asked about their recruitment strategies. What they found is that minorities gravitate to schools that have:

- faculty from ethnic minority groups
- active multicultural participation such as diversity initiatives on campus
- financial support in the form of scholarships
- partnerships with specific libraries
- targeted recruitment strategies such as advertising in ethnic papers
- creative delivery of classes such as evening or weekend classes for those that work

INSERT [Table 1: Schools that Graduate most Minorities in Library Profession] HERE

In 1997, seven schools on the list are located in states that have at the very least 40% minorities in the population. In 2004, there were ten schools located in these states with several of the same schools remaining on the list (Adkins and Espinal 2004, 53-54). This suggests that recruitment efforts should start or be concentrated in these areas first. Of course an increase in the number of recruitment only satisfies the first paradigm. Once minority MLS graduates are recruited to libraries around the country, we must be mindful that they do not become stuck in the second paradigm that focuses on "access-and-legitimacy." For instance, a Latino American can be trained and developed to be responsible for more than just being the Latino Librarian. Recruiting Latinos merely for their bilingual capability often does not help advance Latino librarians in their early career. This tokenism approach of recruitment plus what Isabel Espinal

(2003, 19-24) calls “linguistic double standards” often negatively affects the way that Latinos are perceived. Latinos are often considered effective only in their interactions with Latino patrons. In other situations, “native Spanish speakers who speak English with an accent are viewed as lacking linguistic ability, whereas native English speakers who speak Spanish with an accent are considered to have linguistic breadth or diversity (Espinal 2003, 23).” The double standard, in reality, frustrates Latino librarians especially when they are perceived to be too Latino to fit into the library as an organization.

This brings us back to the third paradigm which seeks to integrate cultural backgrounds and skills of minorities within the organization, especially in management. Moving beyond recruitment and retention to promotion requires commitment from the library director down to the low-level manager/supervisor. A new thought process needs to take place first. To acquire this new thought process, it will also be necessary for many library directors and supervisors to engage themselves into diversity training. No longer shall we view America as a melting pot where non-Anglo-American (white) cultures assimilate and acculturate, but instead look at it as a stew pot where all the races mesh to make a delicious blend without losing their very own individuality and cultural well-being. Joan Howland notes that this does not take place in corporate America nor in libraries but rather in “the concept of ‘success through conformity’”(1999, 5). People usually hire those that closely resemble themselves in thought, speech, dress, etc. While once serving on a search committee, someone said that he supported a certain candidate because he felt that that person would be someone with whom he could socialize. Luckily, in this case, both candidates were white females, so the issue of diversity wasn’t as big an issue as it could have been if ethnicity was a factor. But, suppose it was otherwise?

How do we reach paradigm three in libraries? Thomas and Ely's (2001, 51-54) research suggests eight preconditions that help an organization make the paradigm shift. The eight preconditions require the leaders of an organization to embrace "different perspectives and approaches to work." Another emphasis in Thomas and Ely's eight preconditions is the presence of an organizational culture that stimulates personal development, encourages openness, and values all workers. Howland (1999) suggests that libraries create an environment conducive to retention. As stated earlier, the initiative must come from the very top, the library director. It must be clear that this issue is important to the library director. Time and funds invested in diversity, in addition to cultural awareness or sensitivity training must be continuous and should allow for open expression of ideas from all. Everyone should know that diversity is a goal of the organization, and this can be stated in an annual report, at a library-wide meeting, through internal newsletter, etc. Regardless of how the message is transmitted, it should be clear that this is an expectation or requirement of all in the organization. In addition, "an organization must have a 'relatively egalitarian, non-bureaucratic structure'"(Howland 1999, 8). Bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy is not acceptable. If it hinders the free flow of ideas and information, it needs to be adjusted. Everyone should feel that they are valued and respected and have an opportunity to contribute to the overall goals of the organization.

According to Musser (Musser 2001, 65-66), retention strategies fall primarily into six categories:

- mentoring
- networking
- career and learning opportunities (professional development)
- interesting work

- good benefits
- balance between work and home life

Mentoring is particularly important in assisting a new hire to adjust to the organizational culture. This holds true even more for minorities who may have a different communication style and other cultural differences. Mentoring relationships do not always develop naturally, so a formal program is crucial. It may also prove more difficult for minorities to find networking opportunities. In some cases, a minority may be the only minority faculty personnel. This often leads to feelings of isolation especially when non-minority colleagues are not welcoming and receptive to a minority. So, here again, a networking program is important for minorities to make those connections.

Other strategies relate to:

- job satisfaction
- climate
- residency programs
- promotion

Howland also suggests that libraries ensure equity in regard to promotion, professional development, and success. Being valued and being promoted are two uniquely different ideas. What are some of the reasons given for minorities hitting this “glass ceiling” or “concrete wall”? Howland (1999, 8) says reasons given “are most likely based on unspoken and unexamined assumptions, values, mythologies, apparent and perceived ‘differences,’ and, perhaps, fear.” It could also be based on stereotypes such as communication styles. The criteria for promotion, whether it is non-tenure track or tenure track, in libraries are centered on “(1) performance of primary duties, (2) scholarship, and (3) service (Howland 1999, 9).” Performance of primary

duties is easily measured according to the job description. Scholarship and service aren't as easily determined and can be hindered by superiors who aren't aware of diversity issues. Minorities often get stuck with many responsibilities that are not considered or credited during the evaluation process. This ranges from mentoring other minorities to serving on various committees and task forces. According to Howland (1999, 11), service to the profession, such as an appointment to a national, regional, or local committee, isn't easily attained since this is out of the candidate's control and is decided by officers on the committee.

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

The purpose of this research project was to track the career development path of librarians of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups in relation to their white counterparts. While the general characteristics of the library profession demand qualifications, specific educational, and skill requirement for librarians who choose to enter this profession and want to continue to move up in the career ladder, we hypothesize that there are elements in an organizational environment that have contributed to their success in their career development and barriers that have hampered their career advancement. The personal career experience of a minority manager reflects the quality of a workplace in which a minority manager may find that he/she is challenged and allowed opportunities to continue to develop and grow, or that he/she finds him/herself in a disadvantageous situation in which opportunities for further advancement rarely exist. Some of the most methodical and comprehensive research published on tracking minority managers career patterns is described in the book, Breaking Through: The Making of Minority Executives in Corporate America (Thomas and Gabarro 1999). This book presents results from over six years of research tracking the successful career experience of minority managers from three Fortune 500 companies, who have finally made it to the executive level. Although this

study does not have the depth and scope comparable to Thomas and Gabarro's, it, nonetheless, initiates the preliminary research and present results based on which further studies can be developed.

Two major concerns expressed in the business sector are: (1) with all the best intention, "many have failed to achieve a racial mix at the top levels of management"; and (2) "some have revolving doors for talented minorities, recruiting the best and brightest, only to see them leave, frustrated by their experiences (Thomas 2001, 118)." Does the movement in library professionals bear any similarity? To prove or disprove this assumption is the starting point for this research project.

This research project focused on the framework of the third paradigm outlined by Thomas and Ely (2001). At the conclusion of our research, we hoped to obtain data that may help us understand the career development patterns of minority library managers from our selected population. We also wanted to be able to present an overall assessment of their organizational environment and to identify some factors that have assisted or hampered their advancement to their current positions. By gathering career development data from the library managers in general and from the minority librarians, we hoped to present an analysis and assessment that may lead to answers of questions such as: Do managers of minority background often feel that they have hit the glass ceiling at a certain point of their career? Does it take longer time for minority managers to advance to middle or upper managerial positions? Do they feel that the threshold for their promotion is set higher than those for their white colleagues? What are some of the positive assistance that they have been given to further their success in career advancement? How many of them have had mentoring and networking relationships with senior managers from their own organization? How have these mentoring and networking efforts

contributed to their career success? How many of them have participated in programs similar to ARL's Leadership and Career Development Program? Have they been aware of any programs of this type? How many of them want to become the director of a library? How many of them have achieved their career objective within the organization where they started their first post-MLS job?

DATA ABOUT MINORITY LIBRARIANS IN ARL

One major source that tracks the demographic changes in ARL is Demographic Change in Academic Librarianship (Wilder 2003). The following data are cited from the latest edition of Wilder's book and indicate that there has been very little change over the 20-year period from 1980 to 2000 even though a very slight gain in number and percentage of minority librarians is noticed.

INSERT [Figure 2: Number and Percentage of Minorities in ARL member libraries, 1980, 1990, and 2000] HERE

The data presented here shows that while the number of minority librarians has proportionally increased, the representation of each minority group has remained the same over the 20-year period.

Figures 3 and 4 show that while the minority population has significantly increased, that representation does not hold true for librarians. Asian Americans are the only group that is adequately presented in the profession. We have been unsuccessful in recruiting blacks and Latinos into this profession. Hispanic population, the largest and the fastest growth minority group (with a total of 13% of the populations) accounts for only 2 % in the total number of ARL library professionals. African American population consisting of 12 % of the U.S. population

has only see an insignificant gain from 3.4 % in 1980 to 4.1 % in 2000 in the professional employment in the U.S. ARL libraries.

INSERT [Figure 3: Minority Librarians in ARL Libraries, 2000] HERE

INSERT [Figure 4: Percentage of Minority Population, 2000] HERE

The number of minorities in ARL member libraries also is not representative of the general minority population. Figure 5 shows that in the last six years, there has not been a significant gain of minorities working in libraries of ARL. The percentage of minority librarians holding managerial positions in ARL member libraries are even smaller (9.2%), trailing slightly the percentage of the overall representation of minority librarians in ARL population (11.7%).

INSERT [Figure 5: Change of minority library professionals in ARL member libraries from fiscal year 2000 through 2005] HERE

Data was also available from the published ARL Salary Surveys about the types of managerial positions that minority librarians held. By 2002/2003, there were a total of 5 ARL minority library directors and two of them were hired in 2001/2002. The number of associate directors and assistant directors, on the other hand, has decreased during this time. There were 13 minority associate directors in 2000/2001, but only 11 in 2002/2003. Likewise, the number of minority assistant directors decreased to 10 in 2002/2003 where it had been 14 in 2000/2001. The largest increase in minorities is in the sub-category of “Other” under Department Head—an increase of almost 30 percent. Demographical data recently released in ARL Annual Salary Survey for 2004-05 does not show any break from this existing pattern of distribution.

INSERT [Table 2: Minority Managers in U.S. ARL University Libraries] HERE

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In order to obtain the data needed for this study, a survey instrument was designed that would allow us to gather demographic and career data that could be used as samples from our targeted populations. The target population for the first group was library managers from the ARL member libraries in the 1st tier of states of Hawaii, New Mexico, California, Texas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and the District of Columbia. The focus was on these states because of the high demographic composition of minority population. This may serve as a framework for further research in the second tier of states. The qualifications for our research were that the subjects must have earned at least an MLS degree or equivalent and have already been promoted to the rank of department head, head of a departmental library; or positions above that rank such as functional director, assistant/associate dean, and assistant/associate or university librarian. (University librarians were excluded from the sample because those identified as being an ethnic minority UL would not have had anonymity since there is such a small number of ethnic minority university librarians.)

The standard survey (see Appendix) consists of two sections. The first section is intended to collect information about respondents' educational background; ethnicity; years of post MLS experience before being promoted to the first middle and upper managerial position; and years of experience before being promoted to a managerial position. The second section of the survey is to poll the respondents' assessment of certain aspects of the organizational environment in their own organization. Forms designed for this survey were provided online and selected individuals were approached via e-mail with a URL to the online survey form. There were 200 individuals selected to participate in this study. They were all current library professionals of ARL in the 1st tier of states. Libraries' websites were scanned by position, and names were randomly selected. Out of 200 selected individuals, 52 responded for a 26% response rate.

The target population for the second group was ARL LCDP participants because they are exclusively minority librarians or library managers and have been nominated and endorsed by their library administration as minority leaders or having the potential to become a leader. As mentoring, coaching, and networking have been the goals of the ARL LCDP, which is closely connected to the third paradigm of diversity, the standard survey was sent to program participants to further substantiate our finding and for comparability to the first group. An additional section was included for this group which had six open-ended questions to gather their personal experiences and evaluations of the LCDP. Because the program had a limited number of participants, all participants were contacted including those from the target states and all other states to assess the positive impact of the program on their career advancement. Eighty-eight past participants were approached via e-mail with a URL to the online survey form. From this group, 31 responded for a 36% response rate.

SURVEY RESULTS

Profile of Survey Respondents

Profile of Group 1--ARL Managers (N= 52 respondents from the target states)

This group of 52 respondents holds various managerial positions in 18 ARL libraries, consisting of 8 associate university librarians, 28 department heads, and 10 heads of departmental/branch libraries, while the remaining 6 identified themselves as other types of middle level managers. This group also has a diverse educational background ranging from 27 having an MLS or equivalent degree; 4 without MLS but advanced degree in other fields; 14 having an MLS plus an additional master degree; 2 having MLS plus a Ph.D; and 5 having MLS plus two or more advanced degrees. The racial representation of this group obviously does not reflect the overall distribution of the ARL Salary Report due to the small number of respondents.

INSERT [Table 3: Gender of Group 1] HERE

INSERT [Table 4: Table 6: Race of Group 1] HERE

INSERT [Table 5: Age of Group 1] HERE

Profile of Group 2 – ARL Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP) Participants (N = 31 ARL LCDP participants of which 19 (61%) hold positions from ARL libraries)

This group of 31 respondents holds various managerial positions in 31 different libraries. The types of positions and level of responsibilities are more diverse than Group 1. It consists of 1 Associate University Librarian, 8 department heads, 8 heads of departmental/branch libraries, 5 fitting into the “other” sub-category of ARL department heads, and 7 librarians in non-managerial positions. The educational background of this group is more homogeneous. Twenty-five have an MLS or equivalent degree, 4 with MLS plus an additional master degree, and 2 with an MLS plus two or more degrees. No one in this group holds a Ph.D degree.

INSERT [Table 6: Gender of Group 2] HERE

INSERT [Table 7: Race of Group 2] HERE

INSERT [Table 8: Age of Group 2] HERE

SURVEY FINDINGS

As mentioned earlier, the same set of 28 questions was administered to the two groups. However, for the LCDP participant group, six open-ended questions were added asking them specifically about their personal experience with the LCDP. The standard questions were generally divided into four types (1) career advancement information (2) participants’ ranking of 8 career advancement factors in the order of importance that the respondents believe have helped them in their career advancement; (3) their perception of some aspects of the organizational environment of their libraries that contribute to or hinder the promotion of a diverse workforce;

and (4) a summary of Group 2's assessment of the LCDP and some discussions of their testimonies and our findings. In other words, the data gathered from the two groups are compared to observe any similarities or significant differences and to provide possible explanations.

Career Advancement Situation

Age factor—There is a significant gap between the two groups. For Group 1, the mode is the 46-50 age range (26.9%). If the age of 45 is used as the dividing point, 78.8% of this group are older than 45. In more or less than ten years, 51.9% of this group will be over the age of 60, indicating that more than 50% of the managerial positions may become vacant as those senior managers reach the age for retirement. The mode for Group 2 is the 41-45 age range (29%). If the age of 45 is used as the dividing point, 42% of this group are currently older than 45. In more or less than ten years, only 22.6 % of this group will be over 60. This result is consistent with Stanley J. Wilder's report that minority librarians in the ARL libraries were younger than their Caucasian colleagues. Considering the significant years of experience required to be qualified to fill the middle and upper managerial positions soon to be vacant by massive retirement during the next decade, there are many in Group 2 ready for competition. Our data seems to support Wilder's prediction that even without targeted recruitment efforts, "the retirement would have the effect of raising the percentage of minorities in the population as a whole (Wilder 2003, 35)." This age factor may predict that the movement of the managerial positions in ARL libraries will be intensified and thus may somehow change the general pessimistic view of advancement opportunities in the academic libraries. In one poll conducted by *Library Journal* (*A lot of satisfaction but not much room for advancement 1994*), 27% of

librarians believe there are advancement opportunities in their current jobs versus 73% who do not .

Post MLS Experience (Total years of post-MLS [or equivalent degree] experience as a librarian)—The mode for Group 1 with this variable is the 21-25 year range (26.9%) whereas the mode for Group 2 is the 11-15 year range (41.9%) indicating the majority of Group 2 is still in their middle career period while over 50% of Group 1 have reached their later career stage. This perspective certainly promises great opportunities for managers in their middle career who are waiting in the “bullpen” for their big chance. However, there are also 19.3% from Group 1 who have only ten years or less post-MLS experience and have already advanced to the middle management level.

First Managerial Position (Years between first full-time librarian position and first managerial position)—One interesting result from this survey question was the number of respondents who were promoted to their first managerial position in less than a year after they completed their MLS degree. Fourteen respondents (26.9%) from Group 1 were promoted to a managerial position in less than a year. For Group 2, five respondents (16.1%) were promoted to a managerial position in less than a year after receiving a MLS. One possible reason for such a quick jump-start was that these librarians had already had sufficient experience working in a library as paraprofessional/staff, and the completion of a MLS qualified them for an immediate promotion. A research project (Gordon and Nesbeitt 1999, 37) confirms that a large majority (71%) began working as paraprofessionals or student assistants at least a year before they graduated; the typical respondent worked in a library for five years before acquiring the MLS.

Post MLS Employers—(How many different library positions have you had since your MLS degree/or equivalent?)—With this variable, our intention was to examine how many job changes

the respondents had to make before they gained enough experience to be selected for their current positions. The mode for Group 1 was 4 job changes (25% of the 52 respondents) with 21.2% of respondents saying they had changed job three times and another 23% of the respondents having worked 6 different jobs. The mode for Group 2 was 3 job changes (29.0%) since this group of minority librarians is younger and worked fewer years than members of Group 1. Twenty-three percent of this group had changed jobs twice. Forty-eight percent of Group 2 however, had changed jobs 4 times or more before they advanced to their current position. In comparison, 59.6% of the respondents from Group 1 had changed jobs 4 times or more. Considering that Group 2 is much younger and has less post-MLS years of experience than Group 1, plus the fact that the highest positions for this group (except one AUL) are department head positions, the high frequency of job change in a comparatively shorter period of time suggests either a high job turnover rate from the minority librarians, or the necessity of changing jobs more often in their early career to seek better opportunities for career advancement.

Years on Current Managerial Position—The mode for this variable is more than 10 years (26%) for Group 1 with 21.2% of the respondents in the 4 year group and 15.4% in the 2 year group. The 26.9% who have worked on the same position for over 10 years seem to have reached a level plateau. There are 21% of this group who have remained in the same position between 5 and 9 years. We should not conclude that those managers who arrived at a plateau are not content with their situation. As a matter of fact, research also confirms that not all librarians, given an opportunity, want to move into higher-level administration. Some are willing to go as far as service department head, but not to be a library director (Gordon and Nesbeitt 1999, 39). Group 2 displays a different pattern. Excluding the 35.5% of respondents who did not consider themselves in a managerial position, 32.2% of this group are managers who have been on their

current job for 2 to 3 three years. Another 11% of the group are managers who have been on their current job for only 1 year or less. These data again indicate that minority managers frequently change jobs and, for whatever reasons, they are less likely to stay on one job for more than 4 years.

Academic Status—Librarians are working under different career tracks and thus emphasize different strategies as they move along or up their career tracks. There are mainly three types of career tracks for ARL librarians: (1) librarians with faculty status and tenure track; (2) librarians with faculty status but who are non-tenure track; and (3) librarians of non-faculty status. The distribution of the three different career tracks is very identical between the two groups:

INSERT [Table 9: *Group 1: Academic Status*] HERE

INSERT [Table 10: *Group 2: Academic Status*] HERE

The tenure track and faculty status have both positive and negative impact on retention across all upper-level positions. Some tenure track positions may require a second advanced degree and considerable publications to be qualified for tenure and promotion. For both groups, about half of the respondents hold a position of non-faculty status. In a non-faculty track environment, library managers may be evaluated more for their services than their scholarly activities, and depending on the type of career track they are on, their career development strategy may be set differently.

Eight Career Advancement Factors—Both groups were asked to rank the eight factors of career development according to the importance of each of the factors and the immediate impact of each of the factors on their career. Answers to those questions are based on each respondent's career experience.

INSERT [Table 11: Two Groups' Ranking of the Eight Career Advancement Factors] HERE

The ranking of the eight career factors was based on each of the respondents' career experiences and thus was more factual, but it also reflected the respondents' perception of these factors since they were not asked to answer "Yes" or "No" to the questions. The group ranking (based on the means of frequency), however, reveals a pattern of their career advancement. The two groups ranking the 8 factors are largely similar. For both groups, "Worked harder" was the variable that had the strongest impact on their career advancement. Similarly, an additional advanced degree was the lowest of the ranking to have any significant impact on their promotion even though about 40% of respondents from Group 1 have at least one additional advanced degree and 19.4% of respondents from Group 2 have at least one additional advanced degree. Survey results seem to support an ARL survey on recruitment and retention, which concludes that the requirement of a second master's degree or a Ph.D. had "a fairly low impact either as enhancement or barriers at all levels (including management) (Stevens and Streatfeild 2003, 12)."

Seniority, ranked #7 by both groups, has the next lowest impact as career enhancement or barrier. However, 6 (11.5%) respondents from Group 1 that ranked "Seniority" as the most important factor and another 5 (9.6%) respondents ranked "Seniority" as #3. This is in contrast to the distribution of Group 2 that has a total of 68% of respondents who ranked "Seniority" as 7 and 8. Since the minority librarians are younger and have less post-MLS years of experience, they may have to concentrate on other factors such as "Change jobs" or "Technological proficiency" to get where they want to be.

The differences between the two groups lie in two factors: "Changed jobs" and "Developed mentoring network." "Change job in order to look for new challenges" is the second significant enhancement or barrier for minority librarians. The higher ranking of "Changed jobs" by Group 2 here is consistent with our early observation. Another significant difference between the two

groups is their ranking of the variable of “Developed mentoring network.” Group 2 ranked this variable as the 4th important factor whereas Group 1 ranked the same variable as the 5th important factor in their career advancement. This was to suggest that “Developing a mentoring network” has been a more important enhancement or barrier for minority librarians. Both groups ranked “Technological proficiency” as one of the top three enhancements in their career advancement, but for LCDP participants, “Changing jobs” was their number two career enhancement while for white managers “Technological proficiency” was considered more important than “Changing jobs.”

Perception of Diversity Environment—Part of the survey (questions 12 to 28) polled the respondents of the two groups about their perception of organizational environment in terms of workforce diversity. The following table presents the results of the survey on those environment issues from both groups. A Likert Scale format was used to measure respondents’ perception of their library’s climate for diversity. These results helped to identify and highlight areas where perceptions differed between Group 1 consisting of 84% white library managers and 16% minority managers, and Group 2, which was exclusively minority librarians.

Questions 12 to 15 asked respondents about their perception of diversity at staff, librarian, middle management, and upper management levels. The two groups agreed to a certain degree in their assessment of the diversity of workforce in the library. If we average the two groups together, only 27% agreed that their library’s employees are a balanced representation of the racially diverse population on campus among librarians; 18% agreed the same is true at the middle management level; and 16% agreed the same is true at the upper management level. But we noticed perception gaps between the two groups to questions 12, 14, and 15. The percentage of agreement from the minority group was statistically lower than the average percentage. As for

question 12, we observed that 58% of respondents from Group 2 disagreed with the statement while 59% of respondents from Group 1 agreed with the statement.

Perception gaps were also present in questions 16 and 17 that asked about communication and empathy within and across the race. Thirty-two percent of minority respondents from Group 2 agreed that at work it is easier to relate to people from their own racial and cultural background, but only 7.7% of respondents from Group 1 agreed with this statement. Forty-two percent of minority respondents from Group 2 agreed that at work it is easier to communicate with people from their own cultural background, and only 13% of respondents from the Group 1 agreed with that statement. While some minority respondents felt easier to relate/communicate to people of their own cultural and racial background, very few of them felt that it was difficult to relate/communicate with people from different cultural background. The perceptions of the two groups were very similar on questions 18 and 19. Both groups were positive about their library's efforts in recruiting a diverse workforce in the past five years. The perception gaps appeared again in their assessment of their own library's efforts or effectiveness in retaining a diverse workforce and encouraging managers to hire people that can bring diversity and enrichment to their organizational culture. Forty-four percent of the respondents from Group 1 agreed that their library had made strides in the past five years to retain a diverse workforce. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents from Group 2 disagreed that this was true in their library. When asked if their library has diversity as a strategic priority, only 48% of the respondents from Group 2 agreed. However, when asked if their library should have diversity as strategic priority, an overwhelming 97% of the respondents from Group 2 agreed. When asked if their library has a diversity committee or task force that addresses issues of diversity and supports the implementation of all

the diversity goals, only 40% of the respondents from Group 1 agreed and only 42% of the respondents from Group 2 believed their library has a diversity committee. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents from Group 2 believed that their library tends to hire employees that conform to their existing organizational culture in comparison with 40% from Group 1 who agreed with the same assessment. Seventy-five percent of Group 1 confirmed that their library encourages managers to hire people that can bring diversity and enrichment to the organizational culture while only 42% of Group 2 agreed with the statement.

INSERT [Table 12: Data from Two Groups--Perception of Diversity Environment] HERE

Summary of Group 2's Assessment of the Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP)

Six open-ended questions were added to the standard survey to ask about LCDP participants' experience before and after the program and their assessment of the program's impact on their career advancement. The strong, enthusiastic responses from the 31 respondents provided a valuable inside view into some of the most successful minority managers' career experience. In the following summary of their answers to these questions, one may also notice that some of their responses confirmed some of the assumptions made from early data analysis.

Question 29. What is the successful strategy you employed in your career advancement?

Most of the minority managers in their answers included one or more of the following strategies:

- Remain competent and confident at all times
- Practice flexibility and openness to change
- Change jobs
- Work harder
- Look for challenging work assignments
- Network

- Mentor
- Keep up with technology
- Increase one's skills-set

Several LCDP participants felt that because of their minority background, they had to work harder to prove that their promotion was based on their capability and competence, not just on tokenism. As one of the respondents asserted, “By giving 200% on the job I have proved my competence and value to the institution and become more than just an ‘affirmative action hire.’” Another respondent agreed saying, “As a minority librarian, I always have to prove myself. I have to be twice as good as everyone else, because others are watching me and because I don’t want to bring dishonor on my people. At various institutions where I have worked, I know there have been people who felt I did not get my job on merit alone, that it was because of my minority status—and I feel pressured to prove my worth.”

Thus we can see that for minority librarians, the term “working harder” also means making greater efforts to overcome barriers that their white colleagues do not have to encounter. Research on career experiences of minorities has long identified race- and gender-based prejudice as a major barrier to a minority’s professional advancement. Our respondents’ comments confirmed the existence of the same organizational bias in the library profession. To disprove the rule of their inferiority, minority librarian managers had to develop some strategies to counter and overcome these barriers.

Being willing to change jobs and relocate is a strategy mentioned over and over by several respondents. Some moved because they did not feel they were treated fairly. As one respondent put it, “Work hard, be active in professional organizations and treat others as you would like to be treated; if you are being overlooked and mistreated by an employer do not be afraid to move

to another job.” Others had to relocate for better advancement opportunities. “[I] identified positions for which I was qualified and was willing to change locations to take them.”

Most of the respondents from Group 2 were optimistic and positive about their career objectives and opportunities. While acknowledging some barriers embedded in their own organizational environment, they chose to concentrate more on self-development and expansion of critical skills and networking. Instead of waiting for opportunity to find them, they wasted no time to ready themselves for the next move. One responded, “[I] continually scanned job postings to be sure my skills were up to date and marketable. When opportunities presented themselves, I was prepared.”

One respondent emphasized the importance of collaboration with colleagues and providing support to them as a way to win peers’ recognition, “To take every opportunity I can for professional growth and development and to work hard to be the best I can in my job. To bring my organization the best of my skills, abilities and talents and to support everyone around me as much as I can. To seek mentors wherever I can find them.”

Developing technological competence was also mentioned as a crucial strategy for furthering one’s career. As information and communication technology continue to redefine our profession, a proactive strategy employed by one respondent was “keeping up with technology. Looking at the big picture. Getting along with people. Looking for best practices. Following my own counsel.” In addition to increasing one’s skills-set, our respondents also stressed the importance of being more attuned to the political and social climate of one’s library and university.

Question 30. Did you receive any minority scholarship from your library school toward your MLS degree? ALA Spectrum Initiative?

Fifty-one percent of the respondents said they did not receive any kind of minority scholarship toward their MLS education. Thirty-one percent of the respondents said they received financial support from the following programs:

- U.S. Department of Education Title II grant for Science Librarianship
- Title IIB Higher Education Minority Fellowship
- Title 9 Federal funds for Women Students
- State minority scholarship
- Full tuition scholarship from the library school
- Allowed to pay in-state tuition with a waiver that was provided to reduce the out-of-state portion of the tuition.
- Received tuition remission by working as a paraprofessional in a library
- A work-based program where a in-library internship was offered to participant that allowed release time to attend MLS classes and a job at 50% time with full benefit.
- University sponsored minority fellowship
- Mary P. Key Minority Internship—a temporary but full-time post-graduate position on a two-year term.

Question 31. How were you nominated and selected for the LCDP? Did you receive support including financial support from your library administration?

Most LCDP participants were nominated by a Dean/Library Director or an immediate supervisor. Again, the vital role of the library director in the nomination process was obvious. Of the 28 respondents who answered this question, 22 received nomination or support from their library director or dean. Respondents considered being nominated by their library director an affirmation of their leadership potential, an endorsement from their own institution, and a

commitment to their career development from the administration. A few respondents were self-nominated after having a former LCDP participant recommend the program to them. Many institutions granted full financial support for their LCDP participants, but those that did not offer financial support granted leave time for the participant to attend meetings. Some financial assistance was provided by ARL. In most instances, participants were not granted reduction in workload, so personal time has been used to complete the online courses.

Question 32. What was your immediate benefit from the LCDP and your relationship with your mentor?

The immediate benefit for participants has been a better understanding of their own skills and abilities especially as it relates to leadership. Many responded that the program has helped them develop a career path for advancement. In addition, the sense of community that the program fosters has been beneficial since participants have connected with someone sharing the same difficulties in the profession. With the program, many no longer feel alone in their struggle and now have a peer group to discuss these issues.

The mentoring relationship has been advantageous with most participants. Again those who had a committed mentor benefited the most from the relationship. One respondent described her relationship with her mentor as being terrific from the beginning, “She had made it clear to me from the outset that our relationship was a priority to her and she was committed to make it work. In fact we still get together regularly... She has been there to offer advice on everything from coping with institutional politics to which step I should take next in my career.” In fact, a few of them expressed the sentiment that the relationship would continue long after the program is completed. The positive relationship with mentors has increased the self-esteem of participants and has increased the confidence in their own skills and abilities. In a few cases,

participants regretted that a relationship did not develop with their mentor. For those who were unable to develop a relationship with their mentor, their response was obviously less enthusiastic than those who had a strong, committed mentor.

Question 33. Have you been given enough opportunities on your current position to gain desirable experience to get you ready for a position of higher authority than your current position?

Most of the respondents felt the need to redefine their career goals after the LCDP. Some reported that they have since then rewritten their job description with their supervisor and added more responsibilities in their job description. Some reported that they were given more opportunities to chair a committee, to attend workshops or seminar on management and leadership. None of them reported any immediate promotion. Most of them returned after LCDP to where they were and are going through the process of “priming” themselves for a higher position. A few of them felt they had little chance to get a promotion in their current organization. Still a few stated that they were worried about their opportunities with current employers. As one respondent put it, “I have had to be very proactive, however, in requesting support for various things. I do not feel I am getting enough mentoring and preparation for the next step. I worry about where my career is going as I see few opportunities for promotion here. My boss isn’t planning on going anywhere, so sooner or later I will have to face the question of whether I am willing to leave my institution in order to advance.” Not all participants are looking for a management position. For those who have not been granted such an opportunity, it has been a result of organizational structure or a low turnover rate. For those who aspire to seek an upward move, they wish they were given an opportunity to gain some critical management skills

in the areas of personnel management, project management, and coordination that require complex responsibilities, budgeting, and higher level decision-making.

Question 34. Has the LCDP effectively prepared you for a leadership position? Why or why not?

All with the exception of one stated that the LCDP had effectively prepared them for a leadership position. What LCDP prepared them for was the ability to think “from a leadership perspective” and what they have gained from the program was a discovery of leadership potential in themselves. One respondent thus commented, “The self assessment aspects of the program were key to developing my professional self confidence in ways that don’t come as easily on the job.” They also considered their interaction with library deans/directors and the opportunities to hear and question speakers who are nationally recognized leaders in the library profession incredibly inspiring. One person responded, “LCDP identifies and incorporates critical skills and attitudes that are necessary to being a leader.” Another respondent concurred, “The experiences and learning institutes provided by the LCDP certainly gave me the organizational framework, the educational vision, and the important belief in self to prepare me for accepting leadership opportunities and challenges.”

Question 35. Was the LCDP at all beneficial and would you recommend it to other ethnic minority librarians? Why or why not?

An enthusiastic YES was given by the participants with the exception of one. Many have already recommended the program to other minorities and one said that, “It was definitely beneficial, and I have and will continue to recommend to other ethnic minority librarians because we all know we need leaders, particularly leaders from diverse backgrounds who can address issues [of] equity and equality.” Another participant reflects, “Many programs address

management and skills, but LCDP is on a much higher philosophical level... This program provides a forum for issues specific to ethnic minorities, that may not have ever been vocalized. I have recommended LCDP to other ethnic minorities, and believe that the content would be useful to all in leadership positions regardless of ethnicity.” Other reasons given reflect some of the strategies that Musser (2001) suggested for the retention of employees:

- Networking opportunities
- Self-assessment
- Mentor relationship
- Development of skills for career advancement
- Establish balanced work life
- Develop understanding of organizational culture

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

The scarcity of minority librarians at middle and upper-management levels, combined with a shortage of minority library school graduates entering the librarian profession, has been well documented. Considering that many Fortune 500 companies have reached 15 to 40 percent minority representation within management levels, the 9.2% representation of minority managers in ARL reveal the lack of effective strategies in diversifying the ARL at the management level. Our survey results on the diversity environment show that diversity in ARL has been successful, at most, only at the paraprofessional level. Less than 20% of our respondents (based on two group average) agreed their library has a balanced representation of the racially diverse population at middle and upper management levels. Our data also shows that minority respondents are less satisfied with certain aspects of the diversity environment in their library than their white colleagues. While most respondents acknowledge the existence of a strategic

plan in their library, the execution, follow through, and measurement of the plan was found to be lacking. Although efforts for recruiting minority librarians have intensified, retaining minority librarians and preparing them to advance to the next level remain as critical issues yet to be addressed. The feeling of isolation, the lack of mentoring for minority librarians in their early career, and the need for specific programs to assist them to grow within the organization have yet to be recognized by their library administration. On the other hand, minority librarians, if well prepared, will have greater opportunities to break through into the top managerial level in the ARL libraries within this decade due to the possible massive retirement of the senior library managers in the near future. Given equal opportunity for competition, minority librarians may have to work even harder to overcome unnecessary obstacles to win approval for their ability and competence because of some institutionalized bias.

From the management point of view, the goal of integration of diversity in management and leadership demands serious commitment from leadership at the very top. Library directors must become personally involved in diversity initiatives. We have presented powerful testimonies from ARL LCDP participants on what a difference a library director/dean's personal commitment and support could make in legitimating this process and in affirming the true value of diversity. When a library director fails to understand his/her vital role, the diversity program tends to become stagnant. When a library director is actively involved in diversity initiatives, he/she serves as a role model for those managers who are responsible for implementing those diversity initiatives.

ARL LCDP initiative has been effective in developing leadership skills among minority librarians. It exerts external assistance and influence on library directors who want to implement effective diversity program, but has been limited by financial and personnel resources. ARL

LCDP operates on a national level and attracts the most qualified minority managers or potential future managers to the program. The program offers an enabling environment for minority librarians to reinvent themselves with powerful networking and mentoring. As developing a mentorship is the most critical part of this program, only those who have successfully established, developed, and sustained their relationships with their mentor have been able to capitalize on this benefit. Those who were not well matched with their designated mentor seem to have missed a major benefit of the program. A new initiative of the ARL will start an outreach program to encourage minority undergraduates to pursue graduate library education (Offord 2004). This initiative is an important strategy to attract potential young librarians and to enlarge the pool of minority candidates for middle and upper management positions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the literature review and survey results, the authors offer these recommendations to reach Thomas and Ely's (2001) third paradigm in libraries.

1. **Recruitment.** There is still a need to increase the number of minorities in the field of librarianship. To adequately represent those "majority-minority" populations, more librarians of color will be needed. Continuation of ALA's Spectrum Initiative (**scholarship**) is mandatory, but should incorporate more aggressive measures of recruitment including establishing relationships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). (1st paradigm) Library schools that are not located in states that have "majority-minority" populations or the 1st or 2nd tier of states with high minority populations, should either set up **distance learning programs** in those states or have an online course that actively recruits in those states. Library programs and career

opportunities should be advertised in publications that are read by minorities such as *Ebony*, *Selecciones*, etc.

2. **Retention.** Once librarians of color are in the field, it is imperative that they remain in the field. Retention efforts through **mentoring**, professional development opportunities, etc. should also continue. In 2004, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) awarded over \$14 million to recruit and educate new librarians. The IMLS also awarded ALA's Office of Diversity with \$928,142 (Oder 2004,18). **Funding** of programs that focus on recruitment as well as retention of librarians of color will obviously need to continue. (2nd paradigm)
3. **Recruitment and Retention of Minority LIS Faculty.** The profession has long been aware of the need to recruit and retain minority librarians at a level representative of the general population. Over ten years ago, E.J. Josey stated that the recruitment of minority faculty is the "key to success" in this area. He noted that "only 11.24 percent of our total library and information science faculty are from the four [minority] groups combined....something needs to be done in terms of recruitment of minority faculty—if we truly believe in having a culturally diverse faculty (Josey 1993, 305)." Why is this important? It is important because "students of color expect to see their counterparts on the faculty (Josey 1993, 306)." Having minority faculty in library schools can be a very effective recruitment tool. Only 19 percent of LIS faculty members are of color (Adkins and Espinal 2004, 53). To achieve this objective, minorities in the profession need encouragement and support in pursuing a PhD in librarianship. Between 1995/96 and 2000/2001, only 13 percent of LIS programs' doctoral degrees were given to students of color (Adkins and Espinal 2004, 53). Minorities entering library school should be

identified and recruited early to pursue the PhD. Distance learning and online courses should be made available for the PhD as well as the masters.

4. **Leadership Training Programs.** “In 2003 more than thirty library leadership programs were held annually or biannually (Mason and Wetherbee 2004, 203).” Unfortunately, only three have minority librarians as a target audience: American Library Association Spectrum; Association of Research Libraries Leadership and Career Development; and University of Minnesota Training Institute for Librarians of Color. It goes without saying that the profession needs more of these programs that specifically target minority librarians. ARL’s LCDP, the preeminent program, has been highly successful in preparing minorities for leadership positions. The majority of their participants hold managerial positions. Individual libraries should incorporate aspects of this program beyond mentoring that would include professional development and training in the area of management and being paired with an upper-level manager/supervisor for mentoring. However, Mason and Wetherbee (2004, 192) note that “there is no common vocabulary among library educators or professionals about what constitutes the core body of leadership skills.” A clear and agreed upon definition of “leadership skills”, perhaps stated by ALA, is imperative. Having a clear definition of “leadership skills” provides a measuring tool that can be used in the hiring process as well as in establishing minority-focused training programs. This fits into the first paradigm seeking fairness.
5. **Diversity Training.** Diversity training for all library personnel is a necessity and should include a better understanding of the general population dynamics that libraries are facing. It should be stressed that diversity education and training is an opportunity to learn and does not call into question a person’s ethics or morals. Library directors, deans,

and managers should really buy-in to this idea to better sell it to all library personnel.

This training should be on-going and not just a one-time occurrence. Mandatory updates or refresher training should be required.

6. **Measuring Diversity Progress.** Measurement is a key to ensure the effectiveness and success of any diversity initiative. Without proper measurement it is difficult to convince doubters or supporters the necessity of those programs not to mention justifying continuing budget support. In business organizations, areas of internal measurement usually include tracking the parity of the minority employees, their turnover rates, promotion, movement of career path, complaints or grievances, compensation analysis, networking groups, organizational employees' perceptions of organizational culture and environment, leadership behavior and practice, or top management accessibility. External measurement usually examines customer satisfaction, market segments, and success in global markets. Hayles and Russell (1997, 91-95) list six key diversity areas where measurements can be applied: (1) program evaluation--to ascertain the effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the program; (2) representation—to study the population of the organization with respect to the flow of people through it; (3) workplace climate—to examine whether the quality of work life is accessible to all groups and individuals; (4) benchmarks and best practices—to model after the best practices used in leading organizations within or across industry; (5) external reorganization—measurement made by external sources in the form of reputation and ranking in terms of diversity; and (6) relating diversity to overall performance—examining the correlation between the specific diversity activities and the desired organizational outcomes. A research library, as a sub-organization of a parent organization (its university) or a member of a national

organization (ALA, ARL) should align its measurements to the overall strategic objectives as well as to the desired organizational outcomes.

7. **Change in Management Principle.** Libraries should adopt a modified form of Theory Z. Theory Z is a management principle/style that originated in Japan. It is characterized by lifelong employment, and upon retirement, retirees are hired part-time (Konata 2003, 428-429). Many baby boomers will retire in the next 2 to 4 years with many more retiring when the youngest millennials enter the workforce. To retain institutional memory, when baby boomers retire, working part-time should be an available option. This may also be attractive to baby boomers since they are living longer than any previous generation with many having to supplement their retirement income. These “retirees” can provide guidance for minority librarians in understanding the culture of the organization and what goals to set to establish a path to management.
8. **Bridge Generational Gap.** Generation Xers shouldn't be lost in the discussion of baby boomers and millennials. Generation Xers can help bridge the gap between boomers and millennials. Although smaller in number, Generations Xers provide an excellent opportunity for boomers to begin to make the transition. ““Baby boomers haven't retired yet, but GenXers are looking for their positions to be open. A big vacuum in middle- and upper-management will be created when they do retire. For self-preservation, NextGen librarians need to ask their administration if they've set up succession planning and ways to transfer the knowledge of baby boomers when they do retire. NextGen librarians will improve libraries when baby boomers are gone, but we need their knowledge of the organizations!(Gordon 2005, 46)” Boomers as well as Generation Xers can then integrate millennials, many of whom will be ethnic minorities, within the organization.

CONCLUSION

While there is still a need for recruiting and retaining minorities to the profession of librarianship, emphasis should also be placed on developing these librarians to become leaders in the profession. Having more minorities in the profession at all levels has become a strategic imperative. Thomas and Ely's third paradigm calls for actions leading to a desired result to ensure that an organization "become more effective in developing and advancing people of color to its upper-middle and executive levels (Thomas and Gabarro 1999, 213.)." An organization with a strong commitment to diversity management and an inclusive environment could very well be the most effective tool for attracting and retaining high potential employees.

ALA's Spectrum Initiative falls into Thomas and Ely's first paradigm of increasing the number of minorities to the profession. This is a very necessary step but is only the beginning. A recent trend has been to hire multilingual librarians with titles such as the Latino Studies Librarian or Asian Studies Librarian. This falls into Thomas and Ely's second paradigm of "access-and-legitimacy." In this paradigm, minorities are hired to reflect the minority population and sometimes work mainly with this population. While this is also necessary, it is still only half the puzzle. The ultimate goal is to reach Thomas and Ely's third paradigm which calls for diversity in management and a **complete integration of diversity** within the culture of the organization. ARL's LCDP is the preeminent program with the sole purpose of preparing minorities for leadership positions in the profession. From the 31 LCDP participants who responded to the survey, 23 are managers or supervisors.

In a fable called, "The Giraffe and the Elephant," the giraffe, a master craftsman, builds a home to his family's specifications. It had tall, yet narrow doorways with high ceilings. It was

built perfect for a giraffe. One day, the giraffe sees an elephant, another master craftsman, through the window and invites him over. The elephant comes in and admires the giraffe's wood shop and is equally impressed with his work. They are so impressed with each other's work that they decide to work together on various projects. The giraffe excuses himself to take a phone call upstairs and instructs the elephant to make himself at home and get familiar with the wood shop. The elephant takes him up on this offer and begins to look around. Unfortunately, it immediately becomes clear to the elephant that the house is built to the giraffe's specifications because he realizes that he can't get through the doorway because it is too narrow. He can't make it up the stairs because the stairs can't hold his weight. The giraffe returns, and the elephant brings this to his attention. The giraffe suggests the elephant take aerobic classes to lose weight and take ballet classes to become light on his feet (Thomas and Woodruff 1999, 3-4). Obviously, this will not work and, better yet, should not be expected. A house built to certain specifications will only be comfortable for those with that specification. By building the house to a giraffe's specifications, the giraffe made an assumption that most of us make. He assumed that he would be surrounded by those physically similar to him. Those in management cannot make that same assumption. Diversity in libraries is imperative at each level and we must all learn to see beyond our limiting belief we have about people who may be different from us.

References

ACE, The American Council on Education. 2002. Percentage of public school students of color, 2000-01, [http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=7350]; Internet; accessed 1 May 2006.

Acree, E. K., S. K. Epps, Y. Gilmore, and C. Henriques. 2001. Using professional development as a retention tool for underrepresented academic librarians. *Journal of Library Administration* 33, no. 1/2: 45-61.

Adkins, Denice and Isabel Espinal. 2004. The diversity mandate. *Library Journal* 129, no. 7 (April): 52-54.

Albanese, Andrew. 2005. Can clark atlanta program move? *Library Journal* 130, no. 7 (April): 20-20.

Alonso-Zaldivar, Ricardo. 2004. Census predicts higher diversity in next 50 years. *Chicago Tribune* 18 Mar 2004. available from EIU Viewswire database [www.viewswire.com]; Internet; accessed 22 March 2004

ARL, The Association of Research Libraries. 2004. About arl's leadership & career development program. [<http://www.arl.org/diversity/lcdp/index.html>]; Internet; accessed 2 May 2006.

_____. ARL annual salary survey 2004-05. 2004. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

_____. ARL annual salary survey 2003-04. 2004. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

_____. ARL annual salary survey 2002-03. 2003. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

_____. ARL annual salary survey 2001-02. 2002. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

_____. ARL annual salary survey 2000-01. 2001. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries


- Caldwell, Alicia A. 2005. Texas now a majority-minority state: Texas becomes fourth state to have non-white majority population, U.S. Census bureau reports: ABCNews.com. [http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=1027640&page=1]; Internet; accessed 7 March 2006.
- Census Bureau. 2000. Population by race and hispanic or latino origin, for all ages and for 18 years and over,for the United States: 2000. [http://www.census.gov/population/cen2000/phc-t1/tab01.pdf]; Internet; accessed 4 April 2006.
- De la Pena, Kathleen and Kate Lippincott. 1997. Library schools and diversity: Who mates the grade? (cover story). *Library Journal* 122, no. 7 (April): 30-32.
- Espinal, Isabel. 2003. Wanted latino librarians. *Criticas* 3, no. 5 (Sep/Oct): 19-24.
- Frey, William H. March 2006. Diversity spreads out: Metropolitan shifts in hispanic, asian, and black populations since 2000. Brookings Institution. [http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20060307_Frey.pdf]; Internet; accessed 7 March 2006.
- Generation X : Americans born 1965 to 1976. 2004. *The american generations series*;. Ithaca, N.Y.: New Strategist Publications.
- Gordon, Rachel Singer. 2005. The "Bridge" Generation. *Library Journal* 130, no. 19 (November): 46-46.
- Gordon, Rachel Singer and Sarah Nesbeitt. 1999. Who we are, where we're going. *Library Journal* 124, no. 9 (May): 36.

- Hart, Margaret. 1997. Managing diversity for sustained competitiveness. Conference Board Report; no.1195-97-ch. New York: Conference Board.
- Hayles, V. Robert and Armida M. Russell. 1997. The diversity directive: Why some initiatives fail & what to do about it. Madison, Wis.: ASTD: London: McGraw Hill.
- Howland, J. 1999. Beyond recruitment: Retention and promotion strategies to ensure diversity and success. *Library Administration and Management* 13, no. 1(Winter): 4-14.
- Josey, E. J. 1993. The challenges of cultural diversity in the recruitment of faculty and students from diverse. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 34, no. 4 (Fall): 302.
- Konata, LaLoria. 2003. Theory z. In *Encyclopedia of public administration & public policy* ed. David A. Schultz: 428-429. New York : Facts On File: London.
- A lot of satisfaction but not much room for advancement. 1994. *Library Journal* 119, no. 18 (November): 48.
- Mason, Florence M. and Louella V. Wetherbee. 2004. Learning to lead: An analysis of current training programs for library leadership. *Library Trends* 53, no. 1 (Summer): 187-217.
- McCook, Kathleen de la PenÌfa, Kate Lippincott, and Bob Woodard. 1997. Planning for a diverse workforce in library and information science professions. *Variation: Eric reports* ; ed 402 948. Tampa, Fla.: University of South Florida, School of Library and Information Science, Research Group.
- The millennials : Americans born 1977 to 1994. 2004. Edited by New Strategist editors. American generations series;. Ithaca, N.Y.: New Strategist Publications.
- Musser, Linda R. 2001. Effective retention strategies for diverse employees. *Journal of Library Administration* 33, no. 1/2: 63.

- NCES, National Center for Education Statistics. 2000-2001. Public school student, staff, and graduate counts by state--school year. [Washington, D.C.]: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Serial, LCCN: sn 94-28350. [http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002348.pdf]; Internet; accessed 26 April 2006.
- _____. 2004. Master's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex, racial/ethnic group, and major field of study: 2002-03. [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/tables/dt04_266.asp]; Internet; accessed 4 April 2006.
- _____. 2004. Master's degrees conferred by title iv institutions, by race/ethnicity, field of study, and gender: United states, academic year 2003-04. [http://nces.ed.gov/das/library/tables_listings/show_nedrc.asp?rt=p&tableID=2078]; Internet; accessed 4 April 2006.
- Oder, Norman. 2004. Imls gives \$14.8m for recruiting. *Library Journal* 129, no. 13 (August): 18-18.
- Offord, Jerome. 2004. Arl recruits minority undergraduates to research librarianship. *ARL Bimonthly Report* 233 (April 2004). [http://www.arl.org/newsltr/233/recruit.html]; Internet; accessed 2 April 2006.
- Stevens, Jen and Rosemary Streatfeild. 2003. Recruitment and retention. Spec kit,; 276;. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Leadership and Management Services.
- Thomas, David. 2001. The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters. In *Harvard business review on managing diversity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

- Thomas, David A. and Robin J. Ely. 2001. Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. In Harvard business review on managing diversity 33-66. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Thomas, David A. and John J. Gabarro. 1999. Breaking through : The making of minority executives in corporate america: Harvard Business School Press.
- Thomas, R. Roosevelt and Marjorie I. Woodruff. 1999. Building a house for diversity : How a fable about a giraffe & an elephant offers new strategies for today's workforce. New York: AMACOM.
- Wilder, Stanley. 2003. Demographic change in academic librarianship. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Women and diversity: WOW! Facts 2002. 2002. Washington, D.C.: Business Women's Network.

Figure 2: Percentage of Public School Students of Color, 2000-01




Reprinted with permission from the American Council on Education (ACE 2002)

Table 1: Schools that Graduate most Minorities in Library Profession

1997	2004
University of Puerto Rico	University of Puerto Rico
Clark Atlanta University	Clark Atlanta University
University of Hawaii	University of Hawaii
North Carolina Central University	Pratt Institute
Pratt Institute	North Carolina Central University
San Jose State University	UCLA
Queens College	St. Johns University
University of Louisiana	Queens College
University of South Florida	CUNY
University of Michigan	San Jose State University
	University of Texas, Austin
	Florida State University


Note: Schools listed in bold are located in one of the 1st or 2nd tier states with a high concentration of minorities.

Figure 2: Percentage of Minorities in ARL Libraries, 1980, 1990, and 2000




Source: Wilder, *Demographic Change in Academic Librarianship*, 2003 p.34.

Figure 3: Minority Librarians in ARL Libraries, 2000




Source: Wilder, *Demographic Change in Academic Librarianship* (2003) p.34.

Figure 4: Percentage of Minority Population, 2000



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, "Population by Race and Hispanic Origin for the United States: 2000," Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin
<http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf>

Figure 5: Change of minority library professional in ARL member libraries from fiscal year 2000 through 2005



Note: Compilation of ARL Annual Salary Survey from 2000-01 to 2004-05. Accessible via:
<http://www.arl.org/stats/salary>

Table 2: Minority Managers in U.S. ARL University Libraries

	2000-2001			2001-2002			2002-2003		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
Director	1	2	3	3	2	5	3	2	5
Associate Director	10	3	13	7	3	10	9	2	11
Assistant Director	7	7	14	8	5	13	6	4	10
Head, Branch	37	14	51	34	15	49	37	13	50
Department Head									
Acquisitions	7	2	9	5	2	7	6	2	8
Reference	4	1	5	5	2	7	6	1	7
Cataloging	10	1	11	9	3	12	12	3	15
Serials	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Document/Map	5	0	5	4	0	4	5	1	6
Circulation	6	2	8	4	3	7	6	5	11
Rare Book /Manuscripts	1	1	2	3	1	4	3	2	5
Computer Systems	2	6	8	2	6	8	3	6	9
Other	39	18	57	53	18	71	55	18	73
All positions	131	57	188	137	60	197	151	59	210

Note: Compilation of ARL Annual Salary Survey from 2002-03; 2001-02; and 2000-01. Accessible via: <http://www.arl.org/stats/salary/>

Table 3: Gender of Group 1

Gender	Number (Percentage)
Male	13 (25%)
Female	39 (75%)

Table 4: Race of Group 1

Race	Number (Percentage)
White	42 (80.8%)
Hispanic or Latino	4 (7.7%)
Black or African American	4 (7.7%)
Other	2 (3.8%)

Table 5: Age of Group 1

Age	Number (Percentage)
31-35	2 (3.8%)
36-40	5 (9.6%)

41-45	4 (7.7%)
46-50	14 (26.9%)
51-55	13 (25%)
56-60	12 (23.1%)
60-over	2 (3.8%)

Table 6: Gender of Group 2

Gender	Number (Percentage)
Male	6 (19.4%)
Female	25 (80%)

Table 7: Race of Group 2

Race	Number (Percentage)
Asian	5 (16.1%)
Hispanic or Latino	5 (16.1%)
Black or African American	20 (64.5%)
American Indian and Alaska Native	1 (3.2%)

Table 8: Age of Group 2

Age	Number (Percentage)
25-30	1 (3.2 %)
31-35	3 (9.7 %)
36-40	5 (16.1%)
41-45	9 (29.0 %)
46-50	6 (19.4%)
51-55	7 (22.6%)

Table 9: Group 1: Academic Status

Status	Frequency	Percent
Faculty Status/Tenure Track	14	26.9 %
Faculty status/Non-Tenure Track	9	17.3 %
Non-faculty Status	29	55.8 %

Table 10: Group 2: Academic Status

Status	Frequency	Percent
Faculty Status/Tenure Track	8	25.8 %
Faculty status/Non-Tenure Track	7	22.6 %
Non-faculty Status	16	51.6 %

Table 11: Two Groups' Ranking of the Eight Career Advancement Factors

Ranking	Group 1 N = 52	Group 2 N = 31
1	Worked harder	Worked harder
2	Technological proficiency	Changed jobs
3	Changed jobs	Technological Proficiency
4	Service to profession	Developed mentoring network
5	Developed mentoring network	Service to profession
6	Publications	Publications
7	Seniority	Seniority
8	Additional advanced Degree(s)	Additional advanced degree(s)

1= highest/most important factor (ranking based on the means of frequencies)

Table 12: Data from Two Groups--Perception of Diversity Environment

Group 1: middle and upper managers from selected ARL libraries of mixed races n = 52

Group 2: exclusively minority librarians (some middle and upper managers) from the participants of ARL LCDP n =31

12. Diversity at Staff Level	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group I	5.8%	26.9%	9.6%	44.2%	13.5%
Group II	22.6%	35.5%	0%	38.7%	3.2%
Average Percent	14.2%	31.2%	4.8%	41.5%	8.4%
13. Diversity at Librarian Level	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	13.4%	50.0%	5.8%	25.0%	5.8%
Group II	35.5%	41.9%	0.0%	16.1%	6.5%
Average Percent	24.5%	46.0%	2.9%	20.6%	6.2%
14. Diversity at Middle Management Level	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group I	23.1%	46.2%	3.8%	23.1%	3.8%
Group II	48.4%	38.7%	3.2%	6.5%	3.2%
Average Percent	35.8%	42.5%	3.5%	14.8%	3.5%
15. Diversity at Upper Management Level	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	30.8%	38.5%	5.8%	23.0%	1.9%
Group 2	61.3%	25.8%	6.5%	3.2%	3.2%
Average Percent	46.1%	32.2%	6.2%	13.1%	2.6%
16. Easier to Relate to Own Race	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	23.1%	51.9%	17.3%	7.7%	0.0%
Group 2	3.2%	38.7%	25.8%	32.3%	0.0%
Average Percent	13.2%	45.3%	21.6%	20.0%	0.0%
17. Easier to Communicate with Own Race	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	19.2%	53.9%	13.5%	11.5%	1.9%
Group 2	3.2%	35.5%	19.4%	38.7%	3.2%
Average Percent	11.2%	44.7%	16.5%	25.1%	2.6%

18. Difficult to Relate B/W Races	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	32.7%	59.6%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Group 2	12.9%	74.2%	9.7%	3.2%	0.0%
Average Percent	22.8%	66.9%	8.7%	1.6%	0.0%
19. Difficult Communication B/W Races	Strongly Disagree	Disagree %	No opinion %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %
Group 1	32.7%	57.7%	5.8%	1.9%	1.9%
Group 2	19.4%	64.5%	6.4%	9.7%	0.0%
Average Percent	26.1%	61.1%	6.1%	5.8%	1.0%
20. Recruit Diversity Workforce	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	1.9%	25.0%	23.1%	36.5%	13.5%
Group 2	9.7%	29.0%	16.1%	42.0%	3.2%
Average Percent	5.8%	27.0%	19.6%	39.3%	8.4%
21. Retain Diverse Workforce	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	1.9%	17.4%	36.5%	36.5%	7.7%
Group 2	9.7%	48.3%	19.4%	22.6%	0.0%
Average Percent	5.8%	32.9%	28.0%	29.6%	3.9%
22. Has Diversity as Strategic Priority	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	1.9%	17.3%	19.3%	51.9%	9.6%
Group 2	19.4%	16.1%	16.1%	38.7%	9.7%
Average Percent	10.7%	16.7%	17.7%	45.3%	9.7%
23. Should Have Diversity as Strategic Priority	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	1.9%	5.8%	26.9%	44.2%	21.2%
Group 2	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	71.0%	25.8%
Average Percent	2.6%	2.9%	13.5%	57.6%	23.5%
24. Has Diversity Committee	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	11.5%	34.6%	13.5%	25.0%	15.4%
Group 2	16.0%	22.6%	19.4%	35.5%	6.5%
Average Percent	13.8%	28.6%	16.5%	30.3%	11.0%
25. Diversity and Affirmative Action	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	0.0%	7.7%	11.5%	51.9%	28.9%
Group 2	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	48.4%	48.4%
Average Percent	0.0%	3.9%	7.4%	50.2%	38.7%
26. Hiring and Promotion Should Be Color Blind	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	1.9%	7.7%	11.5%	55.8%	23.1%
Group 2	0.0%	16.1%	9.7%	38.7%	35.5%
Average Percent	1.0%	11.9%	10.6%	47.3%	29.3%
27. Hire on Existing Culture	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Group 1	7.7%	28.8%	23.1%	34.6%	5.8%
Group 2	0.0%	32.3%	9.6%	45.2%	12.9%
Average Percent	3.9%	30.6%	16.4%	39.9%	9.4%
28. Encourages Hiring Diversity	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

Group 1	1.9%	11.5%	11.5%	55.8%	19.3%
Group 2	3.2%	29.0%	25.8%	35.5%	6.5%
Average Percent	2.6%	20.3%	18.7%	45.7%	12.9%