

PART IX
Professional Issues

Marine Science Information Throughout the World.
(eds) Winn, Burkhart & Burkhart, IAMS LIC. 1988

Salary Survey For The International Association of Marine Science Libraries And Information Centers

Elizabeth Fuseler-McDowell
Institute for Scientific Information
3501 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Susan Barrick and Janice Meadows
Virginia Institute of Marine Science
Library
Gloucester Point, Virginia

ABSTRACT

In the spring of 1988 a survey was conducted to assess the influence of various factors, including library characteristics, position characteristics and personal characteristics, on the salaries and benefits of marine science librarians in the United States and Canada.

INTRODUCTION

Salary issues have been a formal and informal topic of discussion at several meetings of the International Association of Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers. At the 1987 meeting Janice Meadows proposed a formal survey to look at the factors that affect salary for marine science librarians. I volunteered to develop and test a survey. We agreed these factors might be location, library characteristics, professional responsibility, and education, as well as other personal factors. We determined that differences in cost of living and standard of living would make it impossible to survey the entire membership. Which comes from over thirty nations. It was decided to start with surveying the libraries in the United States and Canada, as they can be more easily compared. They come from all parts of both countries, in both urban and rural locations.

The membership is diverse. Some have Ph.D.'s in Information Science, while others have the title "librarian," but lack the formal educational requirements for the profession. The clientele served varies from researcher to administrator to undergraduate, and from non-profit research organization to large university to small college. The kinds of data handled vary from maps to lab notebooks to journals to reprints to on-line data files.

Many library groups conduct salary surveys (1-8). The bibliography of salary surveys in the *ALA Survey of Librarian Salaries*¹ is excellent and comprehensive. This survey and the On-Line Salary and Budget Survey,² were thought to be too general. Even though many of the members are affiliated with colleges and universities, or are research libraries, they as a whole are too small to be included in the ARL survey.³ Many see themselves more akin to special librarians. The Special Library Association⁸ and the Medical Group of Southern California and Arizona's 1982 survey⁴ did address many of the issues we had identified. Their data analysis showed a positive correlation between salary and educational level. Other factors influencing salary were job history, number of positions held, and professional responsibility. They also found that salaries of hospital librarians are roughly comparable to those of academic librarians in the area.

Some people have questioned why we decided to do our own survey rather than use the Special Library survey. We wanted to see if there was a significant difference between the field of special librarians and the sub-speciality of marine science librarians.

METHODOLOGY

This questionnaire was originally tested on a group of thirty participants in the 1987 IAMSLIC annual meeting. It was revised slightly then mailed to 133 United States and 25 Canadian members of IAMSLIC. Sixty-eight United States and 14 Canadian responses were received.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) contained 34 questions divided into the following categories:

- 1) Library characteristics, including library budget, collection size, location, type of parent institution number of employees, clientele size and type.
- 2) Personal background, including age, sex, education, experience in the field and in the position, and number of positions held.
- 3) Salary information, including benefits, salary range, faculty status contract length, and union membership.
- 4) Position characteristics, including title, number of employees supervised, and contract length.

Some respondents indicated that they did not keep, or could not get, some of the statistics, such as number of book volumes and number of journal volumes. Almost two-thirds of the librarians did not know what percent of their salary was spent on their benefits package.

RESULTS

Salary showed a strong correlation with location, total number of clients served, number of books, number of journal titles, education, sex and total years of experience in the field. Weaker levels of correlation are seen in number of employees supervised. There appears to be no influence attributable to number of years in the position.

The Responses

Most respondents answered all of the questions. The questions asking for specific numbers, such as book titles, journal volumes, number of clientele served in specific groupings, and percent of salary for benefits, were the ones most frequently left unanswered.

Geographic Location: Looking at the regional distribution, slightly over 26.0% were from the South Atlantic, over 22.0% from the Northeast, 21.0% from the Pacific and West, slightly over 13.0% from the Central States and 17% from Canada. Almost 60.0% indicated that their library was located in an urban area. A few people thought we should have included a "suburban" category.

While the geographic region was significant, an urban or rural locale showed a weaker correlation. Over 60.0% of the urban librarians received more than \$28,000. Over 50.0% of the rural librarians earned less than \$30,000 (Table 1).

Library Description: Over 50.0% were academically affiliated, almost 30.0% were government affiliated, and 11.0% were affiliated with not-for-profit organizations. The remaining 7.0% came from the corporate sector, research organizations and public libraries. Library type, when listed, had only a weak influence on salary.

The average number of full-time equivalent employees ranged from one to over 300, with an average of 18 and a median of three. Number of FTEs employed by the library had little influence on salary.

The sixty libraries reporting on the number of book volumes gave total holdings from 1,000 books to over one million. The 44 libraries reporting journal titles gave total number of titles from 15 to over 29,000. Over 40.0% have fewer than 300 journal titles. Of the title/volume counts, the number of journal titles and book volumes had significant impacts on salary.

The number of clientele varied from under ten to over 25,000. All of the categories mentioned on the questionnaire, - Faculty, Researchers, Graduate and undergraduate students, administration, support personnel, and the general public - were served, in varying proportions by the majority of respondents. The number of clients that were researchers, undergraduates and support staff had a moderate influence on salary. The type and number of other clientele, faculty, graduate students and administration had little influence on salary. Most of the libraries surveyed are open to the general public (72 out of 79), this, however, had no influence.

The conclusion is that the libraries themselves were extremely varied and that the library characteristics had moderate influence on salary.

Position Characteristics: Almost one quarter of the respondents were in one-person libraries. Over 50.0% supervise between zero and three employees. Most libraries supervised paraprofessional and clerical employees (Table 7). This would tend to confirm the perception is that the majority of the IAMSILC membership comes from small libraries.

When less than four employees were supervised there was no difference in impact on salary. However, supervising more than four employees had a significant impact on salary. Only two respondents who supervised more than four employees had salaries of less than \$28,000.

Union membership had moderate significance on salary (Table 11). Faculty status had an impact on salary (Table 12). fewer than 20% of the respondents held faculty status.

Personal Statistics: 80.0% of the sample was female (Table 9). Sex, as opposed to most surveys of librarian salaries, had only a moderate effect on salary. 60.0% of the men and over 50.0% of the women earned more than \$28,000. Almost 50.0% of the sample was 40 years old or under and almost 70.0% was under 46 years old. Age had an effect on salary (Table 10). Almost one quarter of those over 45 earned less than \$28,000, while over 50% of those less than 45 years old did.

Over 80.0% had an M.L.S. or equivalent. One-quarter had a second Masters degree or equivalent. Education level had a definite impact on salary (Table 14). Almost 60.0% of those with a Ph.D. or second Master's degree earned over \$33,000. while only 10.0% of those with an M.L.S. did.

The total years of experience of the sample group ranged from less than one year to over 35 (Table 15). Almost 60% had between three and five years of experience. Years in this position ranged from less than one year on the job to over 30 (Table 16). Total number of years experience was significant, rather than the number of years experience in that particular position, showed some significance.

Benefits: Most employees shared the cost of benefits with their employer. The percent of salary paid in benefits was the question most respondents failed to answer (over 35.0%). Tuition for self (six respondents) and dependents (two respondents), the single most mentioned benefit, was qualified by number of courses which could be taken per semester or percent of reimbursement. The most mentioned other benefit was conference attendance. Other benefits mentioned were, prescription plans, research leave, legal insurance, reduced house/car insurance, mortgages, free fish and "the intangible benefit of working with dedicated researchers."

The average number of paid holidays was 11. The average number of vacation days was 21, with 90% of the respondents replying that they could be carried over to the next year. The average number of sick and personal days per year was 14. Almost 90% of the respondents said they could be carried over,

and two respondents indicated that they had indefinite sick leave. In the case of both vacation and sick/personal days, some librarians indicated that there were some limitations on the number of days which could be carried over.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the personal characteristics of the librarian, in particular education and years of experience in the field, have the most influence on the salary level of this group of marine librarians. While geographic location was significant, there was no attempt to compensate for cost of living in the regions. The size of the library was also significant, especially the number of books, journal titles received and clients served.

What is most important about this survey is that it gives us a picture of "who we are", what the variables are that go into the picture of the "typical" marine science librarian. Perhaps this picture could be expanded by sending out a questionnaire on personal characteristics and library characteristics to develop a composite "marine science librarian/information specialist" for the world. Do I have any volunteers?

REFERENCES

- ¹Lynch, Mary Jo; and Myers, Margaret. 1986 *ALA Survey of Library Salaries, 1986*. Chicago, IL. American Library Association. (An annual survey).
- ²First annual on-line salary and budget survey. *On-line* 2(1):55-59, 1978. (An annual survey).
- ³Fretwell, G. 1987. *ARL annual salary survey, 1986*. Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries,
- ⁴Smith, Julie L.; Connolly, Betty F.; Davis, Marianne; Graham, Elaine; and Wheeler, Sharon. 1984. Salary survey of the Medical Library Group of Southern California and Arizona. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 72(3):295-300.
- ⁵Gray, Rodney. 1976. Survey of Librarians' salaries. *New Zealand Libraries* 39(4):132-133.
- ⁶Andrews, Catherine; Baum, Fred; Griffin, Richard E; and Hoban, Mary Frances. 1979. SLA salary survey, 1979. *Special Libraries* 70(12):559-589.
- ⁷Jones, Jay R. 1987. Sex, salaries, & library support. *Library Journal* 112(17):35-41,.
- ⁸Van House, Nancy A. 1987. Labor market segmentation and librarian salaries. *Library Quarterly* 57:171-189

TABLE 1. Salary by Location (Urban or Rural)

Salary	Urban	Rural	
\$10,000- 19,999	11.4%	8.3%	10.6% n=6
\$20,000- 23,999	17.1%	25.0%	20.3% n=12
\$24,000- 27,999	8.6%	20.8%	13.6% n=8
\$28,000- 32,999	11.4%	20.8%	15.3% n=9
\$33,000- 39,999	37.1%	17.0%	28.8% n=17
>\$40,000	14.3%	8.3%	11.9% n=7
	99.9% n=35	100.2% n=24	100.2% n=59

TABLE 2. Salary by Location (Area of Country)

Salary	NorthEast	South Atlantic	Central	West & Pacific	Canada	
\$10,000- 19,999	0	25.0%	30.0%	0	0	10.5% n=8
\$20,000- 23,999	23.5%	15.0%	10.0%	18.8%	15.4%	17.1% n=13
\$24,000- 27,999	5.9%	25.0%	30.0%	0	23.1%	15.8% n=12
\$28,000- 32,999	17.7%	25.0%	10.0%	18.8%	38.5%	22.4% n=17
\$33,000- 39,999	41.2%	5.0%	0	50.0%	23.1%	25.0% n=19
>\$40,000	11.8%	5.0%	20.0%	12.5%	0	9.2% n=7
	101.1% n=17	100.0% n=20	100.0% n=10	100.1% n=16	100.1% n=13	100.0% n=76

TABLE 3. Salary by total number of clients (Note: There were no responses between 4000 and 6999.)

	<100	100-499	500-999	1,000-3,999	>7,000	
Salary \$10,000-19,999	10.5%	19.0%	0	0	0	9.2% n=6
\$20,000-23,999	26.3%	14.3%	18.2%	28.0%	0	18.5% n=12
\$24,000-27,999	21.1%	23.8%	0	12.5%	0	15.4% n=10
\$28,000-32,999	26.3%	14.3%	18.2%	0	33.3%	18.5% n=12
\$33,000-39,999	15.8%	28.6%	45.4%	25.0%	50.0%	29.2% n=19
>\$40,000	0	0	18.2%	37.5%	16.7%	9.2% n=6
	100.0% n=19	100.0% n=21	100.0% n=11	100.0% n=8	100.1% n=6	100. n=6

TABLE 4. Salary by type of Library

Salary	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	11	
\$10,000-19,999	8.3%	8.7%	0	14.3%	8.3%	100.0%	0	0	8.5% n=7
\$20,000-23,999	0	17.4%	0	14.3%	29.2%	0	22.2	20.0%	18.3% n=15
\$24,000-27,999	16.7	17.4%	0	14.3%	20.8%	0	11.1%	20.0%	17.1% n=14
\$28,000-32,999	33.3%	4.3%	0	28.6%	29.2%	0	55.6%	40.0%	25.6% n=21
\$33,000-39,999	25.0%	39.1%	100.0%	28.6%	12.5%	0	0	20.0%	23.1% n=19
>\$40,000	16.7%	13.0%	0	0	0	0	11.1%	0	7.3% n=6
	100.0% n=12	100.0% n=23	100.0% n=1	100.1% n=7	100.1% n=24	100.0% n=1	100.1% n=9	100.0% n=5	99.9% n=81

1 = Public University, Main Library. 2 = Branch Library of Public University, Main Library. 4 = Branch Library of Private University. 5 = Public Library. 8 = Non-profit organization. 11 = Other.

TABLE 5. Salary by total number of book volumes

	<5,000	5,000- 19,999	20,000- 99,999	>100,000	
Salary \$10,000- 19,999	16.7%	17.6%	0	0	10.0% n=6
\$20,000- 23,999	27.8%	17.6%	12.5%	11.1%	18.3% n=11
\$24,000- 27,999	11.1%	41.2%	12.5%	0	18.3% n=11
\$28,000- 32,999	38.9%	5.9%	6.3%	22.2%	18.3% n=11
\$33,000- 39,999	5.6%	17.6%	56.3%	44.4%	28.3% n=17
>\$40,000	0	0	12.5%	22.2%	6.7% n=4
	100.1% n=18	99.9% n=17	100.1% n=16	99.9% n=9	99.9% n=60

TABLE 6. Salary by total number of journal titles

	<200	200-299	300-999	1,000- 2,999	>3,000	
Salary \$10,000- 19,999	37.5%	0	9.1%	10.0	0	11.4% n=5
\$20,000- 23,999	25.0%	33.3%	27.3%	20.0%	0	22.7% n=10
\$24,000- 27,999	12.5%	22.2%	18.2%	0	0	11.4% n=8
\$28,000- 32,999	12.5%	22.2%	27.3%	20.0%	16.7%	20.5% n=9
\$33,000- 39,999	12.5%	22.2%	9.1%	40.0%	50.0%	25.0% n=11
>\$40,000	0	0	9.1%	10.0%	33.3%	9.1% n=4
	100.0% n=8	99.9% n=9	100.1% n=11	100.0% n=10	100.1% n=6	100.1% n=44

TABLE 7. Number and type of employees supervised
(based on 76 responses)

	Librarians	Other Professionals	Para-professionals	Clerks	Student Workers
Number 0	71.1%	90.8%	55.3%	57.9%	53.9%
1	13.2%	6.6%	15.8%	25.0%	15.8%
2	9.2%	2.6%	11.8%	7.9%	7.9%
3-4	2.6%	0	7.9%	6.6%	4.0%
5-6	1.3%	0	2.6%	2.6%	4.0%
7-10	0	0	2.6%	0	7.9%
<10	2.6%	0	4.0%	0	6.6%
	100.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8: Salary by total number of employees supervised
(excluding student workers)

Salary	0	1	2-3	4-9	>10	
\$10,000-19,999	22.2%	4.5%	5.9%	6.7	0	9.2% n=7
\$20,000-23,999	16.7%	31.8%	11.8%	6.7%	0	17.1% n=13
\$24,000-27,999	22.2%	13.6%	35.3%	0	0	17.1% n=13
\$28,000-32,999	16.7%	31.8%	23.5%	20.0%	0	22.4% n=17
\$33,000-39,999	16.7%	18.2%	23.5%	60.0%	0	26.3% n=20
>\$40,000	5.6%	0	0	6.7%	100.0%	8.9% n=6
	100.1% n=18	100.0% n=22	100.0% n=17	99.8% n=15	100.0% n=4	100.0% n=76

TABLE 9: Salary by sex of respondent

	Male	Female	
Salary \$10,000- 19,999	6.7%	10.5%	9.7% n=7
\$20,000- 23,999	13.3%	19.3%	18.1% n=13
\$24,000- 27,999	6.7%	17.5%	15.3% n=11
\$28,000- 32,999	33.3%	21.1%	23.6% n=17
\$33,000- 39,999	26.7%	24.6%	25.0% n=18
>\$40,000	13.3%	7.0%	8.3% n=6
	100.0% n=15	100.0% n=57	100.1% n=72

TABLE 10. Salary by age of respondent

Salary	26-35	36-40	41-45	46-55	>56	
\$10,000- 19,999	21.0%	0	6.3%	8.3%	0	8.2% n=6
\$20,000- 23,999	21.0%	40.0%	12.5%	8.3%	0	17.8% n=13
\$24,000- 27,999	31.6%	13.3%	6.2%	0	40.0%	17.8% n=13
\$28,000- 32,999	5.3%	20.0%	25.0	33.3%	30.0%	20.5% n=15
\$33,000- 39,999	21.0%	20.0%	43.8%	25.0%	30.0%	28.8% n=21
>\$40,000	0	6.6%	6.3%	25.0%	0	6.0% n=5
	99.9% n=19	99.9% n=15	100.1% n=16	99.9% n=12	100.0% n=11	100.0% n=73

TABLE 11: Salary by union membership

Salary	Yes	No	
\$10,000- 19,999	0	11.1%	5.9% n=3
\$20,000- 23,999	16.7%	14.8%	15.7% n=8
\$24,000- 27,999	16.7%	14.8%	15.7% n=8
\$28,000- 32,999	25.0%	22.2%	23.5% n=12
\$33,000- 39,999	37.5%	25.9%	31.4% n=16
>\$40,000	4.2%	11.1%	7.8% n=4
	100.1% n=24	99.9% n=27	100.0% n=51

TABLE 12: Salary by faculty status

Salary	Yes	No	N/A	
\$10,000- 19,999	0	10.3%	13.0%	7.9% n=6
\$20,000- 23,999	16.7%	13.8%	21.7%	17.1% n=13
\$24,000- 27,999	12.5%	13.8%	21.7%	15.8% n=12
\$28,000- 32,999	29.2%	24.1%	17.4%	23.7% n=18
\$33,000- 39,999	37.5%	24.1%	17.4%	26.3% n=17
>\$40,000	8.3%	14.8%	8.7%	9.7% n=6
	100.0% n=12	99.9% n=27	99.9% n=23	100.0% n=62

TABLE 13: Salary by contract length

Salary	9,10,or 11 mos.	12 mos.	other	
\$10,000- 19,999	0	9.5	23.1%	11.7% n=7
\$20,000- 23,999	20.0%	14.3%	30.8%	18.3% n=11
\$24,000- 27,999	0	11.9%	30.8%	15.0% n=9
\$28,000- 32,999	20.0%	21.4%	7.7%	18.3% n=11
\$33,000- 39,999	40.0%	31.0%	7.7%	26.7% n=16
>\$40,000	20.0%	11.9%	0	10.0% n=6
	100.0% n=5	100.0% n=42	100.1% n=13	100.0% n=60

TABLE 14: Salary by highest level of education

Salary	High School or College	M.L.S.	Second Masters	Ph.D	
\$10,000- 19,999	22.2%	7.1%	5.9%	14.3%	9.3% n=7
\$20,000- 23,999	22.2%	19.0%	17.6%	0	17.3% n=13
\$24,000- 27,999	33.3%	19.0%	5.9%	0	16.0% n=12
\$28,000- 32,999	22.2%	23.8%	11.8%	28.6	21.3% n=16
\$33,000- 39,999	0	26.2%	41.2%	42.9%	28.0% n=21
>\$40,000	0	4.8%	17.6%	14.3%	8.0% n=6
	99.9% n=9	99.9% n=42	100.1% n=17	100.1% n=7	99.9% n=75

TABLE 15 Salary by total years of experience

	<2	3	4	5	6	>7	
Salary							
\$10,000-19,999	33.3%	16.7%	20.0%	5.3%	9.1%	0	10.1% n=7
\$20,000-23,999	0	50.0%	20.0%	15.8%	0	7.1%	17.4% n=12
\$24,000-27,999	0	25.0%	10.0%	10.5%	18.2%	14.3%	14.5% n=10
\$28,000-32,999	33.3%	8.3%	0	31.6%	18.2%	28.6%	20.3% n=14
\$33,000-39,999	33.3%	0	50.0%	31.6%	36.4%	28.6%	29.0% n=20
>\$40,000	0	0	0	5.3%	18.2%	21.4%	8.7% n=6
	99.9% n=3	100.0% n=12	99.9% n=10	100.1% n=19	100.1% n=11	100.0% n=14	100.0% n=69

TABLE 16: Salary by total years of experience in current position

	<2	3	4	5	>6	
Salary						
\$10,000-19,999	22.2%	5.9%	13.3%	0	0	10.1% n=7
\$20,000-23,999	33.3%	17.6%	6.7%	14.3%	18.2%	18.8% n=13
\$24,000-27,999	0	35.3%	13.3%	14.3%	9.1%	14.5% n=10
\$28,000-32,999	5.6%	11.7%	26.7%	28.6%	36.4%	20.3% n=14
\$33,000-39,999	27.8%	29.4%	33.3%	42.9%	18.2%	29.0% n=20
>\$40,000	11.1%	0	6.7%	0	18.2%	7.2% n=5
	100.0% n=18	99.9% n=17	100.0% n=15	100.1% n=8	100.1% n=11	99.9% n=69

TABLE 17: Salary by number of positions held

Salary	1	2	3	4	>5	
\$10,000- 19,999	6.7%	13.3%	7.1%	0	15.4	8.8% n=6
\$20,000- 23,999	33.3%	20.0%	14.3%	18.2%	0	17.6% n=11
\$24,000- 27,999	13.3%	33.3%	7.1%	0	15.4%	14.7% n=10
\$28,000- 32,999	26.7%	26.7%	21.4%	22.3%	7.7%	22.1% n=15
\$33,000- 39,999	13.3%	6.7%	42.9%	54.5%	38.5%	29.4% n=20
>\$40,000	6.7%	0	7.1%	0	23.1%	7.4% n=5
	100.0% n=15	100.0% n=15	99.9% n=14	100.0% n=11	100.1% n=13	100.0% n=68