

2017

Causes Of Satisfaction And Dissatisfaction For Diversity Resident Librarians – A Mixed Methods Study Using Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Jason Kelly Alston
University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>

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

Recommended Citation

Alston, J. K. (2017). *Causes Of Satisfaction And Dissatisfaction For Diversity Resident Librarians – A Mixed Methods Study Using Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4080>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

CAUSES OF SATISFACTION AND DISATISFACTION FOR DIVERSITY
RESIDENT LIBRARIANS – A MIXED METHODS STUDY USING HERZBERG’S
MOTIVATION-HYGIENE THEORY

by

Jason Kelly Alston

Bachelor of Arts
University of North Carolina at Wilmington, 2005

Master of Library Science
North Carolina Central University, 2008

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Library and Information Science

College of Information and Communications

University of South Carolina

2017

Accepted by:

Paul Solomon, Major Professor

Nicole Cooke, Committee Member

Karen Gavigan, Committee Member

Dick Kawooya, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Jason Kelly Alston, 2017
All Rights Reserved.

DEDICATION

To my three grandmothers, Lela Richardson Alston, Edna T. Kelly Anderson, and Mildred Suggs Blount, who lived to see me begin my Ph.D. process, but were not able to see me complete it. I thank you for the way I was raised, and for the values you instilled into myself and the rest of the family. The life lessons you all taught your children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren laid the foundations for all of us. All of the good things that we do are a tribute to your legacies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must acknowledge my biological mother M. Rena Anderson and other mother figures: Florence Harrison, Leslie Madden, Rosa Watkins, Yolanda Bostic, Debbie Kearny-Scott, Miranda and Ceneida. Biological father Clifton C. Alston and other father figures: Jerome Offord, John Madden, William Evans, J.R. Smith, Walter Anderson. My siblings Tanika, Atari, and Aneudis, my ten nieces and nephews, and multitudes of aunts, uncles, and cousins. Also my brothers and sisters in Zeta Phi Beta Sigma, especially my line brothers Fury, Cyntelle and Norman, plus M. Clayton Barrier and Devaris Davis.

The faculty, staff and students at USC SLIS with special thanks to my committee members as well as Sam Hastings, Jennifer Arns, Kendra Albright, Elise Lewis, Carolyn Delton, Sarah Keeling, Chuck Curran, Angela Wright, Zamir, Anmol, Sara, and Maria.

The supportive former coworkers I had at Midlands Technical College, Forsyth Public Library, the Henderson Daily Dispatch, Wagoner Dining Hall, and especially UNC-Greensboro, of which there are too many to name in this limited space. Also, professional supporters from NC Central University, ARL, BCALA and elsewhere. My transcription team, especially Rachel Hillcoat, Mia Mitchell and Derrick L. Thompson.

Finally good friends, of which I want to name more, but I only had one page: Jessica Thompson, Mike and Mishelle Dixon, Anya Davis, Crissi, Robert Greene, Aki, Christal, Keyatta, Kelvin Watson, Lori Ruffin, Natalie M. Smith, Renee Johnson, Jon Adams, Bambadjan, Tanika Martin, Angela Hamlin, Rosalyn Erves, and Eli (R.I.P.)

ABSTRACT

Diversity residency librarian programs are post-MLIS programs aimed at providing recently graduated professionals with real work experience, with the expressed goal of recruiting and retaining a more-diverse workforce in professional librarianship.

This mixed-method study is one of the first empirical studies examining diversity residencies, which – at the time of this writing – have existed for more than 30 years. The study identifies concerns raised in the mostly anecdotal literature about diversity residencies, and 102 individuals identified as current or former diversity resident librarians participated in the quantitative portion of the study. In the quantitative portion of this study, there were four factors derived from the literature that correlated positively and significantly with the residents' overall views of their residency experiences. Those four factors were:

1. Quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff.
2. Perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program.
3. Level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident.

4. Perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment.

In the qualitative portion of this study, 11 current or former diversity residents were interviewed and six emergent themes arose wherein diversity residents encountered satisfaction or dissatisfaction when certain elements were present in the residency experience.

The six emergent themes were:

1. Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.

2. Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors, and administrators.

3. Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents.

4. Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents.

5. Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appears to improve future job outlook.

6. Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	15
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY.....	46
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND HERZBERG FRAMING	64
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	185
REFERENCES	213
APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT QUESTIONS	233
APPENDIX B – QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW BASE QUESTIONS	240
APPENDIX C – IRB LETTER	243

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Herzberg-based Motivations and Hygienes Comparison Table	45
Table 4.1 Distribution of Overall Residency Ratings	164
Table 4.2 Survey Results for First Two Statements to RQ1	165
Table 4.3 Survey Results for the Last Three Statements of RQ1	166
Table 4.4 Survey Results for First Three Statements of RQ2	167
Table 4.5 Survey Results for the Last Three Statements of RQ2	168
Table 4.6 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ4	169
Table 4.7 Survey Results for the First Three Statements of RQ5	170
Table 4.8 Survey Results for the Second Three Statements of RQ5	171
Table 4.9 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ6	172
Table 4.10 Survey Results for the First Three Statements of RQ7	173
Table 4.11 Survey Results for the Second Three Statements of RQ7	174
Table 4.12 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ8	175
Table 4.13 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ9	176
Table 4.14 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ10	177
Table 4.15 Survey Results for Statements Related to RQ11	178
Table 4.16 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ1 Survey Questions	179
Table 4.17 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ2 Survey Questions	180
Table 4.18 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ4 Survey Questions	181
Table 4.19 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ5 Survey Questions	182

Table 4.20 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ6 Survey Questions183
Table 4.21 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ7 Survey Questions184

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

American libraries currently do not employ enough professionals who reflect the communities that they serve in terms of ethnicity. In 1990 when the literature of the LIS field first started paying serious attention to ethnic diversity in the library workforce, there were 120,365 credentialed librarians in the United States. 105,908 of these librarians identified as white (87%) (American Library Association, 2012), while roughly 75% of the U.S. population identified as white in the 1990 U.S. Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992). 7,423 credentialed librarians in 1990 were Black (6%) (American Library Association, 2012), while the American population was 12% Black (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992). 4,483 credentialed librarians in 1990 were Asian (4%), while the American population was 3% Asian. 2266 credentialed librarians in 1990 were Hispanic (1.8%), while the U.S. population at the time was roughly 9% Hispanic. There were 284 American Indian librarians (0.2%), while the U.S. population was 0.8% American Indian.

Significant underrepresentation of Blacks and Latinos in professional American librarianship still exists two decades later with minimal-to-no progress, and there appears to be an emerging underrepresentation of Asian/Pacific Islanders. In 2009-2010, there were 118,666 professional librarians in the U.S. 104,392 professional American librarians were white (88%), while the general American population was 63% non-Hispanic white. 6160 professional librarians were Black (5%), while the American population was 13%

non-Hispanic Black. 3260 professional librarians were Asian or Pacific Islander (2.7%), while the American population was 5% Asian or Pacific Islander. 3661 professional librarians were Hispanic (3%), while the U.S. population was 16% Hispanic. There were 185 American Indian librarians (0.1%), while the U.S. population was 0.9% American Indian (American Library Association, 2012) (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992). Black males are a particularly rare presence in professional librarianship, making up fewer than 600 persons and roughly 0.5% of the professional librarian workforce (Kelley, 2013). Comparing these recent figures to 1990 figures suggests that there is no significant improvement in diversifying the professional librarian workforce, and therefore current initiatives to diversify may be ineffective or not effective enough or practiced on a wide enough scale.

American libraries have long explored options for trying to increase diversity among practicing library professionals. Because American libraries are resources that serve to promote equity of access and provide inclusive environments, recognition of underserved populations and efforts to correct past underservice resulting from issues such as segregated, non-equal facilities and not making access accommodations for the differently-abled are now top library concerns. One proposed method for creating a more inclusive environment for library patrons is to recruit a librarian workforce that closely reflects the communities of the libraries they serve. The American Library Association (ALA) has asserted that diversifying the librarian workforce “makes good sense” because the library should be a more inclusive environment and add diverse perspectives to institutional decision-making (American Library Association, n.d.). Diverse perspectives

can also help institutions become more innovative and creative, and these institutions may be better at solving more complex problems (Shorter-Gooden, 2013).

Other reasons to create a librarian workforce more reflective of the communities that they serve have been proposed. Hastings (2015) suggested that if libraries do not hire a front-line librarian workforce reflective of the communities they serve, potential patrons will just turn to neighbors who have more in common with them; alternative information sources might be less credible but libraries would not even be entertained as an information resource. Jaeger (2015, pg. 130) proposes that a current-day goal of LIS professionals is to be “a more integrated part of the community that they serve.” The demographics of the United States (U.S.) are becoming increasingly diverse, particularly along racial and ethnic lines, and institutions that do not learn how to engage a diverse clientele are not likely to survive (Shorter-Gooden, 2013). However, while the U.S. population rapidly diversifies, the professional librarian workforce is not diversifying at nearly the same pace (Atkins, Virden, & Yier, 2015).

According to statistical reports generated by ALISE (Association of Library and Information Science Education), in 1991, racial and ethnic minorities comprised 9% or 344 of the 4032 graduates receiving accredited MLIS degrees. In 2001, racial and ethnic minorities accounted for 504 of 4,109 graduates receiving accredited MLIS degrees, or 12%. The three percent increase falls significantly short of the 152% increase of these populations in the general U.S. population during that span (Hall, 2006). 2012 data suggest that only four percent of students in ALA-accredited MLIS programs were Black, four percent were Latino, four percent were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 71% were

white; remaining figures were comprised of international persons or those whose race and ethnicity were unknown (Morales, Knowles & Bourg, 2014).

Libraries and LIS professional organizations have launched a number of programs and initiatives aimed at diversifying the librarian workforce. ALA's Spectrum Scholarship has provided funding to approximately 1064 library school students of color as of June 2017, with 18 doctoral fellowships also awarded (American Library Association, n.d.). The Institute of Library and Museum Services (IMLS) has also awarded scholarships for diversity cohorts at accredited library schools as part of grant initiatives aimed at increasing diversity. Particularly in academic libraries, special diversity-related positions are at times created, which are usually used to provide new professionals of color with enhanced skill sets that make them more competitive on the open market. The goal of those creating these positions is to retain practitioners of color who have chosen the profession and give them a solid foundation for being career librarians. Other initiatives that recruit professionals of color into the field include the Association of Research Libraries' (ARL) Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce (Association of Research Libraries, n.d.) and the Knowledge River Institute's Knowledge River scholarship program at the University of Arizona (University of Arizona School of Information, n.d.).

There are also diversity residencies, which are the focus of this research project. Diversity residencies take newly minted professionals and train them in different areas of librarianship during a temporary appointment of usually 1-3 years. Expectations of residents within diversity residency programs differ. Some residencies, such as the University of Utah's, culminate with a sizeable capstone project, while others like the

University of Tennessee-Knoxville's do not. Most residencies are assigned as two-year appointments, but some appointments may be shorter or longer; the University of West Virginia's resident librarian appointment, for instance, lasts for three years. Some residencies, such as the University of Tennessee-Knoxville's, have residents serve in cohorts of two or more, while others, like that at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, employ only one resident at a time. Residents ideally come out of a residency program with a better understanding of what they wish to do professionally and how to conduct themselves professionally in the field of library science. Additionally, residents, in theory, finish their appointments with a more-developed skill set as they should be training under seasoned professionals at reputable institutions. Also, in theory, residents gain some understanding and appreciation of the importance of diversity in librarianship and have increased competence in working toward diversity-related initiatives following their appointments.

Research Problem

Diversity residency programs are aimed at enhancing retention of ethnic minorities in librarianship; but given that these programs hire new professionals and place them into their first work environments as degreed librarians, it is important for residents to have positive experiences so that they will remain in the field and remain enthusiastic about library work. However, not all residency experiences are positive for the new professional (Hu & Patrick, 2006; Hankins, Saunders, & Situ, 2003; Alston, 2016). Negative residency experiences could be counterproductive to the mission of retaining professionals of color (Sheldon & Alston, 2015). Residents with negative experiences could potentially leave the field, since research shows that a negative racial

climate does negatively impact job satisfaction and retention among academic librarians of color (Damasco & Hodges, 2012). Former residents who had bad experiences also might not seek to maintain professional connections with those at the host institution, which stunts the emergence of improvements and brainstorming of good ideas (Alston, 2016). While actual numbers are unknown, it is known that some former diversity residents are no longer practicing librarians (Cooke, N. personal communication. January 15, 2016); this is problematic given the amount of time and monetary resources dedicated to planning and implementing a residency.

Many negative residency experiences stem from lack or perceived lack of institutional support from residency coordinators (Sheldon & Alston, 2015). This lack of support can take the form of inadequate mentorship and professional guidance. Genuine lack of institutional support may also prevent the resident from gaining a sufficient skill set to be marketable following the residency appointment. Negative experiences may also result from hostilities or perceived hostilities toward the resident from coworkers who do not support the diversity residency position and allow their disapproval to manifest in ways that slight the new professional. Such hostilities can take the form of intentional actions meant to demean the resident, or of unintentional racial microaggressions that are not intended to cause harm or offend, but that nonetheless contribute to a hostile work environment. Residents who suffer through these encounters may feel alienated and, due perhaps to lack of perspective since this is typically their first professional librarian appointment, become convinced that the profession is unwelcoming and is not suitable for them.

The field of librarianship is not significantly diversifying despite residencies and other diversification initiatives. If residents are not staying with librarianship after residency appointments, or if they are less enthused about the field or not advancing professionally, then program hosts fail in their mission of retention and preparation. Librarian diversification efforts must continually be assessed to determine what is succeeding and how improvements may continue. Concerning residencies, programs need to be assessed to determine what factors contribute to providing satisfaction for residents, as well as what factors contribute to dissatisfaction among residents. Once such factors are identified, residency programs may achieve more success in retention and in grooming professionals by sharing best practices which cultivate satisfaction while removing dissatisfaction. Once conditions are created in which there is high satisfaction and low dissatisfaction, residents will be optimally motivated and have few complaints, which is a workplace goal as presented in Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, the theoretical framework of this study (Herzberg, 1968).

Hence, it would be useful to know what factors cause satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the residency experience among diversity resident librarians. Previous professional literature on diversity residency positions is almost exclusively anecdotal, with only a few pieces employing descriptive statistics. This study will address the gap in existing literature by being the first study on diversity residency positions to use inferential statistics to analyze data from surveyed past and current diversity residents. Additionally, this study will also be the first to use qualitative methods to identify themes among the experience reports of past diversity resident librarians regarding what produces satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a residency experience. The

goal of this study, therefore, is to investigate what creates an ideal situation of high motivation and high hygiene for a diversity resident, where the resident is highly motivated and has few complaints.

Research Questions

Library diversity residency programs have existed long enough and produced enough working practitioners to determine what factors contribute to positive residency experiences, but the existing literature largely consists of only anecdotal recapitulations from former residents that explain some of the ups and downs of their experiences. There are eleven research questions in this study, as the best method to analyze this data is to examine correlations between one independent variable and one dependent variable at a time, and seven variables with Herzberg-relevant framing emerged through a review of the literature; an additional four variables were devised to explore the relationship between overall score of the residency experience, and the residents' occupational attitudes and approaches beyond the residency experience. There are statistical tests such as multiple regression that would allow for comparison of several independent variables to a dependent variable; however, using tests that could examine more than one independent variable at a time would require a larger sample size, a larger total population from which a sample is being drawn, and in cases such as multiple regression, there would need to be a model constructed. Spearman's Rho correlation tests can be valid even with small sample numbers of people representing small overall populations. This study, the first of its kind, will attempt to gather quantitative data from former and current residents and answer the following research questions:

Research Question 1: Does the quality of effort, as perceived by the resident, that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlate with the resident's opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?

Research Hypothesis (H1): The quality of effort as perceived by the resident that the administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlates with overall quality of a diversity residency experience.

Research Question 2: Does the severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term correlate with the resident's opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?

(H1): The severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term inversely correlates with the resident's opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience.

Research Question 3: Does severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment inversely correlates with resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 4: Does perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency correlates with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 5: Does perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 6: Does level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlates with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 7: Does the perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment does correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 8: Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/ her outlook on the future of librarianship?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship.

Research Question 9: Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her level of enthusiasm for the profession?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her level of enthusiasm for the profession.

Research Question 10: Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her "ambitiousness of goals"*?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her ambitiousness and goals.

Research Question 11: Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her level of professional activity in professional associations?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her level of professional activity in professional associations.

* The "ambitiousness of goals" for this research is defined as how high the resident's aspirations are in eventual job attainment. For instance, did service as a diversity resident prompt the resident to want to move, eventually, into library administration or management? Or, did service as a diversity resident prompt the resident

to want to work for more “prestigious” institutions, such as Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions?

Purpose and Significance of the Research

The potential significance of this study lies in its ability to help institutions improve their residency programs. If residency programs are improved, this may result in better experiences for the residents who serve in these capacities. The broader significance is that if residency programs are improved and the librarianship field is able to retain better-skilled librarians, then this will contribute to creating a librarian workforce more reflective of American racial and ethnic demographics. The benefit and effectiveness of residency programs appears to be assumed and not quantitatively explored or assessed. I plan to provide data obtained from this study to residency program coordinators and to those establishing residencies to help advise them of best practices and actions/situations to avoid. This study will also, one hopes, spur the development of a model for a successful residency, though additional research beyond the scope of this dissertation may be required for full development of such a model.

Research Design

The research design for this study is a mixed methods design. The research questions will be answered through correlation analysis, specifically Spearman’s Rho. Spearman’s Rho is a nonparametric correlation test used to determine correlation between variables measured as ordinal data. Because the research questions are answered through a correlation, a qualitative component was added to provide further context and possibly further explain some quantitative findings. Narrative thematic analysis of in-

depth, semi-structured interview data is used to produce the qualitative portion of the study. Because this study is quantitative dominant, with a qualitative portion used to help explain quantitative results, the overall study design is considered “sequential triangulation – QUAN + qual illustration,” or more commonly, “sequential explanatory” (Creswell, 1994).

Definition of Terms:

There are several terms that need to be defined for this study. These are listed here and include the following:

Diversity residency: Post-degree work experience designed as an entry level program for recent graduates of an MLS program (Residency Interest Group of the Association of College & Research Libraries, n.d.), with some criteria of race/ethnicity or other manifestation of diversity in candidate selection.

Racial microaggression: “Racial microaggressions are subtle, derogatory messages conveyed to people of color. While often delivered unconsciously, these persistent and pervasive negative messages can have devastating effects on individuals and organizations” (Alabi, 2015).

Motivators: All factors contributing to job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1968).

Hygiene factor: A factor that, per Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory, must be present for a worker to avoid dissatisfaction. When hygiene factors are absent and hygiene is low, workers are dissatisfied (Herzberg, 1968).

Ambitiousness of goals: How high the resident's aspirations are for eventual job attainment.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review chapter begins by describing the demographic changes occurring in the United States. The chapter then goes on to describe how some businesses and public resources are addressing the changing ethnic demographics in the U.S. The focus then switches to libraries specifically. The chapter details how the changing demographics of the U.S. are affecting American libraries, and how the demographics of the American librarian workforce are not changing with the demographics of the broad U.S. population. The chapter then details some other diversity initiatives in libraries, before presenting the available literature on diversity residency programs. Finally, the chapter ends by presenting literature on the theoretical framework of this study, which is Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

A Changing America

The United States is continuously becoming more diverse as racial and other demographics in the nation change rapidly. Concerning racial demographics, in 1960, the U.S. was 85 percent White, 11 percent Black, 3.5 percent Hispanic and less than one percent Asian (Taylor & Cohn, 2012). By 2011 – only 51 years later – the U.S. population was only 63 White, 12 percent Black, 17 percent Hispanic, and five percent Asian. The U.S. is projected to be a predominantly non-White country by 2050, with

demographics of 47 percent White, 29 percent Hispanic, 13 percent Black and nine percent Asian (Taylor & Cohn, 2012).

Race and ethnicity are not the only aspects of diversity and are not the only ways in which the U.S. continues to diversify. Religiously, the U.S. was roughly 78 percent Christian in 2007, but in 2015 this figure had dropped to 70 percent; “religious nones” are the fastest growing religious demographic in the U.S. (Lipka, 2015). The United States legalized same sex marriage in 2015 and discussion of gender identity is growing. While participation of women in the professional workforce has been fairly static from the 1990s to 2013, recent numbers reflecting that roughly 75 percent of women are participating in the workforce still mark a change from the pre-1970s, when roughly 43 percent of women participated in the workforce (Covert, 2013). There also has been a pronounced shift in recognition of persons with disabilities as well as educational and professional accomplishment from persons with disabilities since the 1990 passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act. For example, the number of students with disabilities attending colleges and universities tripled between 1978 and 2008 (Future of Equity and Inclusion, 2013). There is also awareness of generational diversity in the contemporary U.S. culture of inclusion and diversity. Three distinct generations – Baby Boomers, Generation X and Millennials – currently occupy the American workforce, and organizations leverage the differences among these distinct generations for maximum effectiveness and accomplishment. Baby Boomers, for instance, may be used to mentor younger generations while Millennials may be used to introduce other generations to new technologies and to re-energize older generations with their enthusiasm (Legas & Sims, 2011).

As America diversifies, domestic institutions and entities that sell or provide goods and services to the American people tend to also adapt with the times and a changing consumer base. Even as Whites continued to be the dominant consumer market in the U.S. into the 1960s and 1970s, decades that marked both the tail-end of the Civil Rights Movement and a shift in advertising behavior where companies such as Coca-Cola, McDonalds, and Kraft (manufacturers of Jell-O) began increasing racial diversity in their advertising campaigns and hiring Black spokespersons to reach Black patrons (Cruz, 2015). Migratory patterns and increased urbanization of Blacks in the 1960s contributed to corporations realizing that profits could be made from Black consumers, and corporations in turn began studying Black consumer habits and advertising more in Black media; *Ebony* magazine, for instance, nearly tripled its advertising revenue from 1962 to 1969 (Weems, 1999).

The trend toward consideration of customer diversity by for-profit entities has continued as the U.S. has become more diverse. Many large corporations now have “inclusion and diversity” initiatives or teams, including McDonalds (About McDonald’s: inclusion & diversity, n.d.), Hilton (Hilton worldwide: diversity and inclusion, n.d.), Microsoft (Microsoft, n.d.), and Verizon (Verizon, n.d.). For-profit industries have learned of the benefits that organizational diversity can bring to the bottom line Caleb (2014).

The healthcare industry in the U.S. has also been at the forefront of recognizing and responding to the changing demographics of America. Transcultural nursing is a dominant mode of operation in contemporary American healthcare; this model, which seeks to be aware of and account for cultural sensitivities in patients when caring for

them, helps to “increase the delivery of culturally competent care to individual, families, groups, communities and institutions” (Andrews & Boyle, 2002, p. 178). Transcultural nursing concepts for addressing the needs of patients of diverse cultures has been so effective that now nursing scholars are considering transcultural nursing concepts not just to adapt to the needs of ethnic populations, but also to adapt to the needs of other particular patient populations such as the homeless (Law & John, 2012).

Government entities also trend toward adapting resources to address a diversifying America and better serving communities. Emergency dispatches are increasingly trying to hire bilingual dispatchers (Ura, 2015), and states such as California offer interpretation services when emergency callers do not speak English (San Mateo County Public Safety, n.d.). Law enforcement agencies have recognized the role of diversity in policing and recognize a need for responding to diversity in communities in order to establish legitimacy in served communities (Wasserman, 2010). Also, in the midst of growing diversity in America, the National Park Service and cultural heritage resources have recognized a need to ensure that the stories told in public-facing monuments and displays have meaning for all Americans (National Park Service, 2001).

Many institutions of higher learning have included diversity initiatives and statements in their official policies (Bangert, 1997). North Carolina State University, for example, has in its diversity statement, “NC State garners strength from the variety of perspectives and experiences of our campus community. The Diversity and Inclusion unit within the Office for Institutional Equity and Diversity advocates for equity, diversity and inclusiveness as critical components to accomplish NC State’s vision to be distinguished in research and transformative in local and global communities,” (North Carolina State

University, n.d.). National policies such as No Child Left Behind have the proposed goal of ensuring that K-12 educational opportunities are adequate for all children, including minority students, first-generation Americans, and students with disabilities (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, 2007). Diversity in educational settings is credited with fostering intellectual development (Knefelkamp & David-Lang, 2000). Additionally, a diverse educational environment reduces student racial prejudice (Palmer, 2000) and encourages students to explore diverse perspectives (Carnevale & Fry, 2000).

Libraries and Diversity

Like other organizations that aim to serve the general public, American libraries are also recognizing the growing diversity and other cultural trends in the United States and are aiming to best serve all potential populations. Jaeger (2015) maintains that the ultimate goal of diversity and inclusion initiatives in LIS is to make libraries and their workers integrated parts of the communities they serve, with awareness and knowledge of those communities and welcoming attitudes toward those communities. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) states, in its diversity standards, “if libraries are to continue being indispensable organizations in their campus communities, they must reflect the communities they serve,” (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2012). Brimhall-Vargas (2015) proposes a bottom-line rationale, a social justice rationale and an excellence rationale for fostering diversity in libraries, saying that for social justice, this is the only way everyone will have equal opportunity for jobs and advancement; for the bottom line, not diversifying would lead to irrelevance.

For excellence, evidence has proven that diverse organizations perform better in a diverse world than homogeneous ones.

Equipping libraries to better serve diverse populations may require better integration of diversity and social-justice training, topics and issues in LIS curricula (Cooke, Sweeney, & Noble, 2016). A diversity consultant working with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Graduate School in Library and Information Science recommended that that particular program take care to not isolate particular cultural groups, identify experts who can help faculty and staff increase cross-cultural understandings and competencies, and offer concrete tools for constructive discussions of racism and diversity (Cooke, Sweeney & Noble, 2016). Integrating diversity into LIS curricula, however, may be hindered by various difficulties in discussing diversity, including pervasive LIS attitudes on the “polite society,” and shying away in some library school courses from discussing taboo topics (Winston, 2005). Peterson (2005) suggests that students wish to take courses that will best prepare them for professional practice, and this may dissuade them from taking classes fully devoted to diversity or multi-culturalism as a central subject matter.

Libraries often try to address diversity in three areas: through services, collections and collaborations; through diversity plans and policies/statements; and through recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce (Dewey & Parham, 2006). Racial and ethnic minorities seem to respond better to general outreach services. Hispanics and non-Hispanic Blacks are significantly more likely than are non-Hispanic whites to consider common services offered by libraries including free Internet/computer access, employment resources, free events, and free meeting spaces to be “very important” to

their communities (Kelley, 2013). Non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics are also much more likely than non-Hispanic whites to use many traditional library services monthly, and somewhat more likely than whites to attend library events (Kelley, 2013). Non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics are significantly more likely than whites to believe that libraries help people find jobs, pursue employability training, and learn emerging technologies (Horrigan, 2015). Non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to believe that closure of the library would negatively impact their lives and that libraries help patrons decide what information to trust (Horrigan, 2015).

Concerning services, collection and collaborations, academic libraries are becoming more deliberate in collecting diversity-related library materials than they have been historically (Gilbert, 1999; Ciszek & Young, 2010). Because of the central place that libraries hold on college campuses, diversity, inclusion and multiculturalism became priority foci of American college libraries largely starting in the mid-1990s (Buttler, 1994). Diversity in services, collection, and collaborations at academic libraries is recognized as important because librarians are seen as not only needing to mirror the populations they serve, but also as connecting them with the diversity of the nation and the world (Bostic, 1995). Academic libraries have been called on to create diverse collections that go beyond suiting classroom needs and support (Schomberg & Grace, 2005). The importance of creating a diverse collection to reach diverse audiences and boost circulation is also recognized in public libraries by the Public Library Association (Chant, 2014). Haro & Martinez-Smith (1978) once asserted that Spanish-speaking populations were being ignored in library services, but this appears to have changed in decades following this observation. Diversity in children's literature and collections is

becoming an increasingly recognized cause (Association for Library Service to Children, n.d.), though diversification efforts have been more successful in some regions of the U.S. than others (Williams & Deyoe, 2014).

Regarding diversity planning and policies or statements, many college and university libraries have diversity statements of their own or abide by and support the diversity statements of the college or university itself (Bangert, 1997). No recent study appears to survey or analyze college and university library diversity statements in particular, but in a recent study of mission statements for institutions of higher learning in general, 74% of institutions mentioned diversity in their primary mission statement and 65% of institutions expanded on diversity in prose outside of the primary mission statement or an actual diversity statement (Wilson, Meyer & McNeal, 2011). Ballard-Thrower and Mills (2006) incorporate mission planning and listing objectives and strategies as integral parts of making diversity a primary goal in a library. Royse (2006) stresses the importance of defining diversity along with developing mission statements and setting goals. With planning comes the need to survey affected communities, and such endeavors have previously been taken (Pisano & Skidmore, 1978).

Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce

Much library literature explores the benefits of recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce. Kim and Sin (2008) state that interpersonal similarities help library users to feel comfortable and know that a resource or institution is right for them. Those who come from minority populations also empathize with users from those populations and understand how to provide relevant services, outreach and collections (Lam, 1988; Chu,

1999; DuMont, Buttlar & Caynon, 1994; Alire, 1996; Knowles & Jolivet, 1991). Alire (2001) proposed that courting ethnic diversity among library leaders in particular will aid institutions by making them more dynamic and flexible in the face of change, as ethnic minorities in the U.S. are accustomed to being adaptable. Smith (1974) proposed that subject specialists who have detailed and intimate knowledge on their specialty are most effective; this later spawned an argument that librarians of ethnic backgrounds may best serve as subject specialists for disciplines related to their heritage (Kim, Chiu, Sin & Robbins, 2007). The argument is not that only librarians of color can serve patrons of color, but that these librarians may have particular sensitivities that allow them to better serve such patrons (Hussey, 2009).

In addition to the ethnic diversity statistics offered in the beginning of Chapter 1, it should be noted that between 1990 and 2010 the overall rate of minority students earning masters degrees has increased by 15%, calling into question conventional wisdom that the MLIS is a barrier to diversifying librarianship (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012); still, requiring the MLIS to serve as a professional librarian may obstruct diversification and normalize “whiteness” in librarianship (Hathcock, 2015).

The need for diversity among the ranks of librarians and library workers may have been loosely recognized as early as the 1920s, when the American Library Association in 1925 expressed enthusiasm for the development of a library school for Blacks at Hampton Institute, and Florence Rising Curtis in 1927 made mention of the need for library schools for Blacks during that era (Neely & Patterson, 2007; Sutton, 2005; Curtis, 1927). ALA asked accredited library schools in 1948 if they admitted

Blacks; it is presumed that ALA at the time recognized a demand for Black librarians to serve on Black military bases during World War II (Peterson, 1996). As the 20th Century progressed and the ideals of the Lyndon B. Johnson administration and the “Great Society” took root, education was seen as a catalyst for leveling social playing fields and initiatives to support institutions of higher learning in particular brought about new demand for librarians (Kantor & Lowe, 1995).

The Great Society also brought about federally funded education grants (Title II-B) supporting graduate education for ethnic minorities (DeLoach, 1980). Librarianship during the Lyndon Baines Johnson administration and the Civil Rights Era reflected the Civil Rights Movement, and concerns for achieving equity and justice through diversity, particularly in academic librarianship, prevailed (Neely & Patterson, 2007). In the 1970s, ALA members met to mitigate the impact of real and de facto racial segregation on library education and minority librarianship (Josey, 1970; Asheim, 1975). Trejo and Lodwick surveyed the need for and best ways to recruit Spanish-speaking librarians in 1978. Work by Trejo and Lodwick revealed that in 1976, of 84 library directors participating in a survey, 51 respondents said at the time that there was an increased need for Latino librarians, while only seven said there was not, with the remaining respondents unsure (Trejo & Lodwick, 1978). The Association of College and Research Libraries first established a Task Force on Recruitment of Underrepresented Minorities in 1989 and, one year later, this group authored a report for recruiting ethnic minorities (Beaudin, Fisher, Knowles & Morita, 1990). Also, the Association of Research Libraries produced a “SPEC kit” in 1990 titled “Minority Recruitment in ARL Libraries” that claimed that

libraries have engaged in diverse workforce recruitment efforts since the 1960s, but with limited success (Burrows, Jennings & Welch, 1990).

Retention may get overlooked in the discussion of diversity (Neely & Patterson, 2007), but there is some literature addressing the need for retention. Numerical data related to retention of ethnic and racial minorities cannot be found. Howland (1999) asserted that enhancing retention would require eliminating workplace factors that would hinder librarians from diverse backgrounds from remaining in the profession; this would first require that organizational leadership take a firm, dedicated and visible stance in support of any diversity initiatives in practice. Visible stances include not just “lip service” and “token gestures,” but also “cold cash and staff time”; directors must press on in spite of resistance and must create an atmosphere in which everyone feels equally valued (Howland, 1999). Sufficient mentoring, salary implications, and fair participation in decision-making are also posed as factors that can impact retention of minority practitioners (Hall & Grady, 2006; McCook & Lippincott, 1997; Josey & Abdullahi, 2002). Leadership institutes provide mentoring and networking opportunities and appear to be effective retention tools (Maurer & Coccaro, 2002). Mentoring of ethnic minority librarians new to the field may be especially needed for psychological reasons, and mentored librarians of color had higher retention rates and higher outlooks on librarianship than did librarians and former librarians of color who were not mentored (Royster, Schwieder, Brillat & Driver, 2016).

Neely and Patterson (2007) recommend that libraries do the following to retain diverse practitioners: orientations and welcomes, programming that addresses work culture issues in a non-threatening manner, opportunities for professional development,

positive environments where opinions are valued, rewards, and recognition of the need for work-life balance. Perry (2006) reminds organizational leaders that when they are implementing a diversity initiative, they are attempting to change the culture of the organization, and that they should be prepared to develop a strategy and reinforce messages and principles constantly because the process is long and difficult. Hussey (2009) notes that in academic settings, minority practitioners may be called upon to serve on committees and diversity initiatives more frequently than their White counterparts are, but they are also expected to meet the same professional obligations for tenure; this can lead to over-assignment, burnout, and failure to meet tenure requirements.

The low gains in recruiting and retaining an ethnically diverse workforce persist even in the midst of various outreach efforts from library organizations and institutions. Scholarships are one tactic; various libraries support the aforementioned Spectrum scholarship by agreeing to make matching grants to awardees (Gollop, 1999). Spectrum also offers support for ethnically diverse doctoral students in LIS (Cooke, 2014). Plus, as of February 2017, 197 ethnic and racial minority students have received Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce scholarships from the Association of Research Libraries, with 33 students enrolled in the program during the spring 2017 semester (M. Swearer, personal communication, February 21, 2017). Knowledge River scholarships at the University of Arizona have successfully recruited Native American and Hispanic librarians (Berry, 2004). While not a technical scholarship program for MLIS degree tuition coverage, the American Library Association and the Institute of Museum and Library Services have devoted student funding toward recruiting high school students and college undergraduates into librarianship careers with the “Discovering Librarianship:

The Future is Overdue” program (Chan, Lota, Smith & Booth, 2016). Scholarships are helpful but there are not enough to give to everyone, and not every potential librarian – paraprofessionals of color included – really has the ability to pursue a master’s degree in library science (Kelly, 2013). Scholarship cohorts only contain a handful of students annually. Several authorities have suggested that attempting to recruit at the legal adult age is not good enough and that intervention must happen during high school or earlier (Neely & Patterson, 2007; Kim, Chiu, Sin & Robbins, 2007; Stanley, 2007; Revels, LaFleur & Martinez, 2003). Latinos and Native Americans may not consider librarianship in part because of lack of positive experience with librarians (Guerena & Erazo, 2000).

In addition to exercising recruitment tactics, LIS researchers have tried to identify reasons why minority students enter LIS in hopes to exploit their motivations (Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, Vassilakaki & Tsatsaroni, 2015; Mayer & Terrill, 2005; Kim, Chiu, Sin & Robbins, 2007). They have also tried to examine people from why specific racial and ethnic minority cultures may choose a particular specialty or may choose librarianship in particular (Lian & Xiong, 2008; Trejo & Lodwick, 1978). Kim, Chiu, Sin and Robbins (2007) identified among librarians of color that top positive factors for choosing librarianship as a career were ability to work in a field they that love, and more job opportunities and advancement opportunities; top negatives were low salary, high cost of library school education, and lack of funding for library school education. Kim, Chiu, Sin and Ribbins (2007) also examined who minority librarians said was most influential in their decisions to become librarians; responses varied among ethnicities but academic librarians were leading influences among all ethnicities. People of color appear

more likely than are their white counterparts to be heavily influenced by family in choosing career paths, including librarianship (Brown, 2002).

Factors identified as barriers in minority recruitment include: lack of qualified applicants in pools, lack of knowledge from recruiters about where to find diverse applicants, and constraints in university recruitment procedures (Burrows, Jennings & Welch, 1990). Lack of awareness about the field and possibilities within it is also a recruitment barrier (Josey & Abdullahi, 2002; Stanley, 2007). Also, minorities are often lumped together for recruitment-tactic brainstorming even though recruitment tactics for one minority group may not be effective with another (Kim & Sin, 2008; Hussey, 2009); some have proposed that within a minority subset, effective recruitment of males may differ from effective recruitment of females (Davis-Kendrick, 2009). Most minority recruitment is “inward” and pulls from student or paraprofessional library workers, meaning that those outside the library field are often missed in recruitment efforts, as are their ideas, perspectives and approaches (Hussey, 2009).

Both recruitment and retention are hindered by: lack of institutional commitment to change, perceived racism, cultural background differences and barriers to advancement (Beaudin, Fisher, Knowles & Morita, 1990; Lian & Xiong, 2008). Lack of diversity in LIS curricula, lack of diversity among LIS faculty, and lack of financial support for minority LIS students have also been cited as recruitment barriers (Neely, 2005; Knowles, 2005; Montiel-Overall & Littletree, 2010). The field also suffers from image problems stemming from normative whiteness (Neely, 2005). Some ethnic populations, including Native Americans and Latinos, have high attrition rates at the undergraduate

level due to transportation and financial restraints, and these factors are compounded at the graduate level for LIS students (Montiel-Overall & Littletree, 2010).

Montiel-Overall and Littletree (2010) noted concern that successful minority recruitment programs, such as the Graduate Library Institute for Spanish Speaking Librarians (GLISSA) of the 1970s are not well documented and cannot be replicated; Knowledge River, a current day program, which also educates Spanish-speaking and Native American librarians, has documented student experiences to remedy this concern. Another concern, lack of true will within the profession to diversify (Chu, 1994; Trejo & Lodwick, 1978), is posed as remediable through a profession-wide collaboration that would require coordinated activity between the American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Association of Research Libraries, Association of Library and Information Science Education, and other library organizations to do such things as produce and share best practices on recruitment and retention (Neely & Patterson, 2007). There was some concern following the 2005 closure of the library school at historically Black Clark Atlanta University that an institutional resource for educating ethnic minority librarians was lost (Kim & Sin, 2008; Stanley, 2007).

Attitudinal challenges and barriers also deserve mention. Peterson (1999) poses that diversity issues and initiatives are often perceived as threatening the majority in LIS. While there seems to be an implicit assumption that minority librarians will have particular desire to work with patrons from their own ethnicity, this is not always the case; also, seemingly similar ethnicities may be conflated and differences not recognized, such as is the case with Black Americans and individuals of Black Caribbean descent

(Hussey, 2009). The majority culture within LIS has been accused of seeking to hire ethnic minorities who appear as though they will fit in well within institutions as opposed to those who seem like they may be disruptive or challenge institutional status quos (Hussey, 2009; Hathcock, 2015).

Diversity Residency Programs

Aside from scholarships, the other main funded efforts for recruitment and retention of ethnic minorities in American libraries currently are specialized positions, which may include internships, cultural specialty center librarians, and diversity residency librarians. Diversity residencies are defined by the Association of Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) as, “The post-degree work experience designed as an entry level program for professionals who have received the MLS degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association,” (Brewer, 2007). Residencies are not “internships” in typical library lingo because “intern” positions are not considered professional, whereas residencies are considered to be entry-level professional positions (Perez, 2007). Currently, most of the information about diversity residency programs consists of anecdotal recaps from former residents or residency coordinators.

Research libraries have been experimenting with various post-MLS term-limited, work experience programs at least since the 1940s (Brewer 2007). Originally, residency programs, then often called *full-time internships*, did not have diversity-related components (McElroy & Diaz, 2015). The U.S. National Library of Medicine began a residency training program for credentialed new librarians in 1957 (U.S. National Library of Medicine, n.d.). The first residency-like program hosted at an academic library was at

Ohio State University starting in 1961 (Wilson, 1963); most residencies today, including diversity residency programs, are hosted at academic libraries.

In 1984 the University of Delaware created the first post-master's internship aimed at recruitment of librarians from underrepresented groups into the librarian profession through a temporary, full-time position (University of Delaware, n.d.). Delaware's program provided the model for the diversity residency that is commonly found today. Delaware's program was originally called an "internship" but was reclassified as a residency in 1992 after ALISE established new guidelines for residency programs (University of Delaware, n.d.). It would be difficult to determine how many diversity residencies are operating in the current year because residencies may start up, fold or freeze from year to year (Fontenot, 2010). The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) has a Residency Interest Group; the Residency Interest Group's web page listed 42 active residencies and four inactive residencies on its page in 2015, but not all of these residencies are diversity residencies, and this listing might not be up to date (Residency Interest Group of the Association of College and Research Libraries, n.d.). Most diversity residencies are hosted by academic libraries, although the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) and Los Angeles (CA) Public Library also host diversity residencies (Residency Interest Group of the Association of College and Research Libraries, n.d.). The majority of modern-day residencies are diversity related, though not all of them (McElroy & Diaz, 2015).

Normally, diversity residency programs are two-year professional appointments in which participants rotate through two to three different departments and gain professional experience within a department while they serve there (Fontenot, 2010).

Some diversity residencies rotate the librarian through departments in the first year and then have the librarian concentrate on building experience in a particular department doing a particular task during the second year (Alston, 2010). Residencies are intentionally broad, whereas an entry-level assignment in LIS is usually narrower in scope (Brewer, 2007). Residents are usually paid a salary similar to that of an entry-level librarian and usually receive travel support. Some residency programs expect the resident to publish a professional paper or complete some other form of capstone by the end of the second year. Diversity residents are usually members of underrepresented or economically disenfranchised groups (Fontenot, 2010). Institutions are generally not expected to retain residents after their appointments (Bayard, 2009). Residency programs can give research libraries that normally must bypass early-career librarians in favor of librarians with experience who can meet grueling skill and tenure requirements an opportunity to consider early-career candidates who may offer the institution such boons as diverse perspectives and/or technological savvy (Brewer, 2007).

Diversity residencies may also incorporate work other than on-the-job training in traditional librarian tasks such as reference, cataloging, or archiving. Residents may be counted on to build bridges outside of the library with student organizations and on-campus entities such as campus multicultural affairs (Alston, 2010). Residents may also be tasked with working on diversity committees within the library or the university and trying to address diversity issues the library currently faces, even if the resident does not have any particular training or experience in dealing with such matters (Hankins, Saunders & Situ, 2003). Residents are usually paired with a mentor at the hosting institution who has similar professional interests as the resident, and these mentoring

relationships can facilitate building professional contacts for the resident as well as offer a rewarding experience to the mentor (Taylor 2005). Because residents are temporary employees, they offer hosting institutions an opportunity to experiment and implement services that vested employees may be unwilling or unable to accept (Brewer, 2010).

Some benefits that previous residents have reported as a result of their experience include having a better idea of what area of librarianship they wanted to focus on permanently (Alston, 2010) and learning how dynamic and varied academic librarianship is after only having limited perspective previously (Goss, 2003). Residents also get the benefit of interacting with tenure-track librarians and learning about the tenure process during the residency appointment (Alcorta, 2007). Librarians of color report stronger influence from role models than do other LIS professionals (Kim, Chiu, Sin & Robbins, 2007) and residencies ideally provide residents with role models. In addition to role models, enhanced networking opportunities for new professionals has been reported as a residency benefit (Bankhead, 2001). Boyd and Blue (2013) conducted a survey of residents from both diversity and non-diversity residency programs and found that the majority reported gaining leadership skills through their experience, reported becoming prepared for ongoing changes in the library profession, and reported receiving experience in collaborating with other academic units.

Though cast in a positive light in much of the professional literature, some write-ups do suggest room for improvement in these diversity residency opportunities. Insufficient assessment is a recurring problem; diversity residencies often do not have a system in place for assessment and evaluation, and failure to reach goals and fulfill promises may disillusion the diversity resident (Hankins, Saunders & Situ, 2003).

Fontenot (2010) states that constant assessment of diversity residencies is necessary, and that hosting institutions need to examine exactly how they are assessing their programs. Fontenot further calls for hosting institutions to communicate with alumni of their diversity residency programs to determine success or failure, and to hire independent consultants if feasible (Fontenot, 2010). Boyd and Blue (2013) found assessment lacking in a survey of residency coordinators and residents and recommended that assessment be done regularly in these programs. Institutions looking to start new diversity residency programs are encouraged to begin cultural climate assessment even before hiring a resident in order to preemptively address issues that may arise such as coworker hostilities or failure to live up to stakeholder expectations (Sheldon & Alston, 2015). Also, researchers have recommended that host institutions develop and list concrete ways that a residency can help the organization achieve certain goals and then follow through (Boyd & Blue, 2013).

Diversity residencies can be vulnerable to cuts, especially during economic downturns, so libraries should assess how these programs benefit the institution and the profession to make a case for keeping them (Brewer, 2010). Perez (2007) compared library residencies to nursing residencies since both fields have similar national demographics and the residencies share common goals. Perez found that there is often nothing similar in library residencies to the skills assessment pieces that measures the progress of fledgling nurses in nursing residencies (Perez, 2007).

Diversity residencies provide libraries with an opportunity to explore new options, such as new collaborations with other departments on campus. But given the time-limited nature of residencies, failing collaborative experiences may stunt

professional growth for the current resident (Alston, 2010). While residencies are sometimes billed as potentially creating a pool of in-house candidates for tenure track positions (Goss, 2003), most residents are not able to remain with the hosting institution after the residency appointment. Residents may also be pigeonholed strictly into diversity-related projects and tasks for the hosting library and not have the opportunity to gain proficiency or demonstrate competency with other issues or challenges, making their experiences less well-rounded and insufficient for developing a employable skill set (Hu & Patrick, 2006; Cogell & Gruwell, 2001).

Hankins, Saunders and Situ (2003) state that diversity residencies often serve as examples of “what not to do” in terms of diversity initiatives on campus; they further state that diversity residencies are not “diversity initiatives” because they are short term and quota-driven initiatives to boost statistics versus being long term solutions to systematic problems at the library (Hankins, Saunders & Situ 2003). Hu and Patrick (2006), recalling their diversity residency experience, said the job description for their residency was intentionally undetailed, thus opening the possibility that they might unintentionally infringe upon the duties and responsibilities of coworkers.

Residents may be paired with the actual residency coordinator for a mentorship role, whereas recommended practice is for the resident’s mentor to be a librarian with similar professional goals (Sheldon & Alston, 2015). Many residencies do include a formal mentoring component, and DeBeau-Melting (2001) insists that a resident must be able to count on the mentor in order for the residency to be successful. Dawson and Llamas (2001) suggest that mentors cannot be merely assigned for a temporary task, but that these relationships should be lasting, perhaps even beyond the residency. Mentoring

for LIS students of color is shown to remedy cultural isolation in LIS programs (Roy, 2005); similar benefits likely manifest in residencies, as cultural isolation has been reported as a problem experienced by diversity residents (Cichewicz, 2001). Former American Library Association president Courtney Young (2001), a former diversity resident at Ohio State University, has testified on the importance of mentoring relationships in her own personal experience as a resident. A survey from Boyd and Blue (2013) of 29 current and former residency coordinators found that 66% of coordinators offered mentoring to the resident, while of those who did not, 67% responded that they recognized the benefits of doing so. Residents may also not be encouraged to seek outside support and guidance; resources such as ACRL's Residency Interest Group and Knowledge+Alliance recruit librarians from underrepresented groups and may provide residents with additional support (Sheldon & Alston, 2015).

Hankins, Saunders and Situ (2003) accuse diversity residency programs of at times taking newly-graduated professionals, inserting them into hostile working environments, and tasking them to address all diversity-related problems among the library faculty and staff. Fontenot (2010) recalled a diversity task force at Louisiana State University's library taking the position that "staff buy-in" for the diversity residency would be important, and that residents would be aware if coworkers were not "on board" and dedicated to the diversity residency or other diversity initiatives. Brewer (2001) recommends effective communication in such resources as library newsletters as the key to stimulating staff interest, creativity and support for the residency. Sheldon and Alston (2015) suggested that if residents gained negative opinions about librarians during the residency, such opinions may remain after the residency. Fontenot (2010) states that the

hosting institution must create an environment that is welcoming and organized. However, in a survey of past and current residents and diversity librarian position holders, only 35% of respondents believed that the hosting institution communicated the relevance and purpose of the position to the library faculty and staff (Alston & Crumpton, 2015). Administrators can create a welcoming environment by educating faculty and staff on the purpose of the residency, by supporting the resident, and by retaining more than one resident at a time when possible, since most faculty at the library cannot relate to the residency experience (Hu & Patrick, 2006). Welcoming environments can be affected by the loss of key personnel; University of Colorado–Denver elected not to continue a residency program after key personnel were lost and the residency at the University of Delaware once lapsed due to a transition between program coordinators (Brewer, 2001).

Reference to diversity residents as “interns” may be an intentional or unintentional slight, but may still be received as an insult by the diversity resident (Alston, 2010). Diversity residents may be identified as “interns” by staff, while other entry-level librarians may escape this misnomer (Hu & Patrick, 2006). Further, residents who were called “interns” during their appointments have reported being asked to perform non-professional duties such as stapling papers for a librarian or cleaning bathrooms when the custodian was out sick (Alston, 2016). Unless coworkers know what the resident is doing, they may feel the resident’s work is less challenging or academically valid due to the nature of the position (Jordan, 2001). Also, when coworkers or other professionals are not familiar with the residency concept, the burden may shift to the resident to explain the difference between a residency and an internship, and explaining this difference can be challenging (Daix & Epps, 2001). Brewer (2001)

insists that work assignments for residents must consist of what is most rewarding for residents and most useful for the host institution; such assignments would likely consist of duties going beyond those given to an “intern.” In a 2015 study, 65 percent of current and former residents said they had been referred to as “interns” during their residency appointment, and 50% of current and former residents in this same study said they believed they were respected as professionals as opposed to mere interns (Alston, 2016). Misidentification as an “intern” may have varied effects on residents who experience it, as some residents may be motivated to work harder in wake of the slight, while others may experience shattered confidence (Alston, 2016). Residents also varied in how they responded when addressed as interns, with many reporting they did not correct the behavior either because they felt correcting the coworker was wasted effort or because correcting a veteran librarian may be a breach of professional etiquette (Alston, 2016).

Diversity residents are also often subject to racial microaggressions. As stated in the definitions section of Chapter 1, “Racial microaggressions are subtle, derogatory messages conveyed to people of color. While often delivered unconsciously, these persistent and pervasive negative messages can have devastating effects on individuals and organizations,” (Alabi, 2015). Sue et al. (2007) identified nine distinct types of racially microaggressive themes. Within the context of these nine microaggressive categories, the experiences with microaggressions of diversity residents as captured in previous research from Alston and Crumpton (2015), and Alston (2016) tend to manifest largely as “alien in own land” (the assumption that an ethnic minority is foreign-born), “ascription of intelligence” (assigning of intelligence to a person based on race), “color blindness” (when a white person claims to not see race and says that race does not

matter), “pathologizing cultural values or communication styles” (when the dominant culture believes their culture’s values and communication styles are ideal), and “environmental microaggressions” (microaggressions that take place at the systems level). Microaggressions also have levels, from “microinvalidations” (actions that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings or experiences of people of color), to “microinsults” (actions that convey insensitivity or directly demean a person’s racial heritage or identity), to “microassaults” (blatant statements or actions in which discriminatory intent is clear) (Sue et al., 2007). While Alabi’s definition of microaggressions states that these are “often delivered unconsciously,” microassaults can be blatant and have clear discriminatory intent.

In a recent survey, former and current residents and diversity hires reported such experiences as enduring inappropriate jokes and having to justify how they count as “diverse” hires; such experiences could lead to alienation or discomfort (Alston & Crumpton, 2015). While diversity training is recommended for institutions with diversity initiatives and institutions that hire diversity residents (Sheldon & Alston, 2015), formal staff diversity training prior to hiring the resident appears to be rare (Alston & Crumpton, 2015). Current and former residents have reported such racially microaggressive experiences as being called on to be the spokesperson for their race, having extreme presumptions made about their political and social justice beliefs, bewilderment if the resident was not bilingual, and seeming amazement when the resident managed to accomplish a task (Alston, 2016). Other microaggressions lodged against diversity residents include these professionals being stigmatized as woefully underskilled for library work (McElroy & Diaz, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

Reviewing the literature related to diversity residency programs and performing a thematic analysis of the available literature allowed me to come up with seven factors that may affect the overall quality of a diversity residency program and its ability to assist in retaining ethnic minority practitioners. The first factor is how well the host institution is believed to have promoted the residency to faculty and staff within the library and educated library workers about the position (Alston, 2016; Fontenot, 2010; Brewer, 2001). The second factor is the severity of hostilities perceived to have been encountered by the resident during the residency term (Alston, 2016; Sheldon & Alston, 2015; Hankins, Saunders & Situ, 2003). The third factor is the severity of racial microaggressions perceived to have been encountered by the resident during the residency term (Alston, 2016; Alston & Crumpton, 2015). The fourth factor is the perceived staff buy in or support for the residency program from other library employees (Fontenot, 2010; Brewer, 2001; Hankins, Sanders & Situ, 2003). The fifth factor is the perceived quality of assessment practices by the host institution for evaluating and improving the residency (Fontenot, 2010; Boyd & Blue, 2013). The sixth factor is the actual professionalism of the job duties performed by the resident during the residency term (Alston, 2016; Hu & Patrick, 2006; Cogell & Gruwell, 2001). The seventh factor is the perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the resident for his or her next professional appointment (Brewer, 2007).

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory of job attitudes is a job satisfaction theory that poses that factors that produce job satisfaction are distinct from factors that produce job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1968). Factors that produce job satisfaction are called

motivators and include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth. Factors that produce job dissatisfaction are called hygiene factors and include company policy and administration, supervision, relationships with supervisors, work conditions, salary, relationship with peers, personal life, relationship with subordinates, status and security (Herzberg, 1968). The ideal work situation is to have high hygiene plus high motivation, which is when employees are highly motivated and have few complaints. There are three other combinations: High hygiene/low motivation situations are when employees do not have many complaints, but also do not have much motivation and the job is just serving as a steady paycheck. Low hygiene/high motivation situations are when employees have complaints about the specific work conditions and salary but are still highly motivated to work and find the work challenging. Low hygiene/low motivation situations are when employees are unmotivated and have a lot of complaints about the job (Herzberg, 1968). Creating high motivation and high hygiene means creating conditions in the position that generate job satisfaction while eliminating conditions that cause job dissatisfaction (Beecher, 2011). See Table 2.1 for a visual conception of the effects of motivators and hygienes.

The seven factors gleaned from the literature and being tested in this survey all fit into the preset concepts of hygiene or motivator. The hygiene factors are:

- Promotion of the residency,
- Hostilities perceived by the resident,
- Microaggressions perceived by the resident, and
- Staff buy-in and support.

Promotion of the residency addresses several hygiene categories: company policy and administration, supervision, work conditions and relationships with peers. Hostilities and microaggressions encountered by residents are both “relationship with peers” categorical factors, as is staff buy-in and support. The motivation factors are:

- Assessment of the residency,
- Professionalism of duties performed by the resident, and
- Preparation through the residency for the next professional appointment of the resident.

Assessment practices are rather overarching because every aspect of a residency should be assessed, but the closest to any Herzberg factor category that assessment broaches is “work itself.” Professionalism of job duties is categorized within the motivator factors “work itself” and responsibility. Preparation for the next professional appointment is categorized within the motivator factors of achievement and growth.

The Herzberg’s Theory of Job Attitudes, also called the Two-Factor Theory or the Motivation-Hygiene Theory in this study, is used in a wide variety of fields such as business, management, and psychology to explain employee job satisfaction and motivation. There has been some use of Motivation-Hygiene Theory in LIS literature. Keogh (2012) concluded in a study that the theory held when examining academic librarians’ motivation for grant writing; recognition, job skills, advancement, job stimulation, and bureaucratic concerns were identified as contributing to ideal job situations where grant writing is pursued by librarians. Bernstein (2011) concluded in a study that academic librarians are motivated independent of title or rank and are more

satisfied with their jobs when they have adequate responsibility and reasonable autonomy; pay, benefits, and relationships with colleagues were secondary concerns that could ease dissatisfaction but would not increase satisfaction. The Bernstein study methodology was replicated by Sewell and Gilbert (2015) when they studied satisfaction of access services workers; hygiene factors such as salary contributed to dissatisfaction among these workers and motivators such as self-actualization in the work itself also were established as factors toward overall satisfaction. Lahiri (1988) invoked Motivation-Hygiene Theory when assessing the then-poor state of job satisfaction for library workers in the Indian state of Manipur. A group of American and a group of Canadian librarians attending a workshop also legitimized Herzberg's listed job motivators and hygienes in a study (Plate & Stone, 1974). Wu, Chuang and Chen (2008), studying motivation and use of Internet search engines, concluded that hygiene factors were more likely to attract than to retain search engine users while motivation factors were more likely to retain than to attract search engine users.

Summary

The United States has become increasingly more ethnically diverse since the 20th Century and will continue to do so. Libraries, like other resources, businesses and institutions that try to serve broad customer bases, must take the nation's growing diversity into consideration in order to remain successful and relevant. Part of this mission will be creating a diverse librarian workforce that mirrors the populations that libraries serve. Recruiting and retaining highly skilled librarians from racial and ethnic minority populations continues to be a challenge, and tactics used to accomplish this must be examined and assessed to ensure that necessary improvements are made and that these

programs achieve maximum effectiveness and are not counterproductive to the diversity mission. Diversity residency programs are a tool used at a few dozen institutions across the country to equip ethnic and racial minority librarians with the skills needed to best serve their target populations and remain competitive in the job market. However, most of what is written about diversity residency experiences is anecdotal, and a quantitative study is needed to predict what factors may make residency experiences more positive or negative for diversity residents, what impacts such overall positive or overall negative experiences with residencies have on the future outlooks of diversity residents toward the librarian profession, and what attributes and features could be incorporated into diversity residencies to improve them.

Table 2.1 Herzberg-based Motivations and Hygienes Comparison Table

	Low (Bad) Hygiene	High (Good) Hygiene
High Motivation	Employees are motivated but have a lot of complaints. The resident is excited but work conditions need improvement.	An ideal situation where the diversity resident is highly motivated and has few complaints. The residency is preparation for a career in libraries.
Low Motivation	This is the worst situation where employees are not motivated and have many complaints. Least ideal circumstances for goal of retention.	The resident has few complaints but is not highly motivated. The residency basically serves as a “job.”

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter on research methodology describes the research design for this study, including the design and rationale, participants, data collection methods, data analysis, consent protocol, and relevant ethical considerations. The research design and rationale is explained first in the next section because I felt it was of particular importance to discuss why mixed methodology was chosen for this study.

Research Design and Rationale for Mixed Methods

John W. Creswell (1994) posed a rationale for a combined quantitative and qualitative design that seemed most sensible for carrying out this study. Eleven research questions were developed for this study, with all 11 research questions testing for correlation. The first seven of the 11 research questions incorporated concepts of Frederick Herzberg's popular Motivation-Hygiene Theory in attempting to find correlations between factors revealed in the literature as concerns of diversity resident librarians and the residents' overall opinion of their residency experiences. All of these concerns can categorically fit into factors that Herzberg identifies either as motivator or hygiene factors. Because a theoretical framework is identified and being tested, the design for this study should be the "sequential triangulation – QUAN – qual illustration" model as described by Creswell wherein one paradigm, in this case the quantitative paradigm, is dominant. More specifically, this method, also called "sequential explanatory" design, consists of collecting quantitative first, then collecting qualitative

data afterwards to assist in explaining and interpreting the quantitative findings (Creswell, 1994).

A mere quantitative study in this case would not well explain results, because the statistical tests are merely testing for correlation. In such situations where quantitative methods can be used to generate results, but do not substantially explain phenomena, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) contend that collecting qualitative data can build upon or help explain the quantitative results. Qualitative interviews were used as the method of qualitative data collection, and these interviews were done as the “second phase” of the research endeavor, following a quantitative first phase that used a survey instrument for data collection.

Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) identify two types of sequential explanatory models: the follow-up explanations model and the participant selection model. The follow-up explanations model was used for this study. In the follow-up explanations model, a researcher identifies quantitative findings that need more explanation, then uses qualitative data to attempt to further explain the quantitative findings. In this study, which used Spearman’s Rho correlations to test hypotheses, further explanation of results was deemed important because while two-variable correlation analyses may demonstrate a correlation, they do not prove causation and do not provide much additional context beyond the connection between the two variables.

Therefore, a sequential explanatory study design incorporating a follow-up explanations model is used in this study in order to test the established research hypotheses and answer the research questions. The primary emphasis on this study is the

quantitative findings, and how they are used to answer the research questions. However, qualitative data is collected to provide further context and further explain these quantitative findings. But the qualitative data is meant to further explain the quantitative findings, and are of secondary emphasis in the study after the quantitative findings. Together, these quantitative and qualitative methods were seen as potentially working together to provide a fullness of data to frame the research problem in the context of Herzberg's concepts of motivators and hygiene factors.

The statistical test used for the quantitative portion of the study was Spearman's Rho, also often called Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient. The quantitative portion of this study consists of research questions that are answerable via statistical tests that test for correlation, as the questions ask if there is a correlation between two variables. The survey instrument collected data using questions that measured the respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with statements pertaining to the research questions. Respondents designated their level of agreement or disagreement by choosing a numerical value on a ten-point ordinal scale where a number the number "1" corresponded with strong disagreement, "5" with neutrality or neither agreeing or disagreeing, and "10" with strong agreement. Also, all respondents were asked to assign an overall score to their residency on a scale of 1-10, with "1" indicating the worst possible experience and "10" indicating a perfect experience; this question, too, used an ordinal scale. Because the survey collected ordinal data for all of the variables, the Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient test is the appropriate statistical test for this study; a non-parametric correlation test, Spearman's Rho can test ordinal data whereas a parametric test such as Pearson's correlation can only assess continuous data (Salkind,

2014). Also contributing to the need for a non-parametric test was a selection bias that favored those who were still practicing librarians. This is discussed further in the “strengths and limitations of methodology” section, but former residents who had bad library experiences and chose to leave librarianship were more difficult to find contact information for than practitioners who remained in the field; therefore, survey responses for views of elements of residencies may trend more positively than they should given that some former residents with largely negative experiences were unreachable.

For the qualitative portion of the study, I chose to collect data via in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Marshall and Rossman (2006) identified in-depth interviewing as a valid and central method of conducting qualitative research. The qualitative research method would allow me to explore how individual residents and former residents were specifically affected by issues asked about in the questionnaire, as well as identify themes that emerged across respondents. Accordingly, interviewees were encouraged to share anecdotes and perspectives, and expound on emotions. Marshall and Rossman (2006) insist qualitative interviews based on the belief that, “The participant’s perspective on the phenomenon of interest should unfold as participant views it (the emic perspective), not as the researcher views it (the etic perspective)” (p. 101). Eleven people who had served as diversity resident librarians at some point in their career agreed via email to be interviewed and all these individuals were interviewed. Some of those who agreed to be interviewed knew me personally; I asked these people via email to let me interview them and they all consented. Others, whom I did not already know personally, responded by email to my original quantitative survey solicitation and agreed to be interviewed after I requested interviews; these former diversity residents responded to my email solicitation

to participate in the quantitative portion of the study in order to offer feedback on issues they thought the survey instrument did not address. The 11 interviewees, recognized as “research subjects” in the results chapter, are described in more detail in the results chapter.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1: Does the quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlate with the resident’s opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?

Research Hypothesis (H1): The quality of effort as perceived by the resident that the administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlates with overall quality of a diversity residency experience.

Research Question 2: Does the severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term correlate with the resident’s opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?

(H1): The severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term inversely correlates with the resident’s opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience.

Research Question 3: Does severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment inversely correlates with resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 4: Does perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency correlates with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 5: Does perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident's overall view of the experience?

(H1): The perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 6: Does level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlates with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 7: Does the perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?

(H1): The perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment does correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience.

Research Question 8: Is there a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/ her outlook on the future of librarianship?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship.

Research Question 9: Is there a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her level of enthusiasm for the profession?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her level of enthusiasm for the profession.

Research Question 10: Is there a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her ambitiousness of goals?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her ambitiousness and goals.

Research Question 11: Is there a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her level of professional activity in professional associations?

(H1): There is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her level of professional activity in professional associations.

Quantitative Population and Sample

The population of this study is current and former diversity resident librarians who served in libraries in the United States and Canada. The sample, therefore, is not a random sample. The geographic scope matches that covered by the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) Residency Interest Group (Residency Interest Group of the Association of College and Research Libraries, n.d.). I searched ACRL's Residency Interest Group and used Google to identify past and current diversity resident librarians and institutions that currently host, or at some point in the past hosted diversity residencies. Contact information was found for the majority of the current and former residents identified through the ACRL Residency Interest Group or Google; these individuals were emailed survey links, an explanation of the study, and a request to participate by completing a survey.

It could not be reliably determined how many diversity resident librarians were currently serving at institutions in the United States and Canada at the time of the study, but 91 former residents were listed on ACRL's Residency Interest Group site as of December 2015. Not all of these former residents served as "diversity residents," and it was not possible to know which had and had not. A question on the survey instrument therefore requested respondents to identify if they had ever been diversity resident librarians or an equivalent position, in order to include those who served in post-MLIS diversity fellowships prior to ALISE's defining of these programs as "residencies."

Hosting institutions for current programs and identifiable past programs were also contacted and asked to encourage their current and former diversity residents to participate. The total population size of current and former residents is small enough that there was no need to attempt random sampling versus setting out to study the entire population. However, statistical testing was performed, as I anticipated the low likelihood that all past and then-current residents would fill out a survey for the study.

As is also explained in the results section, 139 people attempted to take the survey during the winter and spring months of 2016. Twenty-seven (27) individuals identified as having never been diversity resident librarians and were not allowed to proceed further with the survey. This resulted in 102 people identifying as current or former diversity residents and moving on with the survey. Only four of 102 people who identified as current or former diversity residents indicated that they were “white,” generating some confidence that those who went forward with the survey served in appointments that had a diversity component. It was also possible that those four survey participants who identified as “white” were in diversity positions, as there may have been other reasons that they qualified for diversity positions, such as having disabilities, or being considered “diverse” candidates for other reasons, such as sexual orientation; therefore, the responses of these four participants were not discarded. Definitions of diversity can be rather broad and encompass multiple criteria, so while conference sessions and the literature suggest that diversity residencies seek ethnic minorities specifically, there may be room for diversity residencies to take on “diverse” candidates based on other criteria. While it was not possible to determine what percentage of all existing past and current residents these 102 individuals represented, a statistical consultation determined that

having 102 participants would not result in unstable data given the use of the Spearman's Rank correlation test (Sims, W. personal communication, May 23, 2016).

Instrumentation

Data were collected using an electronically administered Qualtrics questionnaire containing 24 primary questions, with each question containing between three and six sub-items. The majority of the survey questions testing for correlation asked the participant to rate their agreement with a statement on a ten-point scale with one and ten being the extremes of the scale in terms of agreement and disagreement, and five being neutral. Included in the 24-question instrument were eight demographic questions. Questions in the instrument were intended to address the previously stated research questions, which were derived from the review of the literature as they attempted to quantify the significance of issues identified in the literature as factors that affected residency experiences, either positively or negatively. I developed the survey instrument used for this research, so validity and reliability were not available pre-study (Rudestam & Newton, 2007).

The statements on the survey instrument stemmed from concerns, either raised in the literature or at past conferences where diversity residencies were discussed. These statements had to have some relevance to a research question. For instance, the topic of idle time during the residency was raised during a conference session about diversity residencies, and the subject idle time had some relevance to Research Question 6, the subject of which was professionalism of job duties (there would not be an abundance of idle time in a professional job position generally). The statements were then grouped with

other statements relevant to each research question. The survey instrument is included as Appendix A.

There was a basic interview schedule of questions (see Appendix B) used for the qualitative portion of the study. Eleven diversity residents who served between 2000-2016 and either knew me personally and agreed to be interviewed, or responded to my email solicitation for survey participants with feedback and – when asked – agreed to be interviewed, participated in this portion of the research (refer to the beginning of the qualitative portion of Chapter 4 to find brief descriptions of each of these 11 individuals). The 11 research subjects were generally asked similar questions about the covered topics. However, the interviews varied to some extent in what exact questions were asked because the responses of the research subjects dictated what follow-up questions were asked. The interviewees did not see the questions prior to the interview, so they were not given an advanced opportunity to formulate answers; the interviewees were all given an opportunity to talk specifically about things they had mentioned in their email feedback. Each interview did begin by gathering basic demographic information such as race/ethnicity, gender identity, and – when possible – approximate age from the interviewees. After securing this demographic information, I usually asked the interviewees to assign an overall score to their residency experience; there were, however, times when the conversation went elsewhere and there were not opportunities to get the interviewees to assign overall scores to their experiences.

Because some interviewees identified topics in the interview that they wanted to speak specifically about, I began by asking interviewees about topics unique to them if they brought up such things prior to the interview. Once interviewees were asked about

unique concerns that were brought up before the interview, they were then asked questions that expanded upon the questions asked in the survey instrument and prompted feedback on how variables discussed in the survey instrument affected the residents, with specific examples always welcome. Time permitting, after questions were asked that were relevant to the survey instrument content, interviewees were asked additional questions that emerged either from concerns brought up by other interviewees or peripheral concerns brought up earlier in the interview.

Procedure

After gaining IRB approval for the study, I emailed solicitations and administered the quantitative portion of the study from January through April 2016. No monetary incentive was offered to complete the online survey; the perceived reward communicated with solicited participants was that their participation would assist with the mission to make the librarian workforce more diverse. I was not able to identify participants in the survey individually and their confidentiality was protected, per IRB protocols.

The survey link was closed in April 2016, after it was determined that people were no longer filling out the survey. I then used SPSS to run Spearman's Rho correlation tests to determine strengths of correlations between variables in order to answer the research questions, with answers stated in the results chapter. I determined that r_s values equal to or greater than 0.4 and r_s values equal to or less than -0.4 represented noteworthy correlations that were worth reporting (Kawooya, D. personal communication. May 23, 2016). Additionally, r_s values equal to or greater than 0.6 and r_s values equal to or less than -0.6 represented noteworthy correlations that were reported as

strong correlations. Only results with p values ≤ 0.01 were deemed statistically significant for this study. For each research question, null hypotheses were rejected only when correlations met these requirements for being noteworthy and statistically significant for all of the sub-item statements, or most of the sub-item statements if there was a logical explanation as to why it was not necessary to include a particular sub-item statement when that particular sub-item statement did not yield a noteworthy and statistically significant correlation per r_s and p values.

For research questions one through seven, where a resident's overall view of the residency experience served as a dependent variable, if the null hypothesis was rejected, then implications for that research question in relation to Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory were considered. If I failed to reject a null hypothesis, then Herzberg's principles were not applied for that research question. For research questions eight through eleven where a resident's overall view of the residency experience was the independent variable, there were no Herzberg implications. The results for research questions eight through eleven are therefore presented as is without theoretical framing. Research questions 8-11 were devised originally to gauge potential effects that serving in residencies may have on the professional trajectory of diversity residents. This was largely to set up further research, as one area of concern for further research should be how serving in residencies influences the careers of residents; this is discussed further in Chapter 5.

Qualitative Procedure

The eleven in-depth interviews comprising the qualitative portion of the study all took place during the summer of 2016. Each interview lasted between one and three

hours and was recorded digitally. Interviewees were asked questions either pertaining to the research questions, or pertaining to additional concerns that they brought up during the interview or in emails to me. To protect the identities of the interviewees, they were all assigned a research subject number by which they would be identified on transcripts and in the study write-up. Additionally, any information that could potentially give away the identity of an interviewee, including most proper names mentioned during the interview, were redacted.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Thematic narrative inquiry was used to analyze the interview transcriptions. The thematic narrative inquiry approach used replicates that used by Ahmed (2015), wherein major themes that emerged from the participants were identified by experiences that they shared during the interviews. Data analysis can be detailed in seven stages: “(a) organizing the data, (b) immersion in the data, (c) generating categories and themes, (d) coding the data, (e) offering interpretations through analytic memos, (f) searching for alternative understandings, and (g) writing the report or other format for presenting the data” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 156).

All eleven interviews were transcribed, either by me or by contracted transcription specialists. I then listened to each digital recording while following the transcript to ensure accuracy; inaccuracies were fixed, and in some cases, voice inflexions, pauses, and other behaviors were added to the transcript. Once the transcripts were corrected, they were printed out, and each transcript was read once so that I could become familiar with the content of the interviews. After all transcripts were read a first time, they were

re-read and coded in order to identify emergent themes. Following this coding phase, six themes emerged:

1. Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.
2. Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors, and administrators.
3. Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents.
4. Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents.
5. Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appear to improve future job outlook.
6. Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.

The emergent themes were explored through a qualitative write-up presenting the themes in a similar vain to the thematic presentation presented in Amer F. Ahmed’s 2015 dissertation, “From the Griot to Hip Hop: Oral Traditions as Critical Libratory Praxis in Islamic America.” The thematic write up is also framed in terms of Herzberg’s concepts of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and are shown to either reinforce or supplement discoveries from the quantitative portion of the study.

Strengths and Limitations of Methodology

The study methodology has some strengths and limitations. The strength of soliciting current and former diversity residents directly and by reaching out to host institutions, listservs, and other stakeholders is that this was the only way to secure participation from this population. Based on a previous attempt to rely solely on listservs and social media to solicit participants in a diversity residency study (Alston, 2016), I determined that no method of reaching out to this population other than direct contact from me would secure an adequate number of participants; my 2016 study on diversity residents garnered only 22 participants despite thorough listserv and social media solicitation. Pursuing a sequential explanatory mixed methods approach prevented the study from being overly reliant on raw numbers without adequate context, which would have likely occurred in a purely quantitative study. A purely qualitative study also would not have been appropriate, as this study set out to generate empirical data on diversity residencies which has been lacking in the literature. Additionally, the qualitative portion of the study made it possible to capture some of the negative experiences that may have manifested in diversity residencies. The quantitative data trended toward positivity in survey responses, which may indicate that most people who I was able to reach had largely positive experiences with their residencies. The negative experiences, however, needed to be captured and presented, and interviewing residents who had had negative experiences – and ensuring their anonymity – made it possible to explore some of the negative aspects of diversity residencies.

The primary limitation of the methodology is a selection bias that could not be avoided, wherein residents who remained in the library science field after their

residencies could be contacted and encouraged to participate, whereas former residents who had left the field and lost contact with remaining library science practitioners were unreachable. Because of this, in the quantitative portion of this study, scores tended to trend toward positive responses more than they might have had more former residents with negative overall experiences participated. This phenomenon bolsters the case for a nonparametric test.

Another noteworthy limitation with this methodology exists within the population numbers; there is no data confirming how many people have served as diversity resident librarians. Thus, some uncertainty exists in how representative the quantitative results are to the entire population of past and present diversity residents. Finally, although the racial demographics of the participants in the quantitative portion of the study are almost entirely non-white, which strengthens the chances that the respondents served as actual diversity resident librarians, there is still some chance that some of those who participated in the study were not actual diversity residents; all who were allowed to proceed with the survey did indicate that they either currently were diversity residents or had once served in such a capacity.

Ethical Considerations

This study is expected to cause minimal to no harm to research participants. Participants were made aware that their participation in both the quantitative and the qualitative portions of this study was voluntary. Furthermore, the confidentiality of the participants was protected to the best of my ability. Participants should not encounter potential risks to their career futures no matter how candid their responses. The level of

candor from qualitative portion participants, in particular, is unprecedented among literature discussing diversity resident librarians, and this candor would be achievable only through protecting the identities of the participants. This data is necessary to contribute actual empirical research on diversity residency programs, which is currently strongly lacking in the library literature. Through this empirical research, suggestions, improvements, and modifications to diversity residency programs might be possible.

Summary

The study aimed to answer the eleven research questions through a quantitative analysis and be the first study of its kind to apply inferential quantitative data to the experiences and conditions of diversity residency programs in the United States and Canada. Additionally, this study aimed to use qualitative methods as a “second phase” to further explain data emerging from the quantitative portion of the study. The resulting sequential explanatory design of this study best suits my desire to discover what generates satisfaction and dissatisfaction among diversity residents, as such knowledge can inform host institutions on conditions to create and remove in their residencies per Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Tackling the quantitative portion of the study using Spearman’s Rho Correlation tests, and the qualitative portion of the study using thematic narrative analysis, tried and true research methodologies are employed in this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND HERZBERG FRAMING

In this chapter, the results of both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study are presented and explained. The results are also framed in the context of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory in this chapter, as Herzberg's theory is relied upon to interpret the results and in doing so this work further tests Herzberg's theory. Given that Herzberg's Theory provided a primary basis for the design of this study, the qualitative portion of the results, in particular, could not be interpreted without this theoretical framing. Thus, for consistency, theoretical framing of the quantitative results appears in this chapter as well. However, because implications are a key portion of Chapter 5, the "discussion and conclusion" chapter, implications spawned from Herzberg's principles are also reiterated in Chapter 5.

This chapter begins by revealing the results of the statistical tests used to test the research hypotheses, with some words regarding what the data means in some cases. After this, the quantitative results are framed in the context of Herzberg's theory. Following the framing of the quantitative results, the qualitative results portion begins by briefly introducing the reader to the eleven interviewees for the qualitative portion, referred to as "research subjects." The results of the qualitative portion of the study are then shared, first by listing the six themes that emerged. After the six themes are listed, the narrative exploring how the themes emerged is presented, and appropriately framed

into Herzberg's principles. The chapter concludes with tables illustrating the descriptive statistics of the survey results for the quantitative research questions.

Quantitative Results:

While 139 people attempted to take the online questionnaire, 27 individuals identified as having never been diversity resident librarians and were not allowed to proceed further with the survey. There were 102 responses to all of the demographic questions, but once the questionnaire began inquiring about participant perceptions regarding their residency experience, there were between 88-93 responses to most questions. Participants were permitted to not answer questions that they did not believe applied to them, so each question does not have the same number of responses.

For demographic questions, 82 respondents self-identified as women, while 20 self-identified as men. For racial demographics, there were four respondents (4 percent) who self-identified as white. While diversity residencies tend to be for ethnic minorities, results from these respondents were not discarded because I could not know for certain if these individuals qualified as "diverse" for other reasons, such as physical impairments or sexual orientation. Forty-six respondents (45 percent) identified as Black, non-Hispanic. Nine participants (nine percent) identified as Asian, South Asian, or Pacific Islander. Three participants (three percent) identified as Native American or Alaskan Native. Twenty-seven participants (26 percent) identified as Hispanic. Twelve participants (12 percent) identified as multi-racial, mixed or other. One participant declined to self-identify with any racial designation.

The majority of participants were 25-34 years of age when they began their residency (69 participants, or 68 percent of participants). Twelve were 18-24 at the beginning of their residency (12 percent). Fifteen were 35-44 at the start of their residency (15 percent). Six participants identified as being 45 or older when they began a residency (six percent). Seventy-nine respondents (77 percent) served at large universities with 15,000 or more students. Fifteen respondents (15 percent) served at medium-sized universities with between 5,000 and 15,000 students. Three respondents (three percent) served at small universities with fewer than 5,000 students. Four participants served at a public library and one selected “other”; some entities that are not actual libraries, such as the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), also host diversity residencies or have in the past.

There was variance among the participants in the amount of time that has elapsed since they served. Twenty-three respondents (23 percent) identified as current residents. Twenty-three respondents (23 percent) indicated that their residencies ended 0-3 years ago. Sixteen respondents indicated that their residencies ended 4-7 years ago. Twenty-two respondents (22 percent) indicated that their residencies ended 7-12 years ago. Seventeen respondents indicated their residencies ended over 12 years ago (17 percent).

Twenty-nine of the respondents indicated that they were the first resident or part of the first residency cohort at their hosting institution (28 percent). Sixty-nine respondents said they were not the first resident or not part of the first residency cohort (68 percent). Four respondents (four percent) were not sure if they were part of the first cohort of residents or were the first resident at the host institution. Fifty-six respondents said their hosting institutions employed more than one resident at a time when they

served (55 percent). Forty-four respondents said their hosting institutions employed only one resident at a time during their term (43 percent). Two respondents were unsure (two percent). In figure 4.1 is a descriptive statistical breakdown on how the survey respondents scored their residence experience overall.

Research Question 1 (RQ1)

The first research question in the quantitative portion of this study was, “Does the quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlate with the resident’s opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?” Five statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ1 questions appear in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, with correlation values in Table 4.16.

The first statement was: “The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution thought staff buy-in for the residency was of utmost importance.” Eighty-eight participants indicated both a level of agreement or disagreement with this statement and offered an overall rating of their residency experience. There was a weak, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .368$, $p < .001$, $n = 88$), but this correlation was below our $r_s = .400$ threshold for a moderate correlation and is not noteworthy.

The second statement was, “The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the relevance of the residency well to the library faculty and staff.” Eighty-eight participants indicated both a level of agreement or disagreement with

this statement and offered an overall rating of their residency experience. There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .522, p = < .001, n = 88$).

The third statement was, “The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the job duties and expectations for the residency well to library faculty and staff.” Eighty-eight participants indicated both a level of agreement or disagreement with this statement and offered an overall rating of their residency experience. There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .577, p = < .001, n = 88$). As reflected in Table 4.3, responses to this statement trended not toward strong agreement or disagreement, but rather toward neutrality or more slight levels of agreement or disagreement. This may suggest some uncertainty among the residents who participated in the survey as to whether or not their host institutions had done adequate jobs in explaining the duties or the expectations of the residents to the rest of the library faculty and staff.

The fourth statement was, “I would have felt/ would feel comfortable going to administration and/or residency coordinators if a coworker questioned my professionalism or my deservedness of the position.” Eighty-eight participants indicated both a level of agreement or disagreement with this statement and offered an overall rating of their residency experience. There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .481, p = < .001, n = 88$).

The fifth statement was, “The administration and/or residency coordinators would defend my work record were it questioned by hostile coworkers.” Eighty-eight

participants indicated both a level of agreement or disagreement with this statement and offered an overall rating of their residency experience. There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .449$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). Thirty-five respondents (over a third) responded with a “ten” (strongest level of agree) to this question, and only eight of 93 respondents to this statement indicated any level of disagreement. From the pool of residents and former residents who participated in this study, it appears that there was overwhelming confidence that administration and coordinators would defend the work of the residents if needed.

The null hypothesis for this research question was, “The quality of effort as perceived by the resident that the administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff does not correlate with the overall quality of a diversity residency experience.” We are able to reject this null hypothesis as there are statistically significant correlations between level of agreement with the survey statements and overall quality rating of the residency program. The correlations were moderate in four of the five test statements. The data support the research hypothesis that, “The quality of effort as perceived by the resident that the administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlates with overall quality of a diversity residency experience.”

Research Question 2 (RQ2)

The second research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does the severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term

correlate with the resident's opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?" Six statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. For RQ2, 87 residents responded to each statement in addition to assigning an overall rating to their diversity residency experience.

The first statement was, "I was well-respected by the majority of my coworkers during my residency." There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .527$, $p = < .001$, $n = 87$).

The second statement was, "My coworkers seemed willing to help me learn tasks and duties in the position." There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .541$, $p = < .001$, $n = 87$).

The third statement was, "My coworkers seemed willing to collaborate with me on projects." There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .595$, $p = < .001$, $n = 87$).

The fourth statement was, "My coworkers seemed willing to introduce me to professional colleagues and help me network." There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .562$, $p = < .001$, $n = 87$).

The fifth statement was, "My coworkers would at least occasionally try to assign "busy work" like stapling papers on me." There was a weak, inverse correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation. ($r_s = -.335$, $p = .002$, $n = 87$).

The sixth statement was, “Negative experiences with my coworkers during the residency appointment will prevent me from collaborating with them or maintaining collegial connections with them in the future.” There was a weak, inverse correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = -.339$, $p = .001$, $n = 87$).

For all six of these statements, the overwhelming majority of the respondents gave responses that indicated positive experiences in relation to these statements. In each case, fewer than 20 percent of the respondents replied with agreement or disagreement that would indicate negative experiences in the areas in question. This suggests that among the respondent pool, at least, most residents felt they were mostly respected by coworkers, that coworkers mostly seemed willing to help residents learn and collaborate with them, that coworkers mostly seemed willing to help residents network, that they were largely not asked to do “busy work”, and that few residents felt negative experiences with coworkers would prevent them from working with the coworkers in the future.

The null hypothesis for this research question was, “The severity of hostilities the resident perceives from coworkers during the residency term does not correlate with the resident’s opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience.” The first four statements would indicate hostilities on the parts of the coworkers if the residents noted disagreement with the statements. The last two statements would indicate hostilities on the parts of the coworkers if the residents noted agreement with the statements. The inverse correlations for the final two statements were too weak to be acknowledged as noteworthy inverse correlations. The responses to the first four statements trended

heavily away from disagreement, with only 13 percent of respondents indicating a level of disagreement to the first statement, seven percent to the second statement, nine percent to the third statement, and nine percent to the fourth statement. Therefore, the data corresponding to RQ2 cannot be used to reject the null hypothesis. The data illustrate the possibility that outright hostilities from coworkers during residencies were not prevalent among the research participants. The moderate correlations noted in the first four statements, however, indicate that respect, cooperation and consideration from coworkers seems to positively correlate with positive overall experiences in residencies. This may go hand and hand with faculty and staff buy in, which is the subject of RQ4. The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ2 questions appear in Table 4.4 and 4.5, with correlation results presented in Table 4.17.

Research Question 3 (RQ3)

Because so few participants actually acknowledged experiencing racial microaggressions during their terms, there was not enough data for a statistical test to analyze correlations between experiences of racial microaggressions and overall rating of the residency experience. Therefore, the research question, “Does severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience?” could not be answered. The null hypothesis, “The severity of racial microaggressions directed toward the resident during the residency appointment does not correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience,” could not be tested or rejected.

The descriptive statistics regarding this research question are shared here. The first inquiry asked for RQ3 was, “Did any of your coworkers ever question your legitimacy as a “diverse” hire?” Eighty-eight participants responded to the question, with 58 saying “no” (66 percent) and 30 responding “yes” (34 percent). The second inquiry was, “Did any of your coworkers seem overly impressed by your ability to perform basic or non-challenging tasks?” Eighty-nine participants responded to the question, with 61 responding “no” (69 percent) and 28 responding “yes” (31 percent). A follow-up question to this second question was, “Do you feel this was because of your race or ethnicity?” This follow-up question, however, did not garner valid responses due to its wording; proper wording of the question would have been, “If yes, do you feel this was because of your race or ethnicity?” Because the question was not worded properly, responses to this question and Likert scale follow-up questions provided logically nonsensical numbers. A similar error occurred with the third main inquiry to test RQ3: “Did any of your coworkers make insensitive/offensive jokes or comments about your race/ethnicity?” Sixty-three of 88 participants responded “no” to this question (72 percent); twenty-five participants responded “yes” (28 percent). Follow-up Likert scale questions to this inquiry also resulted in logically nonsensical numbers in the responses, as the survey instrument should have only allowed those responding “yes” to answer the follow up questions.

Research Question 4 (RQ4)

The fourth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience?” Three

statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. For RQ4, there were varying numbers of residents who responded to both the posed statement and to the question requesting an overall rating of the residency experience.

The first statement was, “My coworkers seemed supportive of me receiving professional level pay as a diversity resident.” The Spearman’s Rho correlation was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation, though the p value was less than .01 ($r_s = .289$, $p = .006$, $n = 88$).

The second statement was, “My coworkers seemed supportive of there being a well-paid position where a highly-experienced candidate wouldn’t be considered.” The Spearman’s Rho correlation was below 0.4. Also, only p-values equal to or less than 0.01 were considered indicative of a significant correlation. The p-value was greater than 0.01 and therefore this correlation is not statistically significant ($r_s = .262$, $p = .015$, $n = 87$).

The third statement was, “My coworkers were supportive of me receiving extra travel opportunities and budgeting.” The Spearman’s Rho correlation was below 0.4. The p-value for this test was higher than the 0.01 threshold for statistical significance and therefore this correlation is not considered statistically significant ($r_s = .201$, $p = .060$, $n = 88$). A high percentage of respondents (44 percent) replied with a score of five, which is a neutral response, to this question; this could at the very least indicate some lack of confidence from many of the residents that their coworkers approved of them receiving these specific benefits.

The null hypothesis for this research question was, “The perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency does not correlate

with the resident's overall view of the residency experience." The three statements posed in this section were reflective of the faculty and staff's buying into the residency concept when it included special perks that the other workers would not have access to. There were no statistically significant correlations of noteworthy strength between level of agreement/disagreement with any of these statements and the overall rating of the residency program by the residents. Therefore, for RQ4, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There were statements in RQ2 that may also be indicative of staff buy-in that did correlate moderately with the overall ratings of the residency experiences. The difference between the RQ2 statements and RQ4 statements was that RQ4 statements dealt specifically with coworker attitudes toward perks unique to diversity residencies, while the RQ2 statements concerned coworker activity that would be extended to any new professional or new coworker, not necessarily a resident who receives special residency benefits. The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ4 questions appear in Table 4.6, with a correlation values summary in Table 4.18.

Research Question 5 (RQ5)

The fifth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: "Does perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?" Six statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. For RQ5, 88 residents responded to each statement in addition to assigning an overall rating to their diversity residency experience. The correlation value breakdown is in Table 4.19.

The first statement was, “My institution’s residency coordinators and/or administration reviewed best practices thoroughly to implement or improve the residency.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .429$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$).

The second statement was, “My institution’s residency coordinators and/or administration communicated with other residency coordinators to assess and improve the residency.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .342$, $p = .001$, $n = 88$). Nearly a third of respondents to this statement (32 percent) indicated a neutral response of five to this statement, indicating some uncertainty as to whether coordinators were communicating with other institutions to assess and improve residencies among the respondents.

The third statement was, “My institution assessed the cultural climate of my institution and its readiness for hosting a residency.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .360$, $p = .001$, $n = 88$).

The fourth statement was, “My residency coordinators were dedicated to identifying and addressing shortcomings and problems related to the residency.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .585$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$).

The fifth statement was, “My institution’s administration and/or residency coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed.” There was a

strong, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .649, p = < .001, n = 88$).

The sixth statement was, “My institution’s administration and/or residency coordinators solicited feedback from me to assess and improve the residency program.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .452, p = < .001, n = 88$). Thirty-seven respondents (41 percent) to this statement responded with a ten, the strongest level of agreement; this indicates that among the participant pool there was high confidence that those in charge of the programs were trying to make concerted efforts to get feedback from the residents to improve the programs. Only 18 of 91 respondents to this statement (19 percent) indicated some level of disagreement with this statement, with five respondents selecting one, which was the strongest level of disagreement.

The null hypothesis for RQ5 was, “The perceived quality of the assessment practices of the residency program does not correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” For four of the six statements used to test this research question, there were moderate or strong correlations between perceived quality of assessment practices and culture and how positively the residents rated their overall residency experience. This null hypothesis was rejected as there are statistically significant correlations between level of agreement with the survey statements and overall quality rating of the residency program. The data support the research hypothesis that, “The perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” The statements that had correlations too weak to note concerned the coordinator(s) efforts to assess the

institution's cultural climate and the coordinator(s) efforts to communicate with other institutions to devise improvements. For both of these statements, roughly one third of respondents indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed, which may indicate they were unsure of the coordinators' efforts on these fronts. The higher uncertainty may have affected the strength of correlations for these queries. The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ5 questions appears in Table 4.7 and 4.8.

Research Question 6 (RQ6)

The sixth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: "Does level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience?" Five statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. For RQ6, 88 residents responded to each statement in addition to assigning an overall rating to their diversity residency experience. See Table 4.20 for a correlation value breakdown.

The first statement was, "At work, I was performing duties that exceeded those of a grad student intern." There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .453$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). Fifty-three respondents (58 percent) in the pool indicated a ten, the strongest level of agreement, while only six respondents indicated any level of disagreement with the statement; among the pool, survey respondents believed they performed professional-level work in their residencies.

The second statement was, "I was expected to and adequately trained to publish, present, or to complete a capstone by the end of my term." There was a weak correlation

between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .389$, $p = <.001$, $n = 88$).

The third statement was, “I was given opportunities and/or preparation for supervising other library personnel.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .368$, $p = <.001$, $n = 88$).

The fourth statement was, “I was frequently assigned busy work that no one else wanted to do or that seemed unproductive.” There was a moderate, inverse correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = -.448$, $p = <.001$, $n = 88$). Half of the respondents answered with a one (strongest level of disagreement) to this statement, while only 13 of 91 respondents indicated some level of agreement with the statement, indicating that among the respondent group, being assigned “busy work” was decidedly uncommon.

The fifth statement was, “I didn’t have a lot of directionless, idle time.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .415$, $p = <.001$, $n = 88$). Nearly a third of the respondents (32 percent) indicated the strongest level of agreement with this statement while roughly a fourth of the respondents indicated disagreement with the statement at any level; given that these appointments are term limited, it is essential that the phenomenon of directionless, idle time be completely eradicated.

The null hypothesis for RQ6 was, “The level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term does not correlate with the resident’s

overall view of the residency experience.” For two of the five statements, there were moderate, positive correlations between professionalism of job duties and overall view of the residency experience. For a third statement, there was a moderate, inverse correlation that suggested that higher professionalism of job duties correlated with higher overall rating of the residency experience. It should be noted that the three statements with noteworthy and statistically significant correlations were not about specified duties but rather conditions in the residency workplace related to professionalism. The two statements with weak correlations that were not noteworthy addressed actual duties more specifically. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected in this case, though it should be noted that the correlations are notable specifically when on-the-job conditions facilitate professionalism. The data support the research hypothesis, “The level of professionalism of job duties expected of the resident during the term correlates with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ6 questions appears in Table 4.9.

Research Question 7 (RQ7)

The seventh research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does the perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience?” Six statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. For RQ7, 88 residents responded to each statement in addition to assigning an overall rating to their diversity residency experience.

The first statement was, “Work that I did as a resident mirrors job duties I see in professional vacancy announcements.” There was a strong, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .604$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). Only four of 90 respondents to this statement indicated some level of disagreement with the statement, suggesting that residencies are providing residents with opportunities that mirror what will be expected of them in the permanent workforce.

The second statement was, “The residency put me in position to make lasting professional connections.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .547$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). Only six of 90 responded with any degree of disagreement to this statement, while 53 respondents (59 percent) responded with a ten, the strongest level of agreement; there was therefore strong belief among the pool of respondents that their residencies had put them in a position to make lasting professional connections.

The third statement was, “I have more knowledge of library systems and software than I did prior to my residency.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .328$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). Fifty percent of respondents indicated a ten, the strongest level agreement to this statement, while only seven respondents indicated any sort of disagreement with this statement. The overwhelming majority of residents in this pool therefore appear to have had more knowledge of library systems and software after the residency than prior.

The fourth statement was, “I gained new insights on what to do and not do when pursuing a permanent position during the residency.” There was a moderate, positive

correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .408$, $p < .001$, $n = 88$). Only six of the ninety respondents to this statement indicated some level of disagreement with the statement, while 49 percent of the respondents responded with a ten, the strongest level of agreement; among the pool of participants, residents largely gained new insights on “do’s and don’t do’s” during their experience.

The fifth statement was, “I have a better idea of what a librarian does during the work day than I did prior to the residency.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .410$, $p < .001$, $n = 88$). Fifty percent of the respondents indicated a ten, the highest level of agreement with this statement, while only eight of ninety respondents indicated any level of disagreement with this statement; this suggests that the overwhelming majority of residents in the pool did indeed gain a clearer picture of the duties of librarians during their residencies.

The sixth statement was, “I was overall better prepared to be a professional librarian after the residency than prior to it.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two factors that was statistically significant ($r_s = .430$, $p < .001$, $n = 88$). Among the pool of respondents, 59 percent of the respondents indicated a score of ten, the highest level of agreement to this statement, while only six respondents indicated some level of disagreement. Given these descriptive statistical results, there was not a large problem among the survey participants of being no better prepared for professional librarianship after the residency than before it.

The null hypothesis for this research question was, “The perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional

appointment does not correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience." We are able to reject this null hypothesis as there are statistically significant correlations between level of agreement with the survey statements and overall quality rating of the residency program in five of the six statements offered. There was a weak correlation in one of the statements, which may indicate that gaining more knowledge of library systems and software has little to no bearing on a resident's view on the overall quality of the residency program; 84 percent of respondents to this question did indicate some level of agreement with the statement suggesting that among survey participants, a strong majority knew more about library systems and software following the residency than prior to it. The data supports the research hypothesis that, "The perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment does correlate with the resident's overall view of the residency experience." The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ7 questions appear in Table 4.10 and Table 4.11. The correlation value breakdown appears in Table 4.21.

Research Question 8 (RQ8)

The eighth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: "Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship?" One statement was offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. The statement was, "I saw librarianship as a viable profession as my residency progressed." There was a strong, positive correlation between the level of agreement with this statement indicated and the overall rating of the residency program ($r_s = .678$, $p = < .001$, $n = 86$). The null hypothesis of,

“There is no correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship” is rejected and data supports the research hypothesis, “There is a correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship.” The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ8 questions appears in Table 4.12.

Research Question 9 (RQ9)

The ninth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Is there correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his /her level of enthusiasm for the profession?” Two statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. The first statement was, “I became excited about a career in librarianship as my residency progressed.” There was a strong, positive correlation between the level of agreement with this statement indicated and the overall rating of the residency program ($r_s = .624$, $p = < .001$, $n = 87$). The second statement was, “I was motivated to do innovative things in the LIS field during and/or immediately after my residency.” There was a moderate, positive correlation between the level of agreement with this statement indicated and the overall rating of the residency program ($r_s = .434$, $p = < .001$, $n = 88$). The null hypothesis of, “There is no correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her level of enthusiasm for the profession.” is rejected and data support the research hypothesis, “There is a correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her level of enthusiasm for the profession.” The descriptive statistical breakdown for responses to the RQ9 questions appear in Table 4.13.

Research Question 10 (RQ10)

The tenth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Is there a correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his /her ambitiousness of goals?” Two statements were offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. The first statement was, “I sought to eventually become a department head or administrator due to my residency.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .287$, $p = <.001$, $n = 87$). The second statement was, “I wanted/want my next job immediately following the residency to be with a well-respected institution.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .250$, $p = .019$, $n = 88$); the correlation was also not statistically significant. Further, the p-value was higher than the .01 threshold for statistical significance as set for this study. We fail to reject the null hypothesis of, “There is no correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her ambitiousness and goals.” The descriptive statistical breakdowns for responses to the RQ10 questions appear in Table 4.14.

Research Question 11 (RQ11)

The eleventh research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Is there correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his /her level of professional activity in professional associations?” One statement was offered for residents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. The statement was, “I pursued membership in professional librarian organizations during and/or

immediately after my residency.” There was a weak correlation between the two factors that was below the $r_s = .400$ threshold for noteworthy correlation ($r_s = .216$, $p = .044$, $n = 88$); the correlation was also not statistically significant. Further, the p-value was higher than the .01 threshold value for statistical significance for this study. We fail to reject the null hypothesis of, “There is no correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his/her level of professional activity in professional associations.” The descriptive statistical breakdowns for responses to the RQ11 questions appear in Table 4.15.

Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory Implications for Quantitative Results:

Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory encourages places of employment to eliminate job dissatisfaction. This requires examination of hygiene factors, creation of conditions of job satisfaction, and examination of motivator factors (Beecher, 2011). RQ1 through RQ7 in this study treat the residents’ overall views of the residency as a dependent variable, with independent variables that can be categorized into motivator or hygiene factors identified by Herzberg. For those research questions where the null hypothesis was rejected, Herzberg’s principles were applied to recommend best practices for diversity residencies. For RQ2, 3 and 4, we failed to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, for these, Herzberg’s principles were not applied to make any recommendations for best practices for residencies. RQ2, 3 and 4 all concerned a hygiene factor (relationships). We were able to reject null hypotheses for RQ1, 5, 6 and 7; RQ1 concerned a hygiene factor (relationships), while motivator factors were the substance of RQ5 (work itself), 6 (work itself) and 7 (growth). None of the research questions that concerned motivator factors yielded data that prevented rejection of the null hypothesis. For research questions 8-11,

in which overall view of the residency was the dependent variable, the Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory framing was not applicable.

Research Question 1 (RQ1)

The first research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: "Does the quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlate with the resident's opinion of the overall quality of the residency experience?" Data support the research hypothesis that, "The quality of effort as perceived by the resident that the administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff correlates with overall quality of a diversity residency experience." The independent variable of "effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff" deals with interpersonal relations, which Herzberg identifies as a hygiene factor.

To eliminate job dissatisfaction associated with this independent variable, in general, the resident's perception should be that there were quality efforts by the administration and/or residency coordinators to garner support for the residency from the library faculty and staff. When residents believe that the administration and/or residency coordinators attempted to garner buy in from the library faculty and staff, this likely manifests in library faculties and staffs understanding the purpose of the residency position and the importance of diversity in the field. Subsequently, faculty and staff members are likely to develop supportive and cooperative relationships with the resident,

removing the dissatisfaction of serving as a resident in an environment where coworkers are not cooperative or supportive.

Four of the five statements used to test RQ1 had statistically significant correlations to the residents' overall views of the residency. The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, "The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the relevance of the residency well to the library faculty and staff," and the overall view of the residency suggests that one way to remove resident dissatisfaction is for administrators and/or coordinators to explain the relevance of the residency to library faculty and staff, probably when announcing the position and before a resident is hired into the position. The resident optimally should not encounter signs that suggest that the administrators or residents coordinators did not do enough to explain to faculty and staff why the position exists.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, "The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the job duties and expectations for the residency well to library faculty and staff," and the overall view of the residency suggests that one way to eliminate job dissatisfaction is to explain what the resident will be doing or is expected to do. An atmosphere should be present in which residents are not under the impression that their coworkers do not have any idea what they are doing and what they are expected to do. When coworkers in the library are unsure of what the resident is doing or is expected to do, it may invite suspicions that the resident is not tasked with enough professional duties and that his/her position is not professional enough (Alston, 2016).

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I would have felt/ would feel comfortable going to administration and/or residency coordinators if a coworker questioned my professionalism or my deservedness of the position,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that one way to eliminate job dissatisfaction is for administration and/or coordinators to establish a relationship with the resident that assures the resident that s/he may depend on them to reinforce the professionalism of the resident and his/her deservedness of the position. Residents may encounter dissatisfaction if they do not believe that the administration or coordinators will reinforce to library employees that the residency is a professional position. Residents may also encounter dissatisfaction if they do not believe that the administration or coordinators will reinforce to library employees that the resident deserves a professional position and should be respected as a credentialed professional.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “The administration and/or residency coordinators would defend my work record were it questioned by hostile coworkers,” and overall view of the residency suggests that one way to eliminate job dissatisfaction is to establish a rapport with the resident that will assure the resident that administration or coordinators are familiar with the resident’s work and are able to and capable of defending that work. Residents may encounter job dissatisfaction if they do not believe that their work record would be defended by coordinators, administration or supervisors; this belief could be the result of actual failures to defend their record, or other things causing residents to infer that this failure to defend the record would happen. Coordinators, administration, or supervisors should not only know what the resident is accomplishing during their term, but should also

demonstrate to library employees when appropriate that they are aware of, and – assuming they should be – are satisfied with the resident’s job record and accomplishments.

Research Question 5 (RS5)

The fifth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience?” Data support the research hypothesis that, “The perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” The independent variable of “perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program” deals with the work itself and, more specifically, phases of it; Herzberg identifies this as a motivator factor.

To create job satisfaction associated with this independent variable, in general, it should be the resident’s perception that there have been earnest efforts to assess and improve the residency. This assessment should occur both between residency cycles, and during the resident’s term. When residents believe that the residency is being assessed and improved, this is likely an indication that they believe the work itself is a result of careful planning and assessment. Also, residents likely would have little to no reason to believe that residency assessment is sound if they are not enjoying the work itself. Assessment, therefore, would generate conditions for satisfaction.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “My institution’s residency coordinators and/or administration reviewed best practices

thoroughly to implement or improve the residency,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that one way to create satisfaction in the residency is to review best practices thoroughly when implementing or attempting to improve a diversity residency. The residency may have satisfactory conditions if residents reasonably believe that their residency term has been an improvement from previous cycles from that institution and built upon best practices from other host institutions.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “My residency coordinators were dedicated to identifying and addressing shortcomings and problems related to the residency,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that one way to create satisfaction in the residency is to identify and address shortcomings and problems related to the residency. The residency may have satisfactory conditions if residents reasonably believe that coordinators fixed problems with the residency as they emerged. The diversity residency, like any position, is going to have some flaws or things that could be done better. However, coordinators who task themselves with fixing flaws or addressing shortcomings are going to help create conditions that are satisfactory to the residents.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “My institution’s administration and/or residency coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed,” and the overall view of the residency also suggests that one way to create satisfaction in the residency is to fix problems with the residency. If residents believe that coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed, this “success” heavily infers that the residents were satisfied with the job.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “My institution’s administration and/or residency coordinators solicited feedback from me to assess and improve the residency program,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents derive satisfaction from being asked for their feedback in how the residency can be assessed and improved. Residency coordinators should maintain an open and ongoing dialogue with residents to get their opinion on what is going well, what can be improved, and how the work itself of the residency program can most properly suit the preferences and needs of the resident.

Research Question 6 (RQ6)

The sixth research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience?” Data support the research hypothesis that: “The level of professionalism of job duties expected of the resident during the term correlates with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” The independent variable of “perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program” deals with the work itself; Herzberg identifies this as a motivator factor.

To create job satisfaction associated with this independent variable, in general, it should be the residents’ perception that their job duties are professional level and respectable. Institutions can create this perception, in part, by assigning residents job duties that are professional level and respectable. Residents are in their position to learn the job, but they should be assigned professional duties to master, as they are entry-level

professionals. Residents should not have an abundance of idle time. Residents should not just have busy work or just be passed the work that permanent employees do not wish to do. When the host institution is creating situations in which residents are performing meaningful, challenging, professional work, the host institution is helping to contribute to resident job satisfaction.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “At work, I was performing duties that exceeded those of a grad student intern,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents derive satisfaction from performing job tasks and duties that exceed those of a mere graduate student intern. Residency coordinators should be aware of what is expected of a graduate student intern and ensure that the resident’s primary work goes beyond this in professionalism. Residency coordinators should also be aware of the job duties that the resident experienced in graduate school and ensure that their residency job duties do not merely duplicate the experiences the residents have already had as graduate students.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I didn’t have a lot of directionless, idle time,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents do not experience satisfaction if they are frequently assigned busy work or work that seems unproductive. Residency coordinators should ensure that residents have productive work duties that actually contribute to the institution or the profession. Residency coordinators should also ensure that residents are not assigned work that they view as mere busy work, as previously noted.

The significant inverse correlation between agreement with the statement, “I was frequently assigned busy work that no one else wanted to do or that seemed unproductive,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents do not experience satisfaction if they are frequently assigned busy work or work that seems unproductive. Residency coordinators should ensure that residents have productive work duties that actually contribute to the institution or the profession. Residency coordinators should also ensure that residents are not assigned work that they view as mere busy work; there is a possibility that residents will perceive actual pertinent work as busy work, but if the need for such assignments is explained, residents should understand the importance of the work.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I didn’t have a lot of directionless, idle time,” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents experience satisfaction if they do not have a lot of directionless, idle time. Additionally, residents who do have a lot of directionless, idle time do not gain satisfaction from this directionless, idle time. Residency coordinators should make sure that residents do not have too much directionless, idle time. Residents should have office time that allows them to review library resources, but there must be enough assigned to residents to prevent them from feeling their time is wasted or without sufficient guidance.

Research Question 7 (RQ7)

The seventh research question in the quantitative portion of this study was: “Does the perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment correlate with the resident’s overall view of the

residency experience?” Data support the research hypothesis that: “The perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment does correlate with the resident’s overall view of the residency experience.” The independent variable of “perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment” deals with growth. Herzberg identifies growth as a motivator factor.

To create job satisfaction associated with this independent variable, in general, it should be the residents’ perception that their possibilities for professional growth have increased. This is logical as the residency is generally in place to cultivate the skills of a new professional and make that professional more competitive on the job market than s/he was coming into the residency. Residents should be performing tasks, assigned duties, and given professional development opportunities that increase their employability before their residency term ends. The residency coordinators should ensure that the residents end their residency feeling that their skill sets have been enhanced, that they understand librarianship better, and that they have some better idea of how they will contribute to the profession. Residents will likely experience increased satisfaction with the residency if they feel they are being successfully groomed for a higher-level appointment following the residency.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “Work that I did as a resident mirrors job duties I see in professional vacancy announcements” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents experience satisfaction if they believe the work they are performing in their residencies is comparable to the work they will be expected to perform in their next professional appointment. Residents who do not

feel that their residency tasks mirror the tasks they will be expected to perform in their next professional appointment will not experience satisfaction with the residency term. Residency coordinators should be familiar with what employers are looking for in librarian job advertisements, and attempt to make sure that residents are picking up these skills and competencies.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “The residency put me in position to make lasting professional connections” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents experience satisfaction if they believe their professional network is growing throughout the residency. Residency coordinators should attempt to make sure that residents are building a networking base, including outside of the host institution. Encouraging the resident to be active in publishing and presenting at the state and national levels can go a long way in helping residents build their professional networks.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I gained new insights on what to do and not do when pursuing a permanent position during the residency” and the overall view of the residency may indicate that residents may encounter increased satisfaction if they have increased awareness of “do’s and don’ts” related to pursuing their next professional appointment. Residency coordinators should make sure that residents are learning how to appropriately pursue their next professional appointment. If residents know how to effectively pursue their next professional appointment, satisfaction may stem from knowing that they will come into a better position once finished with a residency that they realize is temporary.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I have a better idea of what a librarian does during the work day than I did prior to the residency” and the overall view of the residency suggests that residents experience satisfaction if they understand the work of a librarian during and following the residency than they did prior to going into this entry-level residency position. Coordinators can best assist residents in obtaining added satisfaction by creating conditions in which residents are able to learn the day-to-day responsibilities of a librarian, which may or may not be picked up in graduate library school programs.

The significant correlation between agreement with the statement, “I was overall better prepared to be a professional librarian after the residency than prior to it” and overall view of the residency suggests that residents can gain satisfaction from knowing they are better prepared for a permanent librarian appointment after the residency than they were entering it. This statement explicitly and purely pertains to growth experienced during the position. Residency coordinators should strive to set conditions in which the residents believe they are better prepared to be professional librarians than they were coming into the residency. Ultimately, this should be one of the purest and most explicit goals of a residency.

Because Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory encourages employers to create conditions that facilitate job satisfaction and remove conditions that facilitate job dissatisfaction (Beecher, 2011), diversity residency coordinators should review the research questions and the survey questions as presented here that yielded statistically significant correlations and use them for guidance in creating residency conditions that have high hygiene and high motivators (Herzberg, 1968). The concept of high hygiene is

similar to that of personal hygiene, in that, when factors that cause unsatisfactory conditions such as body odor or unkempt grooming are removed, a person is viewed as having high hygiene or good hygiene. Under such conditions, diversity residents will be highly motivated and have few complaints. If a primary goal of diversity residencies is to retain professional practitioners of color and make them competitive for jobs with advanced qualifications, high hygiene/high motivation conditions are the residency conditions most likely to keep residents motivated regarding librarianship and library and information sciences without contemplating career changes during the residency term. A lot of time and staff resources are devoted to successfully forming and maintaining residency programs; institutions should therefore strive to keep these employees motivated.

This presentation now turns to the qualitative data and its analysis.

The Qualitative Section Participants

Eleven current or former residents agreed to participate in the qualitative portion of this study. While I considered including the full interview transcripts in the appendix section, I concluded that all of the participants could be potentially identified due to facts included in the transcripts, even with all personal and institutional names redacted. The number of total diversity residents past and present is still somewhat small. Therefore, in order to give some description of who the interview participants are and what some of the major rhetoric was in each of their interviews, without compromising their anonymity, overviews of each participant are offered in this section. All of the research subjects were residents between the years of 2000-2016; diversity residencies were not new by this

point, but literature about them was still scarce and mostly anecdotal. The following presentation uses illustrative excerpts from the transcripts.

It should be noted, as it is potentially important when considering how those residents who assigned an overall score to their experiences did so, that residents who appeared to have had overall bad experiences, given what they revealed in the interviews, still were prone to giving their residencies overall high numerical ratings when asked in the interview. One of the subjects, designated as RS5 below and throughout this research, said that residents are in a position in which they cannot be brutally honest in exit interviews and will rate their experiences highly overall in formal situations because of the far-reaching consequences to their own career prospects of being critical.

Research Subject 1 (RS1). RS1 self-identifies as a Black woman. RS1 was in her mid-20s when she started her residency program. RS1 was not part of the first cohort of residents at her host institution. Unlike the majority of the research subjects, RS1 did not relocate to a new region of the country in order to participate in her residency. RS1 did not assign an overall score to her residency experience during the interview.

Thematically, RS1 spoke in great depth about the need for residencies to foster growth in new professionals and mentor them effectively, and praised the mentoring relationship she had with the coordinator of her residency program. RS1 also had talked about how she enjoyed her residency experience and plans to remain in LIS, but is taking steps currently to work her way into a new area of LIS. RS1 has a lot of ideas of different types of diversity residencies and fellowships that could be created to draw out particular strengths of particular new professionals or professionals attempting to move into new

areas within the discipline. RS1 also said that, for her, establishing a connection with another Black woman at the library who could empathize with and her concerns made a key difference in her navigating the position; this suggests that informal mentoring was important to RS1.

Research Subject 2 (RS2). RS2 self-identifies as a Black man who started his residency in his mid-20s. RS2 served in a residency cohort and was not part of the first cohort at his host institution. RS2 moved to a different region of the country to serve in his residency. RS2 rates his residency experience as an 8.5 overall on a scale of 1-10.

There were no items to pull out of RS2's interview that were particularly specific to his experience; RS2's recollections and feelings conveyed a sense that his residency had been well-planned, well-assessed, improved, and, therefore, lacking in experiences that would cause him to have insights on how residencies should be improved broadly. RS2 spoke at length about how great his experience in his residency was, and did stress that his particular institution did very well with assessment and took assessment of the program seriously. RS2 does reveal that he has met other former diversity residents and has discussed residencies with these people; RS2 said he did not encounter many of the challenges that he heard these other residents reporting.

Research Subject 3 (RS3). RS3 self-identifies as a Black woman. RS3 was the first diversity resident at her host institution. RS3's age was not discussed and RS3 did not assign an overall score to her residency experience during her interview. However, RS3 did speak mostly in positive terms about her residency experience. There were a few other things that RS3 discussed during the interview, but RS3 largely wanted to make the

point that she felt she was treated differently by library faculty than she was by library staff. RS3 brought this issue to my attention without prompting, and entered this distinction into the narrative; subsequent research subjects were then asked about the faculty-versus-staff dynamic as well. RS3 also spoke more about her post-residency experiences than the other research participants did. Much of the post-residency experience that RS3 shared was outside the scope of the dissertation research, but it may be relevant to future studies; please see the “suggestions for further research” section in Chapter 5.

Research Subject 4 (RS4). RS4 self-identifies as a Black woman who started her residency in her twenties. RS4 did not assign her residency an overall score on a scale of 1-10, but she had an extremely bad experience with the residency overall and did not have anything positive to say about her residency experience. RS4 was the first diversity resident for her host institution and she relocated to a different area of the country to serve her residency term.

RS4’s experience was unique in that it was seemingly bad at every level and was the worst residency experience of the eleven subjects. RS4 described in great detail how the residency was planned poorly and with little direction or goal setting. RS4 also described in great detail how she did not have consistent support from residency coordinators and library administration. RS4 described several examples of microaggressive and blatantly racist behavior from coworkers. RS4 described not feeling included by coworkers, including the few other Black librarians at the library. RS4 described the poor assessment of the diversity residency program and how subsequent residents also had poor experiences. RS4’s host institution no longer hosts a residency

program and she believes the institution was not in any way ready to host one and maybe never will be.

Research Subject 5 (RS5). RS5 self-identifies as a Black woman who started her residency in her early 30s. Despite reporting a lot of negative experiences during her residency term and shortcomings about the residency setup and execution, RS5 still assigned the residency a score of seven overall on a 1-10 scale. RS5 relocated to a different region of the country to begin her residency term. RS5 was the first diversity resident at the host institution.

A unique theme with RS5 is that RS5 spoke passionately about potential career stunting when a resident is employed by a less-reputable school after completing a diversity residency at a top-tier university. RS5 completed her residency at a university with a reputable name, but subsequently went to a smaller college with fewer library resources. RS5 did say that the residency prepared her well for work at the smaller college because she had already mastered the skills needed to do library functions at this smaller college.

Research Subject 6 (RS6). RS6 self-identifies as a Hispanic man who started his residency in his early 40s. RS6 assigns his residency an overall score of 8.5 on a scale of 1-10, but said “on any given day” he could rate it a 10 because it was such a positive experience that positioned him for great things career-wise. RS6 was not part of the first diversity residency cohort at his institution.

Research Subject 7 (RS7). RS7 self-identifies as a heterosexual Black woman who started her residency in her 20s. Her employment with the host institution continued

for a time beyond the actual residency term. She was not the first resident at the host institution. RS7 relocated to a different region of the country for her residency. Despite being able to talk at some length about many shortcomings regarding her residency, RS7 rated her residency as an eight on a 1-10 scale of how good the residency experience was overall.

One distinct theme or topic that RS7 spoke about in greater detail and length than the other research subjects was the actual set up and organization of the library and its operation. RS7 could identify a number of what she felt were flaws in the library's organization, organizational culture and operation. RS7 indicated quite a bit of frustration with the ultimate purpose and goals of her residency not being communicated to her and to some other members of the library faculty and staff.

Research Subject 8 (RS8). RS8 identifies as a mixed-race woman of partial Latina ancestry. RS8 was in her mid-20s when she started her residency term. RS8 was not the first resident or in the first residency cohort at her host institution. RS8 gives her residency an overall score of between a seven and eight on a 1-10 scale, and says that her residency “wasn't horrible” but that she became aware of some shortcomings of it after it was over and she was doing other things professionally.

RS8 spoke at some length about how a lack of actual guidance stunted her growth in her residency position; the lack of guidance in her opinion stemmed from the coordinators being too nice and wanting to be too accommodating. RS8 did not see how this was negatively impactful originally, but discovered the hindrances associated with this after the residency term was over. The residency coordinators had left it largely up to

her from the beginning to carve her own path and pursue her own interests, but they did not seem to consider that she had limited perspective because she was new to the field.

Research Subject 9 (RS9). RS9 identifies as a Black woman who started her residency in her late 30s. Librarianship was not RS9’s first career field. RS9 spoke mostly positively about her diversity residency experience and rated it a nine overall on a scale of 1-10. RS9 was not the first resident at her host institution. RS9 is no longer working as a librarian but insists that this is not due to negative experiences in the residency or other librarian work; rather, she considers her transition out of libraries as “upward mobility.”

A unique recurring theme throughout the interview with RS9 was her self-determination. She, more so than others it seemed, was a self-starter who did not wait for guidance from library colleagues before getting involved with various activities and organizations on campus. Additionally, RS9 was the only research subject to speak in great details about what burdens are on the resident as far as acclimating to organizational culture, not assuming race is the motivation behind disagreements, and making the most of the residency opportunity. RS9 said residents need to be proactive and take the initiative when it comes to reaching out to coworkers, asking questions and addressing misunderstandings and minor conflicts, though she said she did not encounter major conflicts during the residency. RS9 also heavily credits her residency with her subsequent career mobility, saying, “It made all the difference.”

Research Subject 10 (RS10). RS10 self-identified as a Black woman. RS10 started her residency more recently than any of the other research subjects and was in her

early 30s at the beginning of her residency. RS10 was part of the first residency cohort at her institution and relocated from another area of the country to a less-diverse area of the country to participate in her residency. RS10 did not assign an overall score to the residency experience.

One topic that differentiated RS10 from the other research subjects was the emphasis she stressed on the ageism she encountered during the residency; she was the only research subject to speak to this issue without being prompted with a question. Due to her relatively young age, RS10 believed that she was not permitted opportunities to be innovative, outside of doing some things with technology. A lot of assumptions were made about her skill set and aptitudes based on her age, she believes.

Research Subject 11 (RS11). RS11 self-identified as a Hispanic woman. RS11 had a very good experience and rates her residency as a nine on a scale of 1-10. RS11's age at the beginning of the residency was not discussed, but she did transition from another career field and believes she was respected as a professional with previous professional work experience in that other career field. RS11 relocated from another area of the country to take part in her residency program.

RS11 spoke very highly about her residency, but a unique circumstance with her term was a level of ambiguity that she reported regarding the job announcement. RS11 reported not being clear based on the job announcement and even during the interviews that the residency she was applying for was diversity-based. Once in the position, however, RS11 became clearer on the intent of the position and feels she excelled in it.

RS11 reported being afforded both freedom to do the things that she wished to do and guidance to accomplish her goals.

Qualitative Results with Herzberg Framing

The qualitative portion of this chapter explores themes that emerged from the qualitative data gathered through interviews with the research subjects who agreed to be interviewed. Upon completion of a thematic narrative analysis of each in-depth interview, six major themes emerged from the data. The six major themes are:

1. Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.
2. Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators.
3. Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents.
4. Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents.
5. Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appears to improve future job outlook.
6. Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.

Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction. Participating in a diversity residency is something that not everyone is eligible for. Additionally, diversity residents are often afforded some perks and extra benefits such as an increased travel budget and time during their shifts to learn about different areas and functions of the library that other library personnel are generally not afforded. Because of this, unless there is some effort to educate the library faculty and staff about the purpose of the residency and try to garner support for the initiative, the residents may be subject to some backlash from coworkers who do not understand the residency or know anything about the residents and their credentials. (Alston, 2016). This backlash is part of a resident's relationship with coworkers, which Herzberg identifies as a hygiene factor.

An emergent theme in the data was that residents who served in libraries where an effort had been made to court support and buy-in for the residency had better experiences than residents who served in libraries where no such efforts were made. Courting buy-in and support for the residency could include announcing to library personnel what the diversity residency is and the reasons behind forming it are. Additionally, courting buy-in could include explaining to library personnel who the residents are and what their credentials are. Efforts to court support and buy-in should be extended to library staff as well as faculty; some research subjects noticed that librarians who had library degrees and reviewed library literature had understandings about the position and the general need for diversity in the field, while staff members may not approach the residency with the same insight and may display sterner objections toward it. Over time, faculty and staff

at host institutions with established and ongoing residency programs may become more familiar with the intent and purpose of these programs or become less hostile to residents because they have grown accustomed to having them at the host institution.

RS2 served at an institution with a strong, ongoing residency program with previous cohorts and said “90 percent” of library personnel was “pretty supportive,” while also saying, “It’s even hard to say (the other 10 percent) weren’t supportive.” RS2 characterized his residency throughout the interview as an overwhelmingly positive experience and also stated at points during the interview that administrators ensured that faculty and staff knew who the residents were and how the residency operated. RS1 said that coworkers at the library were informed of the residents’ credentials when they were presented to the library faculty and staff; RS1 did not convey that coworkers displayed hostilities to residents or to the idea of her institution hosting the residency. RS6 also rated his overall residency experience highly and said, “I think they made every effort to ensure that people were aware of us, they were aware of the goals of the residency program, and that there was interest in working with the residents to ensure that our experiences were positive and fruitful.” RS11, who had a very positive overall residency experience, reported coworkers being receptive of the residency concept once she was able to explain it to them, saying:

“There was a lot of support from them. You know, I had a lot of people who I was able to easily talk to about how the residency worked and what they gained from it. And ideas that I could work on. There was support throughout the library... Most of the time I didn’t feel that people were looking at me as lesser of a librarian because it was a temporary position or whatever.”

RS3 had a positive overall residency experience and, concerning promoting the residency, said, she did her own promotion in helping coworkers understand the residency. She said of this experience:

“I didn’t like that I would have to tell people, ‘I’m here because there’s not a pipeline.’ Like, I’d have to explain it to people that there weren’t minorities in librarianship and people would be like, ‘*[mocking the tone]* Ugh, I don’t want to talk about this! Oh my god!’”

RS4, whose residency experience appeared to be the worst of the eleven based on experiences shared during the interview, introduced the possibility into the narrative that no amount of trying to appeal to the faculty and staff would get them to support the residency. When asked about efforts to garner support for the residency at her institution, RS4 said:

“You know what, Jason? The climate there *[searching for words for a few moments]*. They were not ready. They may never be ready. You know, everyone has a different definition of diversity... People clearly had an issue. What I really believed or knew at that moment, it was, ‘Why you and not me? Why can you apply for this and why can I not apply for this?’”

Degreed Professional Librarians Versus Staff in Terms of Acceptance. RS6 rated his residency experience highly overall but did say that support was stronger from degreed librarians, while a small number of library staff, “questioned the validity and the value of the residency program.” RS7 felt that library staff did not have the same understanding about the position as library faculty, saying:

“By the staff people, I mean like the circulation supervisor and the supervisor at the reserve desk and others. And like the conference center, and mailroom coordinator. I’m talking about those kinds of staff positions that really didn’t understand, like I guess, what a residency program was all about. And I’ll say this. Even a few of them, maybe, did not even know that I had a library and information studies degree. They thought that this was somehow that I was still in a program or... I don’t think they really got it... But I think the (degreed) people in my department got it.”

RS10, who did not have an overall score for her program but who had mixed overall experiences, said that a chief administrator at her library had worked to ensure that “the people in his office” understood the residency, but added, “It wasn’t necessarily articulated to the rest of the library.” Further, RS10 said, “Faculty knew who we were, but staff, they, like, just knew we were coming”; RS10 noted not feeling that library staff were as on board as library faculty, and this may have stemmed from lack of appealing to library staff. RS10 said she felt some initial problems with coworkers toward the beginning of the term could have been avoided had attempts to court buy-in occurred earlier and made workers aware of why the residents were there. She also stated, when asked if the library faculty and staff knew what the residents’ credentials were:

“Oh no, especially the staff, had like no idea. They just know we had interviews, they had interviews for my position and we showed up and then we got jobs and then, you know, two months later we showed up, right? The program started. They didn’t really do a very good job articulating the program, when they first created it, they didn’t do a very good job at explaining to people what the program

would look like... A part of it too is that they didn't give us a chance, when we first got (there), they didn't actually give us a chance to talk about ourselves... It would be really nice to have been able to introduce ourselves, you know?... On my first day they paraded us to all the different library branches and just, we sat in the staff room while people came in and said 'hi'. That's how we were introduced... There's a library magazine that we were, we were in it. We were in it two months after the fact that we got (there) and that's too late. Honestly. Once you've missed those first weeks it's kind of hard to reintroduce a bunch of people who are already working there for two months."

RS3 also spoke extensively about the faculty versus staff dynamic in acceptance of the residency program:

"Like, the library staff. They don't know the issues in librarianship. They aren't reading about it or talking about it and it's not like librarians were talking to them about it so I think that's where the disconnect came. That staff thought, 'Here goes this new grad.' Some of them didn't even realize that I've graduated from library school. The librarians did. But I was already working there for like a year in and someone was like, 'You're not in library school?' And I'm like, 'No, I'm not, I graduated.' And I think there was definitely like, an air of animosity between the idea that these librarians can come in and it's like, 'I've been working at the library for like ten years and I should be able to do what they are doing but I don't have the degree.'... And with a minority person coming in, they're like, 'This is a residency and a minority residency at that.' That made them even more angry. Like this person is a diversity hire. And especially at a

public university where people are constantly saying we don't have money for raises.”

RS5 mentioned being described by other librarians as an “intern” rather than a resident and said she did not feel that librarians at the host institution respected her as a credentialed librarian. RS5 said the librarians at her host institution did know that she had an MLS because they were involved with the interview process, “However, nobody knew what I was going to do (as far as work during the residency). They didn't know, and the supervisor didn't know. Nobody knew.” Also, because of a lack of selling the diversity residency idea at her institution, RS5 said, “I do think in some ways, you have that affirmative action type of negative thought attached to it.”

Added Perks and Benefits for the Residency. RS11, who explained to coworkers the benefits of the residency, did not report perceiving any objections from coworkers about the added benefits she received as a resident, which included increased travel funds. RS7 reported that her residency experience did not include any privileges, benefits, or perks that set it apart from the privileges, benefits, and perks received by other library personnel (this residency did not include departmental rotations; RS7 remained in one department during the duration of her appointment). RS8 reported that there was some questioning about why early career librarians had larger travel budgets than veteran librarians, but said, “That was not necessarily directed at me”; residents were among a group of “early career librarians” who had higher travel budgets at this institution.

Although he rated his residency highly, RS6 did report that some did not approve of the added benefits he received in the residency position:

“I think I had memories of some folks that, you know, asked unfortunate questions about some of the benefits we were receiving and that sort of thing. So anyway, but you know, was that, you know because that was racially motivated? Was it because of a misunderstanding of, you know, the program, the design of the program and how those design pieces fit together to create some sort of comprehensive recruitment strategy? You know, I don’t know... But (there were) circumstances where people were clearly not enthusiastic or supportive of the work that we were doing. Or you know, questioned why we had access to things, or to people, or to finances that some of the other professional librarians did not.”

RS1, who – based on her interview – appeared to have one of the better overall residency experiences, said that she got additional travel funds due to being a resident, and that coworkers were supportive:

“My colleagues were very encouraging of my getting out there and getting exposure, and understanding what it means to attend conferences, to present at conferences, because if I wanted to stay (at that institution, post residency) and be active in the collaborating system, especially in a tenure-track position, these are things that I would have to do. So that encouragement, that promotion, was definitely there.”

Bad interpersonal relationships with coworkers generated job dissatisfaction for those residents who reported bad interpersonal relationships, while those who had

generally good interpersonal relationships with their coworkers avoided this form of job dissatisfaction. It appeared throughout the interviews that coworkers who knew things about the residents and knew/understood the rationale behind the residency developed better interpersonal relationships with the residents. Therefore, to reduce job dissatisfaction for residents, host institutions should plan to educate library faculty and staff (professional and paraprofessional) about the purpose of the residency and who the residents are. Host institutions should also plan to court buy-in for the residency concept and explain to all library personnel why residents may be receiving benefits, privileges and perks that other library personnel are not receiving.

Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators. Eight of the research subjects were asked about their relationships with their supervisors and administrators; those who were not asked were not asked because of time constraints or because other feedback gave illustrations of their satisfaction with coordinator, supervisor, or administrative support. Experiences with supervisors, coordinators, and administrators that were positive and productive went hand and hand with good overall residency experiences. Experiences with supervisors, coordinators, and administrators that were negative and counterproductive went hand and hand with residency experiences that were on the lower end of the range of overall quality.

RS9 attributed the nine that she scored her residency program overall directly to the support of supervisors and administrators, saying she rated it so highly because:

“The support I had from the person who was actually over, well I had a number of people. I had one of the executive directors, the associate director of the library. Overall, she was actually the person who was very instrumental in getting me interested in the residency here. I also had support from the director of human resources. She was very supportive. I had support for the director of the libraries and also my primary department as well as other departments that I chose.”

RS9 said her director of human resources was one of the people that she directly reported to during her residency term and that this director was not only “supportive,” but also recognized that getting regular feedback from the resident and learning about the experiences of the resident would be useful when planning and advertising for the next diversity resident at the institution; RS9 described the director of human resources as “learning along with me.”

RS10 identified one of the administrators at her library as a former diversity resident librarian who, “understands the positives and negatives of being a diversity resident,” and she additionally identified her direct supervisor as the only other Black librarian at her institution; RS10 said she had “no issues” when talking to these individuals, in contrast to when she talked to many others at her institution. RS6, who coincidentally credits his diversity residency with his career trajectory and said that on any given day he could rate his overall residency experience as high as a ten, said everyone from “senior administration” to “those managing the day-to-day logistics” of his residency program were, “all completely committed to the success of the residency program, absolutely.”

RS10 said it was important to one of the administrators who was a former diversity resident, that he did not want the residency to be “super structured” and that the residency was “their (the residents) experience to have.” RS1 said that her department supervisor was purposely “very much hands off” and that she preferred this approach rather than having to feel that a supervisor was, “standing over my head every time I was doing something.” RS1 preferred going to a mentor, versus a department supervisor, for most guidance.

RS10 said the top administrator for her program would be accessible when there were concerns, but, “Day to day, if there’s an issue, he’s pretty much not present, and I think it’s on purpose... You don’t have too many cooks in the kitchen.” RS1 said if she had concerns, “I felt comfortable that the administration would at least have an open conversation to hear me out.”

RS5, RS4 and RS7 expressed pointed beliefs in the shortcomings in support and guidance from supervisors, coordinators, and administrators. RS7 offered a measured perspective on her chief administrator’s support of her during the residency program, describing it as “misguided” before saying, “Sometimes it’s what she feels is best and not what I feel is best for me, but no, absolutely lots of effort on her part.”

RS5, who offered no experiences of any supervisors or administrators taking up for her during her term, recalled a situation in which an administrator made a remark about her outfit in front of other coworkers, who seemingly were amused. While RS4 could offer an example of when a director supported her, which is described a few paragraphs down, she was largely not supported or defended by supervisors or those in

roles of authority. This lack of support caused RS4 to be asked questions directly by coworkers that ideally should have been fielded to a coordinator or administrator, such as why the institution established a diversity residency based on race that white workers with other potentially-diverse attributes, specifically a non-hetero sexual orientation, would not be eligible for.

RS5 said that lack of support and other shortcomings from a chief administrator at her host institution have strained their relationship even after the residency. Likewise, RS4 said that she learned after talking with people who went through her host program's residency after she did that subsequent residents had been instructed by supervisors not to speak to her. RS5 said of her post-appointment relationship with people in authority at the host library:

“So I felt like unlike a lot of residents who had the support of their (chief administrator), I felt like I could never list her as a reference because I don't think she would support me. I don't think I could list anyone in the department other than the two people that said I could as a reference. I don't even feel like I could use my old supervisor.”

RS4 detailed in great length her exit interview. The exit interview was intended to only be between RS4 and the new director of the library. The new library director at RS4's institution was hired as director during RS4's residency term, and the new director did not work directly with the residency much. However, another library faculty member who had operated in a more hands-on supervisory capacity with the residency managed to convince the new director to let her sit in on the meeting; RS4 and this other

supervisory coworker did not have a good relationship with each other and this supervisor anticipated that RS4 would have negative things to say about the residency. RS4 maintains though, “My intentions were not to blast any of these people or to embarrass them or to get outrageous; I just wanted to tell her what I thought needed to change.” RS4 recounted that during the exit interview:

“Whenever I brought up a point, the (supervisor) would question me about my point so as to make it invalid or to change the nature of the point. Like, it was weird. It was like every time I said something in this meeting, she would have a comeback or she would try to engage me in a conversation about that point to show that she was equally as interested. It was almost as if she was putting on a show for the director to make it seem like she was so supportive and so interested in the fellowship when I knew she wasn’t interested at all. But also she wanted to make sure that the tone was such that the director didn’t understand that underneath it all, I was very upset. What the (supervisor) didn’t do successfully was fool the director. So the director told me near the end of the interview, ‘I really appreciate this meeting and I want to apologize because we did not support you. *[with some emphasis]* WE did not support you’... I never said (I was not supported) but she was able to pick that up.”

RS4 said she believed the director knew that this supervisor “had failed” when it came to the residency and had not established a good relationship with the resident. RS4 shared that her intent in this meeting had not been to embarrass the supervisor; her motivation was concern for the residents who would participate in the program after her. RS4 recalled another situation in which a supervisor, instead of being supportive of her

during an interview of a candidate for another position, actually gave the candidate nonverbal cues to dismiss RS4 when RS4 asked the candidate a diversity-related question:

“I could tell from her body language that she didn’t know how she would react to the question. And I think she kind of thought that the gentleman wouldn’t know either. And she didn’t want him to be uncomfortable. So she motioned for him to move his chair so that he wouldn’t be facing me. And I saw it! I saw that happen! So he adjusted his chair and he was no longer facing me and it was very rude and she was telling him, and it was all non-verbal, that she was telling him, ‘ignore her.’”

RS8, who scored her residency experience as between a seven and an eight overall and who portrayed her residency experience to be a mixed experience with plenty of strengths and weaknesses, more so than the other research subjects, noted that following the residency term, she realized that she could have benefitted from more structure and guidance from supervisors and administrators. Throughout her interview, RS8 revisited the theme of not being fully aware of what would be beneficial to her or what she would need most as a professional because she did not have much perspective or knowledge of the overall profession as an entry-level practitioner; she expressed on multiple occasions during the interview that some guidance on how to spend her time and what different tasks to take on and not take on would have helped her in the long run. RS8 also noted that she had monthly meetings with her supervisor, but that this was not unique to the residents as other faculty and staff also met regularly with supervisors. RS8 said:

“This is sort of something I realized looking back on it, and it may be more of a characteristic of my supervisor who was very much laid back and didn’t give us time or guidance unless it was asked for. It was pretty much I was always doing fine, everything was great. And I realized later on like a little more guidance and structure would have been helpful... So I think that can be helpful for those kinds of positions. I think that they had, like, too much flexibility and freedom but not enough guidance, so I think that would probably keep it (the overall residency experience) from a nine or a ten (as far as overall rating).”

As evident from the data, diversity residents, as new professionals, need some amount of guidance and support from those in administrative, supervisory or coordinating roles. The amount of support and guidance likely needs to be determined on a case by case basis and cannot veer into extremes as the residents’ face “unknown unknowns” as new professionals, but if administrators and supervisors are too intrusive, the resident may end up not having adequate control over their own residency experience. Residents who felt that they could go to supervisors or administrators when necessary did remember and did not encounter dissatisfaction with the residency experience due to this, while residents who did not feel that supervisors or administrators would respect them, take their concerns seriously, or support them in the face of other coworkers remembered this and it clearly contributed to dissatisfaction with the overall residency experience. An overall theme of “Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators” therefore emerged from the data.

Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents. The research subjects were asked about the work that they performed during their residencies. The residents had varied experiences in the types of work they performed, the amount of idle time they encountered during the appointment, the challenge of their duties, and their ability to be innovative and taken seriously. Residents experienced satisfaction when their residency duties seemed meaningful, challenging or when they were allowed to be innovative.

Duties. RS7 scored her residency an eight overall but reported a lot of negative experiences about it. RS7 did not have rotations in her residency and RS7 reported that her duties as a resident were not any different from other professionals in the department she was assigned to. RS7 said, “I didn’t hit the ground running. I was very much eased into the department so I shadowed the desk, which felt a little awkward at first because I wasn’t an intern. So I feel like that’s something you do with an intern. But maybe not.” When asked if her responsibilities would possibly resemble those of an intern, RS7 added:

“Well I don’t think there were any interns here at that time so there’s nothing for me to compare it to and also now seeing how the current intern is worked, I don’t think that her duties are that distinguished from, let’s say another person in that position would be doing. So with that being said, there was no [pause] so initially. Maybe I should mention this. I was told that I would be allowed to do a research project that would be lasting over my residency and that promise was flat out broken. I was taken, I sort of joined someone else’s research project. And it worked that way. I don’t really feel like I had a voice in that.”

RS10 stated that some professional level duties such as publishing, teaching, and doing service were not required of her as a resident, but, “I mean I’d do all those things anyways,” because she wanted professional level responsibilities even if they were not required in her residency. RS9 noted that her experience was somewhat hindered not due to what was required versus not required, but rather because of time constraints during rotations; she said, “For certain rotations... nothing actually happens in (less than two months).” RS9 added that the comparatively brief rotations she had did not lend well to professional-level experiences or skill building, saying, “I would say for the most part in terms of tangibles, like I don’t have always a lot, and some of my tangibles are stuff I got myself, not necessarily something that someone else did for my rotation, but something that I decided that I wanted to do while I was here and that’s sort of the struggle.”

RS1 spoke very specifically to the satisfaction that came with substantive job duties, saying:

“Even though it started off a little slow with a lot of idle time, as I started to pick up my workload with instruction and outreach, and then getting into the technology aspects, I very much feel confident that anywhere, whether it was a community college or a research institution, a liberal arts institution, that I would’ve had a great opportunity to get hired. And even now, with the experience that I gained after the residency, I feel confident that I can work anywhere.”

Structure versus flexibility appears to be a balance that programs will have to find and different residents may have different preferences. RS11, who rated her residency experience highly, said “I definitely had reference responsibilities and responsibilities in

my unit, but there was enough flexibility that I could, that any of the residents could explore what they were interested in.” RS10 also appreciated the flexibility in her program, saying that starting out in an entry-level position such as a reference librarian position would have been too structured, and she would not have the freedom to learn what she did not gain through library school; however RS10 said the residency was still more structured than her previous nonprofit experience so she did not have the same ability to stretch resources and expand into roles other than roles assigned in the job description. RS11 went on to attribute the flexibility to why she “quite enjoyed” her residency. RS9 stated that, “Any new service that our department was doing, I was certainly expected to participate, just like everyone else,” in relaying that while she had some flexibility, she was also required to take on normal departmental responsibilities. RS8, looking back, desired more structure in her residency:

“To the program overall. And just for me in my position, this is sort of something I realized looking back on it, and it may be more of a characteristic of my supervisor who was very laid back and didn’t give us time or guidance unless it was asked for. It was pretty much I was always doing fine, everything was great. And I realized later on, like, a little more guidance and structure would have been helpful... So they were very open to giving me multiple different experiences to where it was almost too self-directed.”

Structure within the residency can help prevent idle time, and residents were generally more satisfied with the residency when they were able to avoid idle time. RS9 lauded her institution’s efforts on this front, saying, “Oh no, I didn’t have any wasted time, that’s for sure; even in staff meetings, for instance, they would have a presentation

[and] would ask if I wanted to do a presentation on certain databases, on new ones.” RS1 spoke at length about the issue of idle time:

“That was actually one of the areas of complaint for me, was the idle time. There just wasn’t enough for me to do. Even though I had rotations and everything, I was still learning the culture and learning what I was going to do. I did a lot of observations, and that still didn’t kind of take up enough time in the day and throughout the week, and so, a position like that, it’s really important for any resident to come in knowing how to take the initiative, and so instead of just sitting around, that’s where I started – you know, I would go out and shelve and dust, to make sure my mind stayed fresh with our call number classifications... It’s not a major complaint, but it’s something where you go to work, you don’t want to be just sitting there for hours. You know, it can get pretty boring if you’re not of the mindset where I need to take the initiative and make this residency experience everything that it could be, you could lose out.”

Capstones: RS11 did offer a particular insight on whether a capstone should be required, saying that she had to leave her residency early because a fitting position had been advertised so a capstone would have prevented her from being able to leave early; she added, “I guess that’s the potential downside of having a project that you have to finish, or that you are expected to finish before moving on because it just deters you from finding another position.” RS9 in contrast, said her associate director was adamant that a capstone or large-scale project be included, saying, “Residents were there not to just kill time. She made sure that people understood it was not an internship, that (the large scale project) was going to be successful.” RS5 also suggested capstones were necessary,

saying, “I think you need producible work [as] sure I can sit at a reference desk [and] can do instruction, but where’s my producible work out of that?” RS3 said that her capstone was extensive and contributed heavily to the function of the library (details about the capstone are withheld to protect her identity); she said of capstones, “You want to do something that will get you so much mileage they will know your name when you walk into the front door.” RS2 said of capstones that, “I think that it can be useful depending on the kind of library you’re looking to work in... for us we were a tenure-track institution so it made sense,” and added that his institution requiring a capstone, “gave us the tools to succeed or at least understand what we were going to be up against.”

RS9 described one of her residency coordinators as being adamant that the resident would gain valuable experience that would translate to an increased job outlook:

“She would say you need to get experience, exposure, in different areas. Not just reference and instruction, but go around to the [various libraries]. So I did. I visited with everybody, literally every single library that they had on campus and every special needs department. If there was a project that I was interested in then I would ask if I could serve on that project. Normally, they would say yes.”

Goals. The better residency experiences also appeared to have clearly-defined goals for the residents. RS9, who had one of the better experiences, said that not only was she assigned goals when she entered the residency, she was also asked to submit goals of her own. RS9 said, “I was also asked what did I want to learn [and] were there any particular areas that I really wanted to spend a little extra time learning and working in,” indicating that she was given assistance in defining her own goals.

RS10 looked to the goal-setting idea skeptically, saying, “The people who develop these programs have a clear-cut idea about what it is they want the residents to do... It’s not really for residents to have their own set of goals,”; RS10 said her experience was colored with “push and pull” between her goals as the resident and the goals of the host institution. RS8 said she realized after her residency term that her experience had shortcomings; on goal setting, she said, “We didn’t do that, at all.” RS5 was highly frustrated with her residency experience despite scoring it high, but said goal setting was problematic with her planners; when asking for more assignments and guidance, she was merely told that the reference desk could use additional staffing. Like RS5, RS7 reported that there were no substantial goals established for what she would accomplish during her residency term. RS7 attributed this to lacking preparation and planning of the residency, saying:

“My goals in the beginning were very basic. I don’t really feel like they were prepared for me. There were no goals of the residency communicated. I came in and developed my own goals to meet for that year, and actually I later learned that that’s also what they have everyone else in the department do as well. So it wasn’t even unique to being a resident... I think people know that residencies like that are needed but they don’t always have the infrastructure to do it. And so they sort of do it and it’s kind of half-assed, and you sort of get what you get. But I also think that that mimics real life, so. I don’t want to come into a place and it’s all kumbaya, rainbows, and lollipops, and candies and then get thrown out here and be ill prepared for what the real world is like.”

Ambitions and innovation. RS7, who reported a lot of hang-ups with her residency experience despite giving it an eight overall score, reported that her desires to be innovative were stunted by coworkers, saying:

“So expectations I had as a resident about what would happen were just not met and also I was made to feel that my projects or my ideas were too ambitious. And I think that that sort of has colored even how I operate and the work that I do. So I don’t do anything that is too ambitious.”

RS10 had mixed experiences with her residency, and did note her attempts at innovation being stunted due to what she believed was ageism:

“But even just, I think the biggest thing to me, Jason, because there is a hierarchal structure, there is this idea that you sort of wait your turn, so if I’m in a meeting and I speak, people look at me funny because, ‘Why are you speaking?’ You know. Like people who are the senior people, they’re the ones that speak. They are the ones that are waiting and who are supposed to talk. You sort of wait your turn until you get to a place where you can speak, right? So even if I have a new idea, or a suggestion, or a question, it’s like, ‘You might need to, you know, you have to wait your turn because that’s what we do around here.’ The younger people, they wait until they’ve worked a couple of years and then they get the seniority and then they’ll be able to make change and bring new ideas and be innovative. I can only be innovative when they need (me) to make a flyer. But if it’s not about technology, it’s like ‘Just wait, you know, in a couple of years

you'll be able to lead a committee and then you can speak your piece, or sort of whatever you'd like to do.”

RS11, who was on the higher end as far as positivity of the overall residency experience, said her attempts to be innovative were appreciated and respected, by saying:

“I think it took some time to get there (respecting my attempts to be innovative). Like, I think that I had to prove myself, which, again, makes sense because it's an entry-level position. You're not really sure what the person knows or what they can contribute. So to me it made sense, but there was that level of helping and then proving myself, and then actually having people come to me for advice, or for help, or whatever and then kind of flipping it that way.”

RS6 also applauded his institution's willingness to allow residents to be innovative:

“We as a cohort engaged in a research project that ended up being submitted and accepted into a peer review publication and so that, you know, we hoped would help, and did help inform, some of the library efforts and strategies for serving historically underserved populations.”

RS9 talked at length and with an enthusiastic tone about an example of innovative work she was allowed to do in her residency, the specifics of which were grand but may hint to her identity if revealed in this study. Her tone while recounting the experiences reflected great satisfaction with the innovative work that was accomplished. RS2 also spoke at length about being taken seriously in an attempt to be innovative by proposing some cost cutting measures that were adopted; being taken seriously when trying to

change some library procedures for the better generated satisfaction for RS2. Despite reporting mixed experiences with her residency, RS8 did express herself most enthusiastically when recalling innovative new initiatives she was allowed to do for international students.

Utilizing Pre-Existing Skills. RS11 had pre-existing knowledge in the hard sciences from her previous career and was able to apply this knowledge to her residency; the ability to do this appeared to generate satisfaction. RS9 also gave her residency a high overall score (nine) and also applied pre-existing skills that she had gained in social work, stating:

“I did a lot of case management. We do a lot of case management in our field. We triage. We assess people, we try to find the resources that are appropriate that would help the client. You know, we call them clients. In the library world, we call them patrons. It’s the same skill set. I actually talked about that in my interview. That exact question was asked of me in my interview. I related my skillset of being a case manager in that same sequence that I just talked about and applied that as being very applicable and appropriate to what I did in my work as an academic librarian, in addition to research.”

RS10 did not assign an overall score to her residency experience but had a blended experience of ups and downs reported. RS10 reported that she came into the residency with advocacy, project management, and community building skills from previous work experience from the non-profit sector. RS10 and RS5 both discussed

seeking the residency as an opportunity to learn skills not acquired through library school education.

Matching Resident Interests. RS11 expressed appreciation that she was allowed to work on Hispanic Heritage Month celebrations, and said that she was able to do this because she wanted to and she was not pegged for this role unwillingly; RS11 spoke fondly of this experience and it appeared to increase her satisfaction with the position. RS2, who had one of the better overall residency experiences, said of his school's efforts to pair him with a mentor, "It would have been easy for them to pair me up with someone who was of my age range or my ethnicity or my regional position, and what they did was they found the one person in the library who had a career trajectory similar to what I was looking to achieve,"; RS2 also said that his institution understood his interests but protected him from "putting all my eggs in the technical services basket". RS9 also appeared to derive some satisfaction from having job duties that incorporated her actual interests:

"I took the more generalist position that the areas that I had the most interest in, African American history since no one had covered that, actually. So I chose that and also some of history. I also worked on some more specific projects with the [name of specialty library redacted] because I had an interest in medical library. I did a lot of projects with them with their new web site. I did outreach. I did presentations to rural clinics... They had a big health literacy thing and I was involved with that. I really enjoyed that. Plus, it was outreach as well. I had the outreach training."

RS9 essentially described failing to match residents to their interests or potential interests as a waste of time:

“So don’t just bring (a number of) people to the university and tell them this is what you’re going to do. You actually have to talk to them, you have to foster a relationship with them, and also to see sort of what their strengths are and then to make sure their rotations reflect those strengths. You can’t just, if you suck a cataloging, why would you go through a cataloging rotation? That doesn’t make any sense. If you hate access services, why would you go through an access service rotation? And so making sure that when the people come in, their focus is on, one, developing new talents, but also really focusing on what they’re good at and then making them fantastic at it. So when they leave, they’re going to be the shit. Like when they leave, they’re going to be the best at whatever it is that they’re good at. Not necessarily what you’re passionate about, but what you’re good at. Because that’s what actually matters.”

While RS2 noted that his institution did well as far as matching residents with professionals of particular interest, he did lament the preference his program appeared to have for residents interested in certain focuses, saying:

“So if you go into a diversity residency like mine, and you say ‘I want reference work’, they’ve got it all mapped out, they’ve done it before, and it’s pretty comfortable and familiar. But when you have someone like me who wants to check out systems, and we want to do stuff with serials, well they’re not ready for that. No one has ever had an interest in those areas of the library before. To the

extent that at a certain point I wanted to continue doing [non-reference] work for my final rotation, and I was pretty strongly encouraged to at least try one rotation in reference, even though it's not at all what I'm interested in, because that was something that was more familiar, and they were actually ready for residents because pretty much every resident wanted to do reference work.”

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory describes the work itself as a motivator factor that leads to satisfaction on the job. The sub-themes listed within this section contribute to the overarching concept of the work itself. Residents with the best experiences had work that was professional and meaningful, and they were able to limit idle time encountered. Also, residents with the best experiences had goals set and subsequently had work that advanced them toward these goals. Residents tended toward better experiences if they were empowered to be innovative in their roles as residents, as well as if their duties fostered their ambitions. A lesser emergent sub-theme revealed that utilizing pre-existing skills in the work itself could be beneficial to the residents' ability to find satisfaction with their work. Finally, residents appeared to appreciate efforts to match their work and focus with their interests, and when this happened, satisfaction was achieved.

Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents. Diversity residents appeared to draw dissatisfaction in situations where the residency programs are not properly assessed or if there are no visible attempts to assess them. Additionally, residents experience dissatisfaction when the host institution does not appear to have taken steps to properly implement the current residency manifestation and is seemingly not prepared to host the

program. Dissatisfaction also spawns when there is failure to communicate the ultimate intent of the residency to the resident; some residents reported situations where the actual motivations of the hiring institution differed from what the residents were led to believe during the hiring process or early into the term. These issues relate to “company policy”, which, per Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory, can produce dissatisfaction with the job.

Assessment Can Improve Experiences. RS7, whose interview suggested a rather negative overall experience despite the fact that she gave her residency an overall score of eight, said that assessment was not a priority at her host institution with the residency or elsewhere:

“I judge that based on how everyone here views assessment. And how they assess things. They might mean a debrief or a conversation about it later. But that will be as far as it goes. Maybe even an in-depth exit interview but that’s not really assessment. And I don’t think that that will be any different from what sort of happens when others leave anyway. So no, there was no assessment. There will be no assessment. There probably wasn’t before me because I don’t think it will be viewed as important because there wasn’t a, there weren’t enough, I guess, bodies to assess. Do you base that assessment on the experience of one person or however many that were here? Because it couldn’t have been many. So no I don’t even think they probably even viewed that as valuable or even necessary. I think they probably think they can draw from existing literature which just isn’t out there.”

RS5, who also reported largely trying experiences, recalled no assessment attempts at her host institution:

“As far as assessment, I never filled out any formal assessment, I never filled out any forms. I never did any surveys. I think that they based a lot of the assessments, I guess, on one on ones and then whatever they felt like they observed. There was no exit interview.”

RS4’s experiences were mostly negative and she said planning and assessment of her residency were not concerns for her host institution; RS4 added that she knew residents who had come after her in that program, and that speaking with them affirmed her suspicions that there were no attempts to improve the program from one cycle to the next. RS4 said that an attempt to assess the program was actually stonewalled by one of the workers responsible for overseeing the program. When RS4 had her exit interview with administration, this particular worker inserted herself into an interview that was just supposed to be between RS4 and administration; RS4’s account of this appears earlier in the study.

RS10 reported mixed experiences in her residency but did say that the host institution later overhauled the onboarding process for residents as an assessment move. RS8, who reported experiences that she concluded later in her career could have been better, said, her particular exit interview was short and consisted of open-ended questions about her experiences; she did feel her host institution tried to assess and improve the program:

“I would think so, because they did change it, honestly it wasn’t super drastically, but expanding it [in term length, as well as other modifications, details of which are redacted so as not to identify the program]. In fact, there is now a residency coordinator or someone in a similar position... But there wasn’t a residency coordinator when I was there, it was just, you’re in this department like anyone else in this department. So I think it does show efforts being made to make it a more sustainable program.”

RS9 reported a very high overall score of nine. She reported that assessment was taken very seriously with the diversity residency at her host institution, to the point that a new residency coordinator who began with the institution after her term was over still was in contact with her to assess the program. She also explained:

“I think (the future of the residency is safe) because I was (part of an ongoing) one. That helped because I wasn’t the first. The other thing is that, I believe before, I think all of them (coordinators and stakeholders) are asked to participate in the interview process. They have several, like a few days to interview with groups of people over a few days’ period... I think with that process they also learn.”

RS6 gave his residency an overall score of 8.5 but said it could be rated a ten potentially, and demonstrated overall affinity for his experience. RS6 said of assessment at his institution:

“Oh yeah, absolutely. There is no question in my mind that the experiences of the first cohort were evaluated and that changes were made in the second iteration. So

yeah, there's no question about that... The administration certainly asked for our feedback with respect to our experience there, you know, but whether those were, whether that feedback was used to inform changes in the cohort that followed, I don't have any firm data on that. But you know, I mean, but I would assume and presume that they definitely did make some program tweaks from our iteration to the iteration that followed. I would assume that to be true.”

RS2 also had a good overall experience and said that his program actually had a residency assessment tool that was developed by residents. It also appeared that RS2 benefited from his host institution improving the residency based on the experiences and feedback of previous residents who identified problems. Of assessment at his host institution:

“I've read some of the literature about the residency when it first started. It was out of date by the time I got there, and I met with a lot of the residents who kind of instructed me on different things: how to approach different situations I might encounter. They were unfortunately in the unpleasant situation that they had to deal with, that I never did. Things like being called an ‘intern’ versus a ‘resident’, or being treated as though you're just a full timer and not someone with a degree. That's stuff that I never had to deal with, and I think that folks around me had been coached to improve their performance because of some issues that had come up with earlier cohorts... They had to have made some improvements, and they had to have assessed really, really with an eye toward improving the program. And the fact that they gave us pretty specific exit interviews on our way out, so I

have to think that they're collecting this information and continually retooling to improve the program every time it has an iteration.”

RS3 did not assign an overall score to her residency experience, but her interview suggested an overall positive experience. She did not know what assessment was done with her residency, but said, “I will say that every resident is so different and their needs are so different that you just have to be really observing in how you help support that person [and] it's just different every time.”

One circumstance that occurred with RS7, RS4, and RS5 is that their residencies started under dubious intentions, were not assessed to improve them, and currently are inactive. RS7 said she believes the residency at her host institution is permanently inactive. RS7 explained, “I think it was discontinued because the dean did not believe it was sustainable and that it really added to the field.” RS5 wondered if it was potentially harmful to host institutions when residencies discontinued, saying, “I met a lady once who was a resident when I was a part of the ACRL residency group and she was like, ‘Yeah I was their only resident, I don't know if that is a good thing or a bad thing,’ and I mean, we just don't know.”

Preparedness. RS5 recalled the blatant uncertainty of her host institution's library faculty and staff regarding what they would do with her once hired, saying, “Nobody knew what I was going to do; they didn't know, I didn't know, the supervisor didn't know, nobody knew.” RS7 and RS10 revealed that their institutions did not seem prepared for them, with RS10 adding that there was no move to assess the cultural climate of her institution before she began:

“And although it would have been really nice if they had gone through, like, actual diversity training, and actually talked to people who had residency programs (when planning the residency). I think it would have been a little bit better, but you know.”

RS4 appeared to have the worst experience of those interviewed. She said of preparedness at her host institution that there was no committee to advise or implement the residency program, and that employee originally responsible for devising the residency program at her institution did not remain there long after her hire. The residency was subsequently monitored by someone who did not support the idea.

Transparency and Communicating the Intent of the Residency to Residents. RS7 concluded her residency with suspicions that the residency was in place to groom a permanent librarian for her institution, but this was not obvious during hiring or during the beginning of the residency. RS5 reported that origins, motives and ultimate intent of the residency at her host institution were not clearly communicated, but entertained that it could have been an effort to diversify the staff at the host institution. RS5 also reported that she was strongly and uniquely pressured to stay at her host institution following the end of the residency term, and that this pressure caused some discomfort.

RS4 reported the worst overall experiences with her residency. She had applied for another position at the host institution, but the position was given to a candidate whom she concedes was more qualified. RS4 was then offered what, per her description, was a hastily put-together diversity residency that was not advertised and that she was contacted and asked to accept; she describes herself as “overqualified to be a diversity

fellow based on the way the position was written up”. RS4 had a coworker admit, following her hire, that she was a “guinea pig” for the position. RS4’s description of the hiring process suggested the diversity residency was offered as something of a consolation after the other position went to another candidate. She took the position reluctantly:

“I wonder if they were relieved because they thought I should for whatever reason think I’d get it, or if they really wanted the other person more and were worried about how I’d feel if I didn’t get it. But I think they thought, I actually believe they thought it was a win-win because they got who they wanted for the [position redacted] and they assumed that I got what I wanted in terms of staying at [institution redacted]. But to their surprise, and I say to their surprise because there were a few people that I was close with that I told I’m thankful for the role but I’m actually, it’s bittersweet for me because it’s only two years. And I was even so open as to tell one of them that I didn’t want a job with a color attached to it. I didn’t want to take that position, or, I didn’t want diversity to be a part of my role. I simply wanted to be a full time, salaried professional.”

RS10, who reported mixed experiences, said that one key intention of her residency was not communicated until after she started work, but not during interviewing and selection:

“RS10: On my second day they told us that we’re hired to be change agents
[stated matter of factly].

Jason Alston: Did that come up during the interview?

RS10: No [*again, matter of factly*].

Jason Alston: Okay, so that was sprung on you after you were hired?

RS10: Yeah.

Jason Alston: Wow, okay. I mean what's your reaction to that sort of thing?

RS10: Well I mean, I think I wanted to do the residency program because it was a practical choice, right? I felt that I lacked a certain amount of skills. I felt like I lacked experience in certain areas, so my idea about doing the residency program was to get all this experience and then being able, in two or three years, to actually get a solid job... And I am an introverted person. I'm not a particularly vocal individual so like, for me, the hardest part I had to figure out was how to be me and how to be the change that they want to see. So how can I be myself and also instigate change? But it's something I struggle with all the time because that's not why I came here."

RS1 said that, at least during her residency term, her institution was transparent, noting:

"Well I took them at their word. I think for the most part that they were being honest and truthful with me. And I know every single day I was doing my work and doing new things so I know I was performing at a high level. So I knew that they wanted to keep me, but the administration was very much set on, 'Hey, this is how we developed the program and it's, again, going back to it being a short term position and all that.'"

RS11 reported a very positive overall residency experience but did note some initial confusion with the position because it was a diversity residency that was not advertised as such. She therefore interviewed for the position because she liked the opportunities it offered to learn more about an academic library, while not being aware that it had a diversity component. The institution also had some uncertainty during RS11's interview as to whether she would qualify for a diversity position, but did not seem to want to reveal that they were specifically hiring ethnic minorities for the diversity residency.

RS3 did not report that this had much influence on her, but shared that within a group of residents that she speaks to, a question exists regarding residencies and who they should intend to hire:

“We talk about hiring trends in residencies. Like, that was a big one that we had that we talked a lot about. Do you hire someone who is the most polished person to represent you as a resident or do you hire the person who needs it the most, kind of?”

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory suggests removing factors that cause dissatisfaction to increase hygiene and to eliminate job dissatisfaction. Here, host institutions would be best served to perform assessments that would identify and fix poor and obstructive job conditions and make it apparent to residents that this is being done. Further, host institutions must create conditions that make the host institution appear prepared to host the program, and fix conditions that make the host institution seem unprepared. Finally, as policy is a known hygiene factor per Herzberg's theory, policies

need to reflect the intents of the host institution when it comes to the residency; the intent of the residency must be transparently present to the resident and any uncommunicated ulterior or ultimate goals must be communicated or discarded.

Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appears to improve future job outlook. The Motivation-Hygiene Theory identifies growth and advancement as motivation factors that cause satisfaction for employees. These are particularly important factors to diversity residencies because the underlying point of a residency is for the resident to achieve growth and career advancement. “Advancement” would not necessarily need to be promotion or retention at the residency host institution. Residents can be deemed as “advancing” if their residencies lead to enhanced career prospects and/or positions that they otherwise would not qualify for. Within the interviews for this research, an emergent theme was that residents who had experiences they perceived as growing experiences and experiences they recognized as cultivating potential advancement expressed seeming overall satisfaction with their appointments. Residents whose residencies did not produce recallable growth experiences or preparation for advancement did not demonstrate comparable satisfaction.

RS5 implicated growth and future prospects as another negative aspect of a residency that, despite her seven overall rating, came across through her interview as a negative experience overall:

“No. Let me preface that by saying, I don’t want to say that I didn’t get anything out of it, because I think that that would be very false. However, I don’t think that

that experience stood out uniquely amongst, if I just went and got a regular reference job. I would say that the advantage that I felt like I got, that one of the best things I got out of the residency, other than that the institution has a really good name, is that I got to do the [specific program for early career librarians redacted]... I felt like if I was competing against other residents no, no way (did the residency give me an advantage). If I was competing against what would have been an average graduate or person who was just working at X, Y, and Z library, then yeah, I feel like I might have even had an advantage. Not because I felt like I had gained a skill set, but again even the residency process itself, getting selected, all of those things, I think they play into your marketability.”

The following exchange between RS5 and me also suggests that RS5 was frustrated with the lack of growth but did not know what else to do:

“RS5: Actually I almost thought about leaving the field entirely.

Jason Alston: Was there anything in particular that stopped you from leaving the field?

RS5: I didn’t know how else to get a job.

Jason Alston: That’ll do it.

RS5: I felt like I had invested in this career regardless. I didn’t know how to not do it. What was I going to go back to? What was I going to do? Go back to school and get a new degree? At that point it was like ‘just stop the bleeding, just try to get somewhere.’ I also was encouraged by my mentor and one of the other

librarians that this is a very common experience. Every librarian at least once goes to an institution that they feel is not a good fit. The librarian that told me about this, the one who said I could use her as a reference from [redacted], said that she had a similar experience at an institution that she was at and she felt very discouraged and also thought about not going to be a librarian anymore. That was helpful.”

RS5 was further bothered that her experiences as a resident at a school with a great name parlayed into getting post-residency work at a much less reputable school. Speaking on whether she left her residency with confidence and enthusiasm, RS5 said:

“No, I think it took me years. It took me at least a year to feel like that because initially when I went to the [less-reputable school], they were excited about where I had been and the experiences that I had as far as presenting and the institution that I was at and the types of things I had done, sure, yeah. However, I felt like when I left the residency and went to a job, I felt like I was starting all over again. So I felt like I had to rebuild that experience up. Even still, I felt like there’s a bit of a transition because I’m going from a well named [school] to a [less-reputable school], which even in the library world is, ‘like why would go there?’ I mean I even got a lot of push back, not push back, but like, a lot of negative comments from people I personally knew.”

RS5, in voicing frustration with the end result of her residency program, also questioned the need for diversity residencies, saying:

“I mean just in general, what makes you feel like you need to have a residency in general? Why? Do you not feel that the education is enough? What void are you trying to fill? What need are you trying to meet? If it’s diversity that’s different. We could just be a diversity hire, we could put people on contract... I understand that it is the entry-level and the terminating point of the field, which is fair. But if I’m a graduate student, I kind of feel like a lot of this stuff could be built into a (graduate school) program.”

Though she mentioned her likelihood of career retention, RS7, who reported largely negative experiences, did not credit or blame her residency for her desire to eventually leave the field, saying, “I don’t feel it’s for me but not for any of the reasons people think. It’s because I want to live a much different lifestyle. So with that being said, I’ll never be paid what I want to be paid as a librarian so I’ll probably have another career.” RS3 reported mostly positive experiences but did note some frustration after being unable to advance with the host institution after she was hired on to stay with the institution after the residency; RS3 said, “It was like I was hired for doing all the things that I was doing across campus and then not promoted for doing those same things is what it felt like.” RS4 may have served as an outlier in this theme; while RS4’s experiences were overwhelmingly negative, she said that she knew she would be capable of getting a better job following her residency because of the initiative she showed in doing extra work while at the host institution, as well as due to the prestige of the host institution’s name and her overall experiences in libraries.

RS10 reported a mixed experience with her residency overall, and, like with other elements of the residency, she expressed frustration with how the residency was shaping

her post-residency potential. Concerning enhanced opportunities post-residency, RS10 said “they better do what they said they were going to do”, referring to her host institution’s promises to help her become a more marketable candidate. RS10 added:

“I think out of [several] rotations, I think three or four of them I actually have tangible things that I can take with me to sort of, wherever it is that I go. But for the other (rotations), it’s like I don’t know, I just, I don’t know [*a hint of noticeable frustration and hopelessness*]. The thing is it’s not like they were bad, but I spent more time getting to know the people in the department and understanding sort of how they function within the library. So some of that knowledge, you can’t exactly articulate that knowledge on a piece of paper. You can’t articulate relationship building, you know, for six months.”

RS8 rated her residency “between a seven and an eight” overall, and reported having good experiences during the residency but later came to believe the residency could have gone better. She did, however, believe that her residency put her in a better position for desirable job opportunities:

“I mean for me I would say it was worth it in that way and I wouldn’t say that it was necessarily a specific goal of mine to stay at a tier one university. But I mean the more I learned about, I guess, sort of like the systems and rankings of schools, and the rankings don’t mean a whole lot to me but I knew I wanted to work in an academic library versus other kinds of libraries. So that definitely helped me get that edge and have, like. For so many jobs you need like a base level certain years of experience or certain things that you’ve done in the past. Whereas, straight out

of school, especially people that have less actual library working experience than I did, but even for me, so many jobs had a minimum one year experience, or it's just impossible. So for me it was just like, well I kind of have to apply for these residency positions so that I can get a job at all. And then I think it did motivate me as for the kinds of positions I applied for after that.”

RS11, who scored her residency a nine out of ten overall, believed that her variety of experiences enriched her job prospects post residency, and added that she believes the reputation of her host institution's iSchool also enhanced her prospects, even though she did not work for the iSchool. RS9 also rated her residency a nine overall, and believed her residency and specifically a large endeavor she undertook within it made a clear difference in her post-residency employment prospects:

“It (the residency) made the difference. It made all the difference. I love my residency. I know that it was the standout piece for me, not just on my resume, but being able to talk about my experience and how much I was able to gain from that experience. No one who got hired or who interviewed for the position that I was eventually able to get and move to [redacted] had coordinated such a large program.”

RS9 also spoke to expectations she set for herself to ensure that she would be competitive for a good post-residency job:

“I think I was on track and that I was performing and producing and learning the things that I needed to learn so that by the time I left after my two years, I would be very competitive in terms of applying for a job. And I was. Plus, I took on the

extra things that I had interest in. So then you like, only had two years to learn as much as I possibly could. And I soaked it all in. Those expectations were actually there. Then I set expectations on myself also.”

RS2 rated his residency experience an 8.5 overall and said:

“I mean it’s like I said, the residency is part of the reason I’m in the position I am now. Going into it I had my degree, I had a couple of years of experience in technical services, and I had experience with managing student workers. Being at the library gave me a chance to try out some new and different things as far as clearing work, as far as working reference, working with different people, supervising actual full-time employees as opposed to just students, which served me well in getting the position that I applied for right after that residency and worked in for four years.”

RS2 later added:

“I think that there’s definitely a difference (between where I am versus I would be without the residency). The residency was highly responsible for what I’m doing now, and had I not found it, I don’t know what I would be doing. I’d probably still be in libraries, but probably not doing the work I wanted to do, probably not being paid the amount of money that I’m being paid, and I might have had to take a position in a region I really didn’t want to go to just to find a position... There’s different circumstances but for me I just happened to luck out with the right job at the right time. The residency isn’t going to do it all for anybody, it just helps a lot.”

RS6, who rated his residency an 8.5 overall, credited the residency for giving him “exposure” to complex concepts and issues that exist in academic libraries, as well as the existence of diversity initiatives in libraries. RS6 thinks this knowledge eventually led to him caring about the issues that he primarily works with in his current position. RS6 claimed, “I had multiple offers, I had lot of different opportunities, as I was preparing to exit out of that experience.”

In keeping with Herzberg’s theory, conditions must be created that create job satisfaction and foster motivators. To promote job satisfaction among residents, host institutions should strive to promote opportunities for growth that residents will interpret as opportunities that will make them more marketable once the residency is over than they were coming into the residency. Also, while Herzberg’s theory tends to approach “advancement” as the opportunity to advance within the current place of employment, the concept of advancement in this case should be expanded, and viewed as the opportunity and ability to advance within the profession. Residents may tend to be most satisfied if they believe that their experiences within the residency will be lead to jobs following the residency that they otherwise would not have found as quickly, if at all.

Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment. Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory identifies relationships on the job as hygiene factors. Good relationships with coworkers and colleagues remove dissatisfaction, but when there is a void in appropriate relationships, dissatisfaction emerges. Mentoring is of particular importance to a residency program because residents are new professionals who have a degree of uncertainty of where their careers will be in just two to three years (DeBeau-Melting, 2001). Within the interviews in this research

process, a final emergent theme emerged wherein residents who scored their residencies higher overall or whose reported experiences were overall better than others had developed the more fruitful and fulfilling relationships with mentors.

RS7 stated early in her interview, “I think maybe there could have been, like, some mentors sort of picked out, somebody I could sort of talk to and consult about things in the city or things on the job [but] I didn’t really have that”; RS7 reported mostly negative experiences in the residency despite scoring it an eight overall. RS7 said she believed that an administrator at the host institution who was also a Black woman felt some need to attempt to mentor her, but RS7 felt these efforts were misplaced and pointed out that this administrator was not serving in a formalized mentoring role.

RS4 reported the worst experiences of the research subjects. When asked if she had a mentor, she simply responded, “No, they didn’t match me with a mentor, no not at all.” However, when subsequently asked about what librarians at her host institution were doing to help her become more marketable, RS4 recounted that those in administrative or supervisory positions seemed to question why she had so much initiative and wanted to perform so much professional activity; this runs counter to the guidance and support that a mentor would typically give. Through this, dissatisfaction was clearly apparent from RS4’s program lacking a reliable mentoring component, formal or informal. Worth noting is that some of the residents felt that senior librarians, supervisors, or administrators who matched their demographic profile felt a particular need to mentor them in some way. RS4 experienced the opposite, saying that the few other Black or mixed-race librarians at her host institution purposely distanced themselves from her; RS4 said that because the environment at this institution was so racist, “You can’t even

associate with each other for fear of being put on the outside.” RS4 explained that a mixed-race coworker that she actually knew prior to the residency appointment would not associate with her once she was hired by the institution as the resident; this mixed-race coworker appeared to be attempting to transcend the racial differences she had with others at the library.

RS5 reported a largely negative overall experience. RS5 was excited when she entered her residency because one of the library administrators who would be overseeing the program was, like her, a Black woman. RS5 said, “I was definitely like, wow, she would get it, I felt like she would understand what it is like to be Black academic librarian.” However, RS5 shared that this relationship, which became the only mentoring relationship she had within the host institution, became taxing as this administrator became intrusive in her efforts to mentor, criticizing things such as RS5’s decision of where to live and where to send her daughter to school. RS5 also said she believed this mentoring relationship with this administrator was not sufficient because the administrator had many other time-consuming obligations. RS5 further expounded:

“I guess it depends on how you define ‘mentor’. At a lack of a better description, I guess, yes (she was a mentor), but I didn’t feel like it was a true mentor relationship where it was like, ‘let me really guide you and that can take you into a place where I feel like that is going to be beneficial to you’. There was no mutual goal setting between us. There was no conversations for ‘what do you want to do and how can I help you get there’, so.”

RS10 reported mixed experiences, and in keeping with the emergent theme, RS10 had a formal mentoring relationship established but the relationship was not on par with RS10's needs or expectations:

“It’s funny because I have a formal mentor but I only, I mean I like her a lot, and I work with her in a committee, but I see her more as a peer. I see her more as a peer mentor versus an actual, it’s just harder to differentiate her from the people I consider my mentors here. It’s much more like a colleague relationship. And I think a lot of that too, I just think, I have a lot to learn from her but it’s very different. It’s in a way where, I feel like being mentors is really about nurturing my talent and you know, steering me into the right direction. Whereas our relationship is more informal, I guess, if that makes any sense. But I just feel like our relationship is less about nurturing my talent and introducing me to things versus, you know, a listening ear. So it’s more like a friend.”

RS10 continued by suggesting how her host institution’s mentoring component for the residency could be improved:

“I think our mentoring program would have been better if they had actually done a really good job in interviewing people and placing them with someone who fit their career, their career path, or sort of fit what they’re looking for. Because for me, I’m looking for, what I’m looking for in a mentor is someone who can sort of expand my mind and teach me something that I don’t know. I want someone who’s been through it and can tell me, ‘Listen, I’ve been through it and you don’t need to.’”

RS10 did speak more positively about an informal mentoring relationship she had with a supervisor. The supervisor was a fellow woman of color who took it upon herself to advocate for the residents. RS10 said that this supervisor “kept me grounded and really kind of pushed me to move forward”, and that when difficult situations came up, this supervisor assisted in navigating the difficulties. RS10 continued:

“She (this supervisor) was just like, ‘I’m not going to lie to you, I’m just going to be myself.’ I really appreciated that a lot. And I am so happy that she is my supervisor. I don’t think I would have been able to have done this without her, seriously. She’s phenomenal. I mean she is older, so there are generational differences, but I think she fights for us. Like, she visibly fights for us and she is very honest with us. Like, when someone complained about us, she told us exactly what it was that they said. She was very real and very honest. And she has very high expectations for us and I think that’s the difference between her and the other people because she knows that we can do high level shit. Like, she knows that we are capable of doing really wonderful things and she expects us to do really wonderful things. And I think that’s so important for a residency. Like, having someone who knows that you are smart, knows that you’re capable and holds you to a high standard, that’s so important for any residency... She definitely is one of our mentors.”

RS8’s residency experience was complicated, as it was one that she found to be on the positive end while she was serving, but her perspective on her residency experience changed after she went on to her next professional appointment. Just as her experiences regarding her residency overall were mixed, her view of mentoring

components within her residency were also mixed. RS8 did have a formal mentor after taking the initiative to set such a relationship up, but felt that some of the best guidance emerged through an informal mentorship relationship with a supervisor. RS8's comments about the mentoring situation at her program suggested some dissatisfaction with how this component was executed:

“I do think it would have been helpful to have another separate mentor because the people that I had were all people that I reported to in one way or another, either formally or informally. So I think it would have helped to either have a mentor in the library, but in another part of the library to get sort of like a bigger picture view on it. The mentor that I had, the person I asked to be my mentor, she agreed for [proper noun redacted]. I think she was like, the assessment person or something. It was like an administrative role. But it was really helpful because she could look at things objectively and sort of give her views, well, opinions and other views on the library or help me realize, that oh there's all this other stuff that I'm not even thinking about, like, 'Oh yeah, I should be setting goals.' All this stuff so that [inaudible footage] would be someone outside of the library I was in, in order to have someone to talk to and not have to worry about the fact that I work with this person.”

RS8 was pressed on whether she would prefer a mentor inside or outside of the host institution. She said:

“I think one within and one outside. I think there are benefits to both and I'm kind of thinking like someone outside the institution, it may be helpful to have

someone who, maybe not another current resident, although that could be helpful too, but maybe someone who's been through a residency semi-recently but has progressed in some way or has moved on to another institution. Someone that's kind of like, been in your shoes recently but has a little bit more of *[searching for words]* has had time to reflect on it a little bit, I guess. Not necessarily someone in, like, a high up administrative role that someone new to the profession might not feel comfortable talking to.”

RS1 reported mostly positive views of her residency and had a formal mentor-mentee relationship with the supervisor of the residents at the institution:

“I benefited from the fact that she was part of the internship program before [institution name redacted] turned it into a residency, so, in a lot of ways, she was aware of what I was going to be going through. So she was able to help me address things the right way because she had essentially went through those same things herself. She was always available, and we talked quite frequently, just about things within the residency, things outside of the residency. So I felt very comfortable going to her when it came to learning about the instruction set up and how to communicate with other librarians.”

As RS1 described her mentor-mentee relationship, it became apparent that this mentor, in particular, was able to help RS1 avoid dissatisfaction with the job. RS1 said that her mentor had encountered many of the issues as an “intern” that RS1 herself would later encounter as a resident. And RS1 said she appreciated this relationship because, “working in a predominantly white environment, you don't always feel comfortable

going to white colleagues.” RS1 spoke to a preference for a “mentor group” versus just one professional mentor, suggesting that “personality clashes and other things may come up” in particular situations, so just having one mentor to appeal to may not always be sufficient. Also, RS1 described her interactions with her mentor, another Black woman, as “honest” and in no need of any careful or trepid speech.

RS11 had a largely positive view of her residency and scored it a nine overall. While she did not have a formal mentor, she did have a librarian that she was able to seek for guidance and to observe job duties. RS11 explained that there was a senior librarian at her institution who was very active with the residents as an informal mentor:

“So there was the one woman who just liked to make sure that we knew she was there, and we would all get together and go to lunch sometimes and we would just kind of talk about being a new librarian and all that stuff. Anything that she could help with. So that was very informal and it was kind of like a group situation... I do wish that there was an official mentorship program. I have that now in my current position and I find it very useful, and it’s nice just having it official I guess.”

RS3 spoke positively of the residency overall but had very little to say about mentoring. The extent of her input on mentoring was to share that she met with an informal mentor about once a week, and that she encountered no issues with this relationship. RS3 did add that she and her informal mentor became good friends and that friendship endures years after the residency ended.

RS9 rated her residency a nine overall and had an assigned mentor, an administrator who was a fellow woman of color; RS9 said that while this administrator served as her mentor, her guidance through the residency program was good and it enabled her to perform well and avoid missteps. RS2, who rated his residency an 8.5, did not convey any general dissatisfaction due to the mentoring component of the residency; RS2 said his mentor always had time for him and he credited his mentor for having the job that he currently has.

RS6's positive report of his residency included one of the more detailed descriptions of his residency's mentoring component offered by the research subjects. RS6 began by saying:

“That (the mentoring component) was a significant part of the residency experience of where I was. It was, I think not part of, I'm trying to reflect on the experience. I don't think that every entry-level library professional was paired up with a mentor at this organization. It would have been in other organizations, but with respect to my residency, yes. It was definitely part of the overall design of the program and it was also, I think, fairly unique in that we were really charged as residents to get to know senior faculty and to actually connect with and identify and actually recruit our own mentors. So we were actually not appointed, we had the opportunity to develop relationships with people and pursue those mentor-mentee relationships that we felt drawn to. So, which I think is kind of a unique approach.”

RS6, immediately prior to stating that he thought his institution's unique approach to the mentoring component was a strength, continued:

“Now with respect to, you know, the type of guidance and support that was derived from that, it had really a lot less to do with sort of the functional, practical side of my position, as it was more related to understanding, as you previously mentioned, concepts of organizational culture, trying to have conversations around politics, you know, without getting a complex political environment in a large research institution. It had to do with, you know, understanding, or developing, understanding myself, you know. So there was definitely, I think, a deliberate attempt to allow the mentorship program to open up things with respect to self-awareness. I think that was definitely one of the maybe, unmentioned but fairly explicit goals in my experience. And, you know, of course, trying to allow opportunities for conversations around what my long term career goals, aspirations, and trajectory might be, so I think those were more what the focus of the mentorship, at least in my context, was about.”

It should be noted that a few of the research subjects in this study were participants in the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians. Offered by the University of Minnesota Libraries, the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians is a professional development program for college and university librarians from traditionally underrepresented groups. The reason this is noteworthy for the study is because the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians, according to those who participated, requires participants to have a mentor at their library who is not their supervisor. Some of the research subjects had mentors due to the fact that they

participated in the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians and may not have had mentors, or may have had different mentors, otherwise. It is not stated which research subjects did participate in the Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians because noting this could compromise the anonymity of the research subject or the host institution in some cases.

Per Herzberg's theory, factors that create job dissatisfaction must be removed from the work environment. To avoid job dissatisfaction, host institutions should help residents establish mentoring relationships – within the institution as well as outside of it – that can help the resident navigate frustrations and therefore mitigate job dissatisfaction. As the content within this theme suggests, residents rely on their mentors for guidance, expert opinions, a shoulder to cry on, a relatable voice, and honesty. When these things are absent, dissatisfaction occurs. Herzberg's theory establishes that professional relationships serve as hygiene factors and securing a positive mentoring relationship between the resident and one or more mentors can help residents function more effectively during their term because of avoided dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory Implications for Qualitative Results

There are Herzberg implications for each of the six emergent themes drawn from the qualitative portion of this study. As with the quantitative portion of the study, the goal in applying Herzberg principles is to remove job dissatisfaction and create satisfaction in a job environment. Therefore, the Herzberg implications for the six emergent themes are presented here briefly.

1. *Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.* To remove dissatisfaction from the residency experience, host institutions should explain to the faculty and staff of the library why the residency is in place and what the residents are there to do and to bring to the institution. Institutional hostilities and confusion, at least in some cases, appears to come from the host institution neglecting to explain adequately why the position exists. Removing the environment conducive to the hostility and confusion may prevent poor relationships with coworkers, and this will remove job dissatisfaction. This theme relates specifically to relations with coworkers, which Herzberg identifies as a hygiene factor; therefore, taking the step of educating coworkers about the residency to improve coworker relations for the resident improves hygiene for the resident.

2. *Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators.* Two of the recognized hygiene factors are supervision and relationships with bosses and supervisors. According to Herzberg reasoning, effective and supportive supervision removes job dissatisfaction. The research subject interviews indicated that supervisors that provided appropriate structure for the residency and defended the work of the residents when appropriate provided the best experiences to residents. Also according to Herzberg's theory, relationships with bosses and supervisors can generate dissatisfaction if not positive. The research subjects who encountered the least dissatisfaction were those who received quality guidance from their supervisors, administrators and coordinators. Therefore, per Herzberg theory implications, supervisors should offer good guidance to these new

professionals, defend their work records when necessary, and help with structuring the residency effectively and appropriately to accommodate the resident in order to remove and prevent dissatisfaction.

3. Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents. This theme essentially reinforces the findings of Research Question 6, which is that there is correlation between the level of professionalism of job duties expected of the residency, and the resident's overall view of the residency experience. The "work itself" is a motivator factor, and according to Herzberg's theory, creating work that is challenging and matches the skills and abilities of the worker increases job satisfaction. The interviews data mirrored this reasoning of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Interview subjects drew motivation from having job duties that were professional and challenging, that allowed them to be innovative, that utilized pre-existing skills and matched their professional interests; to facilitate job satisfaction in residents, residency coordinators should create conditions where the work itself meets these conditions.

4. Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to Residents. Herzberg identifies "company policy" as a hygiene factor that will cause dissatisfaction when not optimal. Institutional policy regarding the residency needs to be explicit, transparent, and explained to the resident. Also, institutional policy regarding the residency needs to be assessed and improved when faults are identified. Sufficient assessment will remove items within policy affecting the residency that would cause dissatisfaction.

5. *Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appears to improve future job outlook.* According to Motivation-Hygiene Theory, advancement and growth are motivator factors that will cause satisfaction when present. Growth should be at the core of any residency experience since a residency is, by definition, aimed at giving newly minted practitioners practical professional experience after earning their degree. To comply with Herzberg reasoning, coordinators should ensure that residents feel they are experiencing growth on the job, so that they will experience satisfaction. Additionally, coordinators should take care to make sure residents believe there is a chance for them to experience career advancement beyond the residency, likely by landing a more professional and competitive permanent librarian job upon completion of the residency.

6. *Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.* Relations with coworkers and peers is identified as a hygiene factor. When there are good relationships with coworkers and colleagues, dissatisfaction is reduced or prevented, but when these relationships are not present, dissatisfaction emerges. Host institutions can create environments where dissatisfaction is lowered or prevented by assisting residents with establishing beneficial mentoring relationships. The research subjects who had this type of assistance avoided some dissatisfaction that others without that assistance did not manage to avoid.

Conclusion

The four research questions that yielded valid, Motivation-Hygiene Theory-relevant correlations and the six emergent themes offer implications for practice as

explained through theoretical framing in Chapter 4. Discussion of the results, including implications for the other research questions and additional interview data, appears in Chapter 5.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Overall Residency Ratings.

Overall Score of Residency	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1 Highly Unsatisfactory	0	0.00%
2	3	3.41%
3	2	2.27%
4	3	3.41%
5 Okay/Average	9	10.23%
6	4	4.55%
7	9	10.23%
8	20	22.73%
9	19	21.59%
10 (Highly Satisfactory)	19	21.59%

Table 4.2. Survey results for the first two statements related to RQ1.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: complete disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: complete agree)	The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution thought staff buy in for the residency was of utmost importance.	The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the relevance of the residency well to the library faculty and staff.
1	1 (1.08%)	5 (5.38%)
2	4 (4.30%)	3 (3.23%)
3	2 (2.15%)	6 (6.45%)
4	2 (2.15%)	7 (7.53%)
5	16 (17.20%)	18 (19.35%)
6	9 (9.68%)	11 (11.83%)
7	16 (17.20%)	12 (12.9%)
8	12 (12.90%)	13 (13.98%)
9	14 (15.05%)	12 (12.9%)
10	17 (18.28%)	6 (6.45%)

Table 4.3. Survey results for the last three statements related to RQ1.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: complete disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: complete agree)	Admin or coordinators at my institution explained the job duties and expectations for the residency well to library faculty and staff.	I would have felt/ would feel comfortable going to administration and/or residency coordinators if a coworker questioned my professionalism or my deservedness of the position.	The administration and/or residency coordinators would defend my work record were it questioned by hostile coworkers.
1	5 (5.38%)	7 (7.53%)	3 (3.23%)
2	3 (3.23%)	3 (3.23%)	2 (2.15%)
3	3 (3.23%)	3 (3.23%)	1 (1.08%)
4	12 (12.9%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.15%)
5	15 (16.13%)	5 (5.38%)	10 (10.75%)
6	9 (9.68%)	4 (4.3%)	5 (5.38%)
7	16 (17.2%)	11 (11.83%)	7 (7.53%)
8	13 (13.98%)	12 (12.9%)	12 (12.9%)
9	9 (9.68%)	19 (20.43%)	16 (17.2%)
10	8 (8.6%)	29 (31.18%)	35 (37.63%)

Table 4.4. Survey results for the first three statements related to RQ2.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: complete disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: complete agree)	I was well-respected by the majority of my coworker-s during my residency.	My coworker-s seemed willing to help me learn tasks and duties in the position.	My coworkers seemed willing to collaborat-e with me on projects.
1	1 (1.09%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.09%)
2	5 (5.43%)	2 (2.17%)	2 (2.17%)
3	1 (1.09%)	2 (2.17%)	2 (2.17%)
4	5 (5.43%)	2 (2.17%)	4 (4.35%)
5	7 (7.61%)	4 (4.35%)	4 (4.35%)
6	5 (5.43%)	7 (7.61%)	8 (8.7%)
7	7 (7.61%)	6 (6.52%)	9 (9.78%)
8	15 (16.3%)	19 (20.65%)	16 (17.39%)
9	22 (23.91%)	17 (18.48%)	12 (13.04%)
10	24 (26.09%)	33 (35.87%)	34 (36.96%)

Table 4.5. Survey results for the last three statements related to RQ2.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: complete disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: complete agree)	My coworkers seemed willing to introduce me to professional colleagues and help me network.	My coworkers would at least occasionally try to assign “busy work” like stapling papers on me.	Negative experiences with my coworkers during the residency will prevent me from working with them or being with them in the future.
1	2 (2.17%)	36 (39.13%)	26 (28.26%)
2	3 (3.26%)	12 (13.04%)	14 (15.22%)
3	3 (3.26%)	12 (13.04%)	7 (7.61%)
4	1 (1.09%)	6 (6.52%)	5 (5.43%)
5	3 (3.26%)	7 (7.61%)	18 (19.57%)
6	7 (7.61%)	4 (4.35%)	5 (5.43%)
7	10 (10.87%)	3 (3.26%)	3 (3.26%)
8	15 (16.3%)	1 (1.09%)	7 (7.26%)
9	16 (17.39%)	3 (3.26%)	2 (2.17%)
10	32 (34.78%)	8 (8.7%)	5 (5.43%)

Table 4.6 Survey results for statements related to RQ4.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	My coworkers were supportive of me receiving extra travel opportunities and budgeting.	My coworkers seemed supportive of me receiving professional level pay as a diversity resident.	My coworkers seemed supportive of there being a well-paid position where a highly-experienced candidate wouldn't be considered.
1	5 (5.43%)	1 (1.09%)	3 (3.3%)
2	4 (4.35%)	5 (5.43%)	5 (5.49%)
3	3 (3.26%)	3 (3.26%)	2 (2.2%)
4	3 (3.26%)	1 (1.09%)	2 (2.2%)
5	20 (21.74%)	18 (19.57%)	40 (43.96%)
6	4 (4.35%)	2 (2.17%)	3 (3.3%)
7	9 (9.78%)	6 (6.52%)	2 (2.2%)
8	16 (17.39%)	16 (17.39%)	12 (13.19%)
9	9 (9.78%)	16 (17.39%)	11 (12.09%)
10	19 (20.65%)	24 (26.09%)	11 (12.09%)

Table 4.7 Survey results for the first three statements related to RQ5.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration reviewed best practices thoroughly to implement or improve the residency.	My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration communicated with other residency coordinators to assess and improve the residency.	My institution assessed the cultural climate of my institution and its readiness for hosting a residency.
1	5 (5.49%)	5 (5.49%)	7 (7.69%)
2	5 (5.49%)	7 (7.69%)	6 (6.59%)
3	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	6 (6.59%)
4	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	5 (5.49%)
5	20 (21.98%)	29 (31.87%)	28 (30.77%)
6	5 (5.49%)	7 (7.69%)	3 (3.3%)
7	11 (12.09%)	4 (4.4%)	13 (17.29%)
8	12 (13.19%)	12 (13.19%)	11 (12.09%)
9	10 (10.99%)	8 (8.79%)	5 (4.49%)
10	15 (16.48%)	11 (12.09%)	7 (7.69%)

Table 4.8 Survey results for the second three statements related to RQ5.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	My residency coordinators were dedicated to identifying and addressing shortcomings and problems related to the residency.	My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed.	My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators solicited feedback from me to assess and improve the residency program.
1	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	5 (5.49%)
2	5 (5.49%)	4 (4.4%)	3 (3.3%)
3	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	7 (7.69%)
4	5 (5.49%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)
5	14 (15.38%)	20 (21.98%)	8 (8.79%)
6	7 (7.69%)	6 (6.59%)	6 (6.59%)
7	9 (9.89%)	14 (15.38%)	5 (5.49%)
8	18 (19.78%)	11 (12.09%)	9 (9.89%)
9	10 (10.99%)	11 (12.09%)	8 (8.79%)
10	15 (16.48%)	14 (15.38%)	37 (40.66%)

Table 4.9 Survey results for statements related to RQ6.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	At work, I was performing duties that exceeded those of a grad student intern.	I was expected to and adequately trained to publish, present, or to complete a capstone by the end of my term.	I was given opportunities and/or preparation for supervising other library personnel.	I was frequently assigned busy work that no one else wanted to do or that seemed unproductive.	I didn't have a lot of idle time without direction.
1	0 (0%)	9 (9.89%)	19 (20.88%)	46 (50.55%)	3 (3.3%)
2	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	9 (9.89%)	13 (14.29%)	5 (5.49%)
3	1 (1.1%)	8 (8.79%)	9 (9.89%)	8 (8.79%)	6 (6.59%)
4	2 (2.2%)	3 (3.3%)	10 (10.99%)	6 (6.59%)	9 (9.89%)
5	3 (3.3%)	9 (9.89%)	7 (7.69%)	5 (5.49%)	6 (6.59%)
6	1 (1.1%)	10 (10.99%)	7 (7.69%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.3%)
7	6 (6.59%)	3 (3.3%)	8 (8.79%)	7 (7.69%)	8 (8.79%)
8	11 (12.09%)	10 (10.99%)	6 (6.59%)	1 (1.1%)	10 (10.99%)
9	11 (12.09%)	9 (9.89%)	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.2%)	12 (13.19%)
10	53 (58.24%)	28 (30.77%)	12 (13.19%)	2 (2.2%)	29 (31.87%)

Table 4.10 Survey results for the first three statements related to RQ7.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	Work that I did as a resident mirrors job duties I see in professional vacancy announcements.	The residency put me in position to make lasting professional connections.	I have more knowledge of library systems and software than I did prior to my residency.
1	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.22%)	3 (3.33%)
2	0 (0%)	2 (2.22%)	1 (1.11%)
3	0 (0%)	1 (1.11%)	0 (0%)
4	0 (0%)	1 (1.11%)	3 (3.33%)
5	8 (8.89%)	3 (3.33%)	7 (7.78%)
6	2 (2.22%)	2 (2.22%)	1 (1.11%)
7	10 (11.11%)	3 (3.33%)	6 (6.67%)
8	14 (15.56%)	14 (15.56%)	10 (11.11%)
9	14 (15.56%)	9 (10%)	14 (15.56%)
10	38 (42.22%)	53 (58.89%)	45 (50%)

Table 4.11 Survey results for the second three statements related to RQ7.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	I gained new insights on what to do and not do when pursuing a permanent position during the residency.	I have a better idea of what a librarian does during the work day than I did prior to the residency.	I was overall better prepared to be a professional librarian after the residency than prior to it.
1	2 (2.22%)	3 (3.33%)	3 (3.33%)
2	0 (0%)	3 (3.33%)	1 (1.11%)
3	1 (1.11%)	2 (2.22%)	1 (1.11%)
4	3 (3.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.11%)
5	4 (4.44%)	11 (12.22%)	5 (5.56%)
6	5 (5.56%)	2 (2.22%)	4 (4.44%)
7	9 (10%)	5 (5.56%)	3 (3.33%)
8	9 (10%)	8 (8.89%)	8 (8.89%)
9	13 (14.44%)	11 (12.22%)	11 (12.22%)
10	44 (48.89%)	45 (50%)	53 (58.89%)

Table 4.12 Survey results for statements related to RQ8.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	I saw librarianship as a viable profession as my residency progressed.
1	2 (2.33%)
2	2 (2.33%)
3	0 (0%)
4	6 (6.98%)
5	8 (9.3%)
6	3 (3.49%)
7	8 (9.3%)
8	18 (20.93%)
9	12 (13.95%)
10	27 (31.4%)

Table 4.13 Survey results for statements related to RQ9.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	I became excited about a career in librarianship as my residency progressed	I was motivated to do innovative things in the LIS field during and/or immediately after my residency
1	5 (5.75%)	1 (1.14%)
2	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.27%)
3	2 (2.3%)	3 (3.41%)
4	3 (3.45%)	2 (2.27%)
5	11 (12.64%)	10 (11.36%)
6	8 (9.2%)	6 (6.82%)
7	6 (6.9%)	3 (3.41%)
8	18 (20.69%)	14 (15.91%)
9	12 (13.79%)	18 (20.45%)
10	20 (22.99%)	29 (32.95%)

Table 4.14 Survey results for statements related to RQ10.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	I sought to eventually become a department head or administrator due to my residency.	I wanted/want my next job immediately following the residency to be with a well-respected institution
1	8 (9.2%)	0 (0%)
2	6 (6.9%)	1 (1.14%)
3	7 (8.05%)	0 (0%)
4	4 (4.6%)	0 (0%)
5	16 (18.39%)	11 (12.5%)
6	5 (5.75%)	3 (3.41%)
7	7 (8.05%)	5 (5.68%)
8	8 (9.2%)	8 (9.09%)
9	13 (14.94%)	9 (10.23%)
10	13 (14.77%)	51 (57.95%)

Table 4.15 Survey results for statements related to RQ11.

Indicated level of agreement with the statement (1: completely disagree; 5: Neutral; 10: completely agree)	I pursued membership in professional librarian organizations during and/or immediately after my residency
1	6 (6.82%)
2	0 (0%)
3	0 (0%)
4	1 (1.14%)
5	8 (9.09%)
6	3 (3.41%)
7	3 (3.41%)
8	12 (13.64%)
9	13 (14.77%)
10	42 (47.73%)

Table 4.16 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ1 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value (n = 88 responses)
The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution thought staff buy in for the residency was of utmost importance.	.368	<.001
The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the relevance of the residency well to the library faculty and staff.	.522	<.001
The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the job duties and expectations for the residency well to library faculty and staff.	.577	<.001
I would have felt/ would feel comfortable going to administration and/or residency coordinators if a coworker questioned my professionalism or my deservedness of the position.	.481	<.001
The administration and/or residency coordinators would defend my work record were it questioned by hostile coworkers.	.449	<.001

Table 4.17 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ2 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value (n=87 responses)
I was well-respected by the majority of my coworkers during my residency.	.527	<.001
My coworkers seemed willing to help me learn tasks and duties in the position.	.541	<.001
My coworkers seemed willing to collaborate with me on projects.	.595	<.001
My coworkers seemed willing to introduce me to professional colleagues and help me network.	.562	<.001
My coworkers would at least occasionally try to assign "busy work" like stapling papers on me.	-.335	.002
Negative experiences with my coworkers during the residency appointment will prevent me from collaborating with them or maintaining collegial connections with them in the future.	-.339	<.001

Table 4.18 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ4 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value	n
My coworkers seemed supportive of me receiving professional level pay as a diversity resident.	.289	.006	88
My coworkers seemed supportive of there being a well-paid position where a highly-experienced candidate wouldn't be considered.	.262	.015	87
My coworkers were supportive of me receiving extra travel opportunities and budgeting.	.201	.060	88

Table 4.19 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ5 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value (n = 88 participants)
My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration reviewed best practices thoroughly to implement or improve the residency.	.429	<.001
My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration communicated with other residency coordinators to assess and improve the residency.	.342	.001
My institution assessed the cultural climate of my institution and its readiness for hosting a residency.	.360	.001
My residency coordinators were dedicated to identifying and addressing shortcomings and problems related to the residency.	.585	<.001
My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed.	.649	<.001
My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators solicited feedback from me to assess and improve the residency program.	.452	<.001

Table 4.20 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ6 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value (n = 88 participants)
At work, I was performing duties that exceeded those of a grad student intern.	.453	<.001
I was expected to and adequately trained to publish, present, or to complete a capstone by the end of my term.	.389	<.001
I was given opportunities and/or preparation for supervising other library personnel.	.368	<.001
I was frequently assigned busy work that no one else wanted to do or that seemed unproductive.	-.448	<.001
I didn't have a lot of directionless, idle time.	.415	<.001

Table 4.21 Spearman's Rho Correlation Values for RQ7 Survey Questions.

Statement	r_s value to overall residency score comparison	p-value (n = 88 participants)
Work that I did as a resident mirrors job duties I see in professional vacancy announcements.	.604	<.001
The residency put me in position to make lasting professional connections.	.547	<.001
I have more knowledge of library systems and software than I did prior to my residency	.328	<.001
I gained new insights on what to do and not do when pursuing a permanent position during the residency.	.408	<.001
I have a better idea of what a librarian does during the work day than I did prior to the residency.	.410	<.001
I was overall better prepared to be a professional librarian after the residency than prior to it.	.430	<.001

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Results from Chapter 4 yielded four noteworthy correlations from the quantitative portion of the study and six emergent themes from the qualitative portion of the study that could be used to inform practice when framed into Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory reasoning. Implications for practice were explained in the theoretical framing and, therefore, appeared in Chapter 4. In this chapter, the findings of the study are examined in the context of the existing literature on diversity residencies. After this, limitations and suggestions for further research are offered, though some suggestions for further research were included in the interrogation of the existing literature. Finally, the conclusion appears at the end of this chapter.

Discussion of the Findings

Findings with Herzberg Implications. As discussed in Chapter 4, there were four key quantitative findings and six key emergent qualitative themes formed as a result of the study. The four key quantitative findings were that the following factors correlated positively with the residents' overall views of their residency experiences:

1. Quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff;

2. Perceived quality of assessment practices of the residency program;
3. Level of professionalism of job duties expected of the diversity resident during the term and;
4. Perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment.

Literature on diversity residency programs is scarce, and most of it is anecdotal in nature or otherwise not empirical research. However, these correlations do not appear to be at odds with the scarce, existing literature. Fontenot (2010) appeared to be the first to explicitly introduce the importance of “staff buy-in” into the literature when recalling that Louisiana State University’s diversity task force believed buy-in to be important for the position. According to Fontenot, Louisiana State University’s diversity task force believed that residents would be aware if coworkers did not support the residency. The legitimate correlation between “Quality of effort as perceived by the resident that administration and/or residency coordinators dedicated to garnering support for the residency from library faculty and staff” and the residents’ opinions of the overall quality of their residencies suggest that the opinions expressed by Louisiana State University’s diversity task force – as reported by Fontenot – were accurate. This correlation also gives credence to Brewer’s 2001 assertion that using resources like the library newsletter can stimulate staff interest in the residency and generate support for it.

The positive correlation between perceived quality of assessment and perceived overall quality of the residency does add weight to anecdotal pieces that suggest that proper assessment can help improve resident experiences. Fontenot’s calls for constant

assessment of residency programs appears justified, as assessment appears to positively correlate with the resident's experience in the residency program. Boyd and Blue (2013) performed a survey among residents and residency coordinators and found assessment practices to be lacking among the programs; the correlation found within this study may suggest that these residents surveyed by Boyd and Blue may have had improved experience if proper assessment were performed. Boyd and Blue's survey results backed the assertion of Hankins, Saunders, and Situ (2003) that diversity residencies often do not have assessment systems in place. The results of this study suggest that such assessment systems do carry some importance.

The correlation between the professionalism of job duties expected of the resident and the overall view of the residency among the residents has a few implications. Residents who participated in Alston's 2016 informal study who reported being asked to perform non-professional tasks or busy work such as stapling papers or cleaning bathrooms also expressed the feeling that receiving these requests as slights to their professionalism. Hu and Patrick (2006) wrote an anecdotal piece on their residency experiences at Miami University in Ohio; in this piece, Hu and Patrick note being seen more as minorities than qualified librarians, with job duties accordingly affected. Furthermore, Hu and Patrick note a vague job description that posed some obstacles for them and caused them to have to communicate their interests to their supervisors. Also, Cogell and Gruwell (2001) asserted there was a need for helping residents gain well-rounded experiences and a hireable skill set. The correlation found in this study between professionalism of job duties and residents' overall view of their experiences legitimizes the Cogell and Gruwell position by suggesting that residents who gain an employable

skill set through the residency tend to have higher overall views of their residency experiences. Regarding Hu and Patrick, results of this study suggest that their residency experience, which judging by their article was an overall mixed experience, could have been improved if more attention were paid to assigning them professional librarian-level work consistently and helping them develop a hireable skill set.

The correlation between perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment, and the residents' overall views of the residency experiences, had one particular implication with existing literature. Brewer (2007) asserted that research libraries may have to bypass early career librarians of ethnically diverse backgrounds in order to hire librarians with more experience and better-developed skill sets. Study results show that the more firmly residents believe their residency experience has prepared them for their next professional appointments, the higher they would score their overall residency experiences. This does not necessarily confirm or refute Brewer's position. However, an essential goal – even if unstated – for most residency programs is to make these residents better-qualified for permanent positions following the residency. Residencies have achieved this goal when residents are more qualified and better prepared for their next professional appointment than they were coming into the residency. Therefore, the residency has achieved some degree of success when the resident is better prepared for their next professional appointment following the residency, and this benefits the residents, the host institutions, and the field at large.

There were six emergent themes spawning from the qualitative portion of the study. The qualitative themes are not generalizable across the population of residents in

the same manner that an inferential statistical method like a Spearman's Rho correlation may be, but these themes were also used to interrogate existing literature on residencies.

The six qualitative themes that emerged from the in-depth interviews were:

1. Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.
2. Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators.
3. Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents.
4. Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents.
5. Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and "advancement" during the term that appears to improve future job outlook.
6. Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.

The first emergent theme was, "Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction." This theme is consistent with experiences and assertions posed in the literature. Brewer (2001) recommended using library newsletters to inform library faculty and staff of the residency and the residents, and to garner support for the program. Brewer's recommendation appears to have some legitimacy as

the qualitative research suggests that residents had better experiences when their coworkers understood who they were and why they were there; the qualitative results also demonstrate that this seemingly obvious step does not always happen. As was the case with the first quantitative correlation discussed, this theme also gives some credence to Louisiana State University's diversity task force believing that courting staff "buy-in" for the residency position would be beneficial for the resident (Fontenot, 2010).

Presumably, after host institutions have courted buy-in for the residency concept they are implementing, the library coworkers will be more knowledgeable of the residents, the residency, and the purpose of the diversity in libraries if buy-in courting efforts were effective. A survey conducted by Alston and Crumpton (2015), however, found that only 35 percent of former and then-current residents surveyed believed that their hosting institutions communicated the relevance and purpose of the residency position to library faculty and staff. These efforts may need to become more commonplace to improve residency experiences, and if such things are being done, residents should be able to tell they are being done, as suggested by Louisiana State University's diversity task force. Hu and Patrick (2006) did note that most library faculty and staff cannot readily relate to a residency experience; the qualitative data in this research project also suggests it should not be assumed that they can. Finally, Jordan (2001) suggested that coworkers may become hostile toward the residency or the resident and not consider the position professional if they are unaware of what the resident is tasked with; qualitative data in this study echoes this suggestion and further illustrates the need to educate coworkers on what the resident is charged with doing.

The second qualitative theme was, “Diversity residents can avoid dissatisfaction with appropriate guidance and support from coordinators, supervisors and administrators.” While this theme appears to hold valuable relevance in practice, the implications related to existing literature on residencies is shallow. Some pieces of literature discuss the influence that working with professional librarians has on residents (Alcorta, 2007; Kim, Chiu, Sin & Robbins, 2007; Goss, 2003), but these are not specifically discussing the guidance received from coordinators, supervisors, and administrators. Mentoring is also discussed in professional literature discussing residencies, but again, this mentoring is not necessarily coming from administrators. Mentoring is one of the other qualitative themes explored, so pre-existing literature on mentorship and residencies will be interrogated when that theme is discussed.

The third theme emerging for the qualitative portion of the study was, “Opportunities to perform meaningful, challenging, and innovative work can generate satisfaction in diversity residents.” Several pieces of existing residency literature address the aspect of the actual work and responsibilities of a resident. To challenge and stimulate residents, it may indeed be appropriate to have them participate in outreach (Alston, 2010), work on diversity task forces and committees so long as they are not pigeonholed into only or mainly diversity work (Hankins, Saunders & Situ, 2003), and have them experiment with some innovative things that other workers may be unable or unwilling to do (Brewer, 2010). This theme tangentially also reinforces literature that describes the detriment to residents of being called “interns” or mistaken as such (Alston, 2016; Jordan, 2001; Brewer, 2001; Daix & Epps, 2001); one element of this emergent theme was that residency duties should be professional and distinguishable from the duties of an

“intern.” This theme also favorably compliments Boyd and Blue’s survey results that suggested that a majority of residents gained leadership skills and experience collaborating with other academic units (2013); residents are likely appreciative of these experiences if the theme emerging from this study is any indicator.

The fourth emergent theme was, “Job dissatisfaction occurs with lack of assessment, unpreparedness, and failure to communicate residency intent to residents.” Hu and Patrick (2006) explained that their residency job descriptions were intentionally vague and that this ambiguity – while beneficial at times – was also problematic at times; the fourth emergent theme in this study is at some odds with the mixed nature of Hu and Patrick’s experience with ambiguous goals and intents, suggesting instead that clear expression of intent would have been wholly beneficial. Hankins, Saunders and Situ (2003) suggested that diversity residencies could be “quota driven” and aimed at boosting diversity statistics at the host institution; this type of actual goal, if it indeed happens, is likely not communicated with the resident openly and that may cause concerns later. Assessment as part of this emergent theme, is consistent with findings from the second correlation analyzed in the quantitative results: the positive correlation between perceived quality of assessment and perceived overall quality of the residency; the discussion on assessment will not be restated as it was explained thoroughly in that portion of the discussion.

The fifth emergent theme is, “Satisfaction emerges when a resident achieves growth and “advancement” during the term that appears to improve future job outlook.” This theme does not appear to have any direct implication on any existing literature. It is actually a recognizable flaw/gap in the literature that nothing is written about the long-

term effects on practitioners of serving in a diversity residency. So, the implication for the literature related to this theme is that it identifies a gap in the research. As will be restated in suggestions for further research, the research related to diversity residencies needs a study that somehow examines the transformation or the career trajectory of professionals who have completed residency programs. This would be the way in which “growth” and “advancement” could be examined within the literature.

The sixth emergent theme was, “Effective mentorship practices can remove job dissatisfaction during the residency appointment.” This theme has large implications for existing literature, as mentorship is discussed in several pieces of professional literature about residencies. Thematically, the mentoring emergent theme is consistent with DeBeau-Melting’s assertion that residents must be able to depend on mentors (DeBeau-Melting, 2001) and Young’s assertion that mentoring was an important component of her residency (Young, 2001). This theme also favorably compliments descriptive statistical data from Boyd and Blue (2013) wherein 66 percent of diversity residency coordinators offered some form of mentoring to residents and of those that did not, 67 percent recognized the benefits of offering mentoring to residents; this sixth emergent theme furthers the case for including a mentoring component in a residency. Dawson and Llamas (2001) posed that mentoring relationships should not be temporary, but instead should possibly even extend beyond the residency; Dawson and Llamas’ assertion is not at odds with the qualitative theme in this study and, in fact, one of the research subjects from the qualitative portion of the study spoke openly and enthusiastically about her ongoing relationship with her mentor, even as her residency is complete. Not confirmed or refuted from this emergent theme was the Sheldon and Alston assertion that mentors

have similar professional goals to the residents and not necessarily be a coordinator or administrator of the residency (Sheldon & Alston, 2015); there were varying opinions among the interviewees on who should serve as a mentor to residents, and there were numerous possibilities: a professional who does share the resident's interests, a professional who does not share the resident's interests, an administrator, a non-administrator, someone within the host institution, someone at another institution. In sum, however, there was never any instance in the literature that downplayed the importance of mentorship for a diversity resident. RS1 did note explicitly and without prompting how important it was to her to have a Black woman at her institution that could serve as a mentor to her; the importance of this to her does also affirm in some fashion the importance of informal mentoring particularly to ethnic minority professionals.

Findings in research questions where the null hypothesis was not rejected and Herzberg reasoning applies. For research questions two, three, and four, there would have been Herzberg implications had the null hypotheses of these questions been rejected and research hypotheses supported by the data. This, however, did not happen with any of these three research questions. Therefore, instances in the literature addressing the substance of these research questions were not supported by the results of this study, though they were not necessarily refuted either.

For Research Question 2 (RQ2), there was not a noteworthy correlation – positive or inverse – between severity of hostilities as perceived by the resident and the resident's overall view of the residency. There are published pieces that suggest that residents can encounter hostilities and that these hostilities can impact their residency experience (Alston, 2016; Sheldon & Alston, 2015; Hankins, Saunders & Situ, 2003); data in this

study does not support nor does it refute these positions. The belief of Fontenot (2010) that host institutions should create environments that are welcoming and organized also should not be discarded just because the results of this study do not fully support the suggestion. The concept of hostilities directed toward the resident should not be discarded, however, but may be the worthy subject to some further research.

Racial microaggressions were the subject of Research Question 3 (RQ3). The inconclusiveness of any results with this research question are attributable to flawed question drafting as acknowledged in the results section. Descriptive statistics utilized regarding racial microaggressions in this study and in a previous survey (Alston & Crumpton, 2015) suggest that racial microaggressions happen to diversity residents, but such descriptive statistics do not allow inference on how residents are affected by racial microaggressions or how these racial microaggressions affect a resident's overall review of a residency experience. McElroy and Diaz (2015) posed that a racial microaggression that residents encounter is an assumption that they are woefully underskilled; while no inferential statistical data from this study ties such microaggressions to the overall view of the residents regarding residency experiences, there is no grounds to discard that there may be a link.

Research Question 4 (RQ4) attempted to determine if a noteworthy correlation between, "The perceived staff buy-in/support from the library faculty and staff in support of the residency" and the overall view of the residents toward the residency existed. No such noteworthy correlation emerged. However, Brewer (2001), who recommended that resources such as the library newsletter be used to inform coworkers of the residency and the residents, is still justified in this recommendation due to the emergence of the

qualitative theme that, “Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.” Fontenot, whose 2010 piece discusses staff buy-in at some length, particularly in regards to it helping the resident feel included, was not backed up in his assertions in the quantitative results; however, Fontenot’s position is still reinforced by the first qualitative theme, “Knowledge of who the residents are, what the residency is, and why it was established combats institutional hostilities and confusion, reducing resident dissatisfaction.” Hankins, Sanders and Situ (2003) stated that residencies often place residents in hostile environments; such environments would logically lack faculty and staff buy-in. While the quantitative data does not support any suggestion that residents’ view of the residency may be negatively impacted by this, the data also would not give credence to any suggestion that care should be taken to not insert residents into particularly hostile environments.

For research questions 2, 3 and 4, failure to establish noteworthy correlations between the above factors and the overall view of the residencies in the eyes of the residents should not be interpreted as these factors not having any bearing on the residency experiences. Hostilities, racial microaggressions and staff buy-in were of enough concern to receive mention in the professional literature and these results, while not confirming assertions in the literature, should not be interpreted as refuting such assertions either. Future research may indeed affirm that these factors have bearing on the experiences of residents, even if this study failed to affirm such.

Research Questions with no Herzberg Implications. Research questions 8, 9, 10, and 11 did not have Herzberg principle implications. In these four research questions,

overall view of the residency was the independent variable, whereas it was the dependent variable in the research questions with Herzberg implications. Though these questions are not analyzed in the framing of Herzberg's theory and concepts, they do merit discussion and have loose implications within the suggestions for further research.

For Research Question 8 (RQ8), the data supported the research hypothesis that, "there is a correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his/her outlook on the future of librarianship." The emergence of a correlation between a resident's overall view of his/her residency experience and his/her outlook on the future and viability of librarianship favorably compliments one piece of existing literature explaining the benefits of diversity residency programs. This is because residents who see librarianship as a viable career path likely do so as the result of experiences encountered during the residency. Harold Goss (2003) explained that residency experiences during a residency at Auburn University helped expose him to the truly dynamic and varied nature of academic librarianship after previously only having a very narrow view of the field.

The results of research questions 9, 10, and 11 do not refute or support any claims or assertions made in the literature, but do have implications for further research.

Research Question 9 was, "Is there correlation between the resident's overall view of the residency program and his /her level of enthusiasm for the profession?" Data supported the idea that there is a noteworthy positive correlation between a resident's overall view of the residency and his/her level of enthusiasm for the profession, but the link between view of the residency and post-residency enthusiasm for the profession should be further explored. For research questions 10 and 11, there was no noteworthy correlation between the variables. Research Question 10 was, "Is there correlation between the resident's

overall view of the residency program and his /her ambitiousness of goals?” Failure to identify a noteworthy correlation here may be problematic if residencies are aimed at preparing professionals for jobs they may not have qualified for prior to the residency, and examining how residencies can enhance the professional goals of the residents may be a worthwhile exploratory endeavor. Research Question 11 was, “Is there correlation between the resident’s overall view of the residency program and his /her level of professional activity in professional associations?” There is no identifiable instance in the literature that suggests that residencies are aimed at increasing the level of professional activity residents have in professional organizations. However, professional activity in these organizations may have some impact on a professional’s contributions to the field. If there is any desire to have alumni of residency programs be key contributors in the field, more research into the effect that residency participation has on motivation to pursue professional organization work may be relevant for exploration.

Due to the nature of existing literature on diversity residencies in libraries, results from this study can generally only possibly lend surface credence or refutation to anecdotal assertions and suggestions in pieces of literature that are not actual research pieces. This research study is perhaps the first to use inferential statistics to examine the experiences of residents, and also perhaps the first to use a qualitative method such as thematic narrative analysis to discover themes through the experiences of those who served as residents. As such, this research endeavor may more so be a starting point for research that attempts to create empirical data, but has little to no possibility of supporting or refuting any existing empirical research on the diversity residency topic, since such empirical research is not out there.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

There were a number of limitations that emerged throughout the duration of this research endeavor. They are categorized and discussed in this section, with suggestions for further research accompanying. Following these limitations is an additional 'suggestions for further research' subsection.

Important Comments/Concerns Expressed Via Emailed Feedback about the Study

Soliciting participants for both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study consisted largely of identifying and personally emailing all past and at-the-time present diversity residents possible. Because of this personal approach in reaching out, a handful of those who completed surveys emailed me and shared feedback. I attempted to convince those who emailed back with crucial feedback to participate in qualitative interviews. Some of these individuals agreed, but others declined. However, the feedback of some of those who declined is still worth noting, as this feedback informs some of the limitations of this study, as observed by some of those who participated in the data gathering by completing surveys. The relevant feedback is shared in this section. The names of those who emailed back feedback have been changed to protect their identities.

One participant, referred to here as Sally, said:

“Hi Jason-- I also think that having a comments section in the survey would be helpful, because there were a lot of things I wanted to convey about my residency program that weren't expressed in the survey. Overall, I had a good experience, but I think it was because my coordinator was very well versed in diversity initiatives and diversity residency programs...”

Sally's email feedback noted one limitation within the quantitative portion of the study, which is that results could not account for the cultural competencies of residency coordinators, or their knowledge of diversity initiatives in libraries and the reasoning behind forming such programs. It may stand to reason that coordinators who are "very well-versed" in diversity initiatives and residency programs will be more successful, but this important distinction could not be quantified or examined in the quantitative portion of the study as carried out. Elements regarding the competence and preparedness of coordinators did emerge in some of the qualitative portion of the study.

Another former resident, Deana, shared:

"I'm was [sic] one of two [program name redacted] interns in the early 1990s and my fellow intern [name redacted], went on to the public library world. He and I were in the second round of [institution redacted] interns. Frankly, I don't remember hostility from [institution redacted] faculty or staff but it's been 21 years now. What helped is that [name redacted] and I were partners and could bounce things off each other. His memory may be better than mine with regard to awkward, insensitive, or hostile moments, however I don't remember anything like that. Time has a way of healing if one can let go of insensitive slights, intended or not."

A few noteworthy limitations emerged from Deana's email. One noteworthy factor with residencies is the year in which they occurred, for at least two reasons. One is that, as Deana points out, memories of residency occurrences may fade over time.

Another issue with elapsed time is that as higher education has become more conscious

of diversity issues over time, there may be some possibility that more recent residents are having better experiences than residents who served longer ago. The quantitative survey instrument did ask the participants how long ago their residencies ended, but the total number of participants to the study was fairly low, and the number of total actual past and present diversity residents is also likely a rather low number of individuals. There were not enough participants indicating the number of years since completing the residency to make statistically valid comparisons in attitudinal feelings between those who finished residencies more recently versus those who completed residencies longer ago. Another limitation mentioned here is this study was not able to adequately compare the attitudes and experiences of those who served alone as residents at their host institution to those who served in cohorts; this is explored further in the “*Ideas from the qualitative interviews that did not become emergent themes*” subsection coming up.

A woman who will be identified here as Cheryl, said:

“Additionally, one of your questions asked about if the residency got us “excited” about future librarian work? I think? While I definitely felt ready for life as a librarian, I was not as interested in being one after my residency because I just don’t feel that I fit in this world. That said, it’s what I chose and I have to stick with it and I’m doing fine. But, I don’t know if that’s due to the low numbers of minorities in our field, something internal about me, or perhaps libraries are made up of a lot of subconsciously very biased people that will only continue to hire and respect people just like them. I don’t know. I won’t speculate, but I don’t feel that this will be my last career.”

This study did concentrate on examining correlations versus causations, which is why the Spearman's Rho statistical test was the one used for quantitative data analysis. It should be noted, however, that these correlations do not necessarily indicate causations of attitudes within those who completed the survey. Cheryl was still a librarian as of her correspondence with me in February 2016; however, Cheryl's attitudes toward librarianship did not and still do not appear to be influenced by the residency that she completed sometime before the study. Her wording indicates that she is unsure as to how the residency actually influenced her attitude toward the field.

Finally, a woman I will call Hilda, said:

“Hi Jason-- I've filled out the survey. I thought the questions were a little leading, so I don't know if this might skew the results of your survey. Hope your research turns out [sic], though! It sounds like you had a rough time in your diversity residency program (just based on the types of questions you asked in your survey). I had a good experience in my residency, mostly because of the support that I found through ACRL's Residency Interest Group... I also think that having a comments section in the survey would be helpful, because there were a lot of things I wanted to convey about my residency program that weren't expressed in the survey.”

Hilda would have been a prime candidate for the qualitative portion of the study, as she notes having “a lot of things” she wanted to share that were not expressed in the survey. However, after initial correspondences in which I tried to get Hilda to share more of concerns and possibly do an interview, there was no further contact between Hilda and

myself. I did, however, respond to Hilda to assure her that I, too, had a good residency experience personally, but that the concerns surveyed in the study emerged through literature on diversity residencies and discussions about residencies at conferences. No other person who completed the survey described the questions to me as “leading”. However, Hilda’s concerns should not be dismissed. Potential researcher bias may have influenced how questions were worded, which therefore may have influenced how survey participants responded. An open comments section for the quantitative survey instrument had been considered, but was eliminated to maximize participation numbers (also, more than one-third of the original research questions were eliminated for this reason). The addition of a qualitative portion to the study was intended in part to substitute for the advantages of having an open-comments section on the survey instrument.

Ideas from the Qualitative Interviews that did not Become Emergent Themes

Many ideas and issues arose during the qualitative interview process that did not become emergent themes for the qualitative piece. This was usually because I was only able to tease out elaboration on these ideas and issues from a few of the research subjects, but not enough of them to declare that an actual theme had emerged from the discourse. In other cases, enough of the research participants may have spoken to the issue or idea, but they did not expound upon the idea/issue enough, or the discussion was too unfocused to detail an actual emergent theme. However, future research on diversity residencies could possibly attempt to explore these ideas and issues.

I attempted to draw out responses from the qualitative research interview subjects on efforts that their host institutions undertook to ease their transitions to the new place of

employment (onboarding) as well as ease their transitions into their new city. Additionally, I attempted to draw out ideas from the interviewees on what host institutions in general could do to help ease transitions, particularly for residents who were relocating. Despite the importance of this issue, however, themes did not emerge as the interviewees either did not have institutional efforts or their own ideas to report, or no inference could be drawn between what they reported and their overall take on the residency. There were a few good ideas contributed: RS6 noted that people of non-white heritage moving to predominantly white towns may need to be directed to “ethnic” public accommodations such as where to buy ethnic foods, worship, or get their hair done, while RS5 noted that pairing the residents with people of like demographics who would know where these public accommodations are in town could be a good idea. Onboarding and coping with a new environment could serve as a suggestion for further research. RS5 and RS7 did report struggles with living in the city they had moved to, and this, in addition to helping residents cope with the new location could possibly affect the residents’ overall views of their residency and enhance their on-the-job performance.

RS4 in particular spoke about the isolation and lack of inclusion that she experienced at her host institution, and according to her, the subsequent residents at her institution experienced the same thing. These feelings of alienation could quite possibly generate job dissatisfaction among residents if it is happening at more than just this one institution; relationships with coworkers is a hygiene factor. However, the other residents at this institution could not be secured for interviews for this study, and the other interviewees did not report the same types of isolation at the hand of coworkers. Because only one of the research subjects reported this phenomenon, this could not be treated as

an emergent theme within the qualitative portion of the study. However, feelings of alienation and isolation among diversity residents could be a topic for a future research study.

In the quantitative and qualitative sections, I tried to determine which survey respondents and which interviewees served alone as residents and which served in a residency cohort with at least one other person. RS2 in particular spoke about how serving in a cohort was beneficial because the members of the cohort were able provide each other with emotional support and bounce ideas off of one another. However, while conventional wisdom may suggest that residents who serve in a cohort may have an easier time than residents who serve as the only resident at the host institution at a given time, the other interviews for this study did not offer any hints that those who served as the lone resident necessarily had a better or worse time than those in cohorts. RS10 actually noted a complication that arose from her cohort situation; specifics of the incident will be withheld to protect RS10's identity and that of her host institution, but RS10 reported that deficiencies with the work of a cohort member wound up reflecting poorly on the entire cohort. Unfortunately, because the total number of survey respondents was so low for the quantitative portion of the study, any attempt to compare the overall residency ratings of those who served in cohorts to those who did not would not be statistically stable. A future study examining the differences in experiences between residents who served solo versus those who served in a cohort at their host institution may be appropriate.

Finally, racial microaggressions were intended to be a much larger portion of this study than they ended up being. The subject of Research Question 3 (RQ3) was racial

microaggressions but not enough of the survey participants indicated that they had definitely experienced racial microaggressions on the job to generate inferential statistics on this issue. All of the interviewees were asked about racially microaggressive behavior during their interviews, but again there was no emergent theme regarding these. Some of the interviewees did not recall experiencing racial microaggressions, while others did not report being particularly impacted by them, and one interviewee experienced racial microaggressions but these appeared to just add on to a horrible overall diversity residency experience. Still, the racial microaggressions piece may be worth examining in a future study using different methods.

RS9 spoke at length about the responsibility of residents themselves in ensuring a successful residency experience, but she was the only research subject to speak at length on the resident's role in residency success. RS9 also spoke about this theme without me prompting her to. A key limitation of this study is that it does not explore in any real detail what residents should do themselves to ensure a positive experience; instead, this study focuses on the role of the host institution. A study that explored what residents should do to ensure success within a residency program may have some merit.

I also noticed within some responses that residents may also not know what they can and cannot ask for during the residency, and this may be because they lack the perspective of someone who has professional librarian experience and would know what to request to enhance their skills, develop professionally or gauge their growth. For instance, a resident may not know that s/he can request a performance appraisal if s/he wishes to know how the institution views his/her progress, growth and development. It may be in the resident's best interest for the coordinators and/or supervisors to inform the

residents of various requests they can make in order to gauge their performance and growth.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory Concepts

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory does not consider satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposites; these concepts are not binary. Rather, Herzberg's theory treats no satisfaction as the opposite of satisfaction, and no dissatisfaction as the opposite of dissatisfaction (Beecher, 2011). This study, however, asked diversity residents for their overall views on their residency experiences on a scale of 1-10, versus asking the residents to try to quantify or express amounts of satisfaction versus non-satisfaction and dissatisfaction versus non-dissatisfaction. Because the various factors examined throughout this study can fit into Herzberg's categories of motivators and hygienes, it is still fair to apply the practical base of Herzberg's theory in real work situations, which is to create conditions that motivate and generate satisfaction while removing things that cause dissatisfaction and impact hygiene.

In the scope of Herzberg's theory, however, there are far more types of factors that can be explored than were explored in this study. The only hygiene factor that was examined and yielded statistically significant quantitative data was "relationships." Herzberg also identifies as hygiene factors: company policies, working conditions (lighting, heating, and similar physical conditions), salary, perks and bonuses, status, security and personal life. Unlike "relationships," these hygiene factors did not emerge from the literature review for this study and therefore were not considered for inclusion. However, some of these hygiene factors would still be applicable to diversity residencies.

Because perks and bonuses such as additional travel funding and professional development opportunities are such an integral part of residencies, this particular hygiene factor may be worth further exploration in a future study. Resident salaries are also an important consideration, as residents will likely want a professional pay grade, but hostilities may arise if the resident's salary is competitive with vested and tenured professionals, or significantly above paraprofessionals that they may end up reporting to. There may be implications for personal life in diversity residency research, including examining resident adjustments to new regions/cities, and exploring the boundaries established between residents and coworkers in after-work activities. There are ripe research opportunities within these concepts.

Like the hygiene factors, the motivator factors were limited to what had emerged in the previous literature for the purposes of this study. Aspects of growth and the work itself were motivator factors that were explored in the research and yielded statistically significant results in the quantitative portion of this study. Not explored or legitimized through quantitative results in this study were achievement, recognition, responsibility, or advancement. Several of these motivator factors are relevant to residencies. Residents may seek or have the need for achievement, recognition, and responsibility, and research studies that attempt to explore the need of residents for these things could be beneficial. Also, deeper probing in the areas of growth and work itself is likely possible.

Further Limitations

The primary limitation with this study would have to be the low number of total people that have served in these library diversity residencies and fellowships; this actual

number, also, is unknown. It was a very time-consuming endeavor to individually solicit all known past and at-the-time current residents who could be reached to participate by filling out a survey. While the Spearman's Rho correlation analysis used in this study is an inferential statistical analysis, the original desire to use more powerful inferential statistical tests just was not possible. I believe that the findings as presented here accurately reflect the total population of residents who have served so far, but it is possible that a future study done the same way with twice the number of participants (should a future at some point occur where twice as many people have served as residents than had as of this study) could yield significantly different results.

Another limitation of this study is that past and current diversity residents who are still employed by libraries were easier to contact than those who decided to leave the profession. I did attempt to find contact information for former residents who had left the profession, and in some cases, was successful. However, there is no way of knowing if these people were concerned enough or cared enough to fill out surveys. In some cases, former residents who left the field could be identified through their former host institutions or through ACRL's Diversity Residency Interest Group listing, but these individuals were not discoverable on social media or in contact information for current jobs. It is impossible to know if those who could not be reached by me did participate (some may have received the survey link from former coworkers), and if they did not, it is impossible to ascertain how their participation may have affected the quantitative data.

Concerning the qualitative portion of this study, a limitation that surfaced was the lack of interviewees of Asian ethnicity. While nine percent of the quantitative portion participants identified as Asian, South Asian or Pacific Islander, none of the interviewees

were of Asian, South Asian or Pacific Islander heritage. All of the interviewees were Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino. Asian, South Asian and Pacific Islander residents may have different attitudinal approaches to the residency, shaped by their cultural differences or other life experiences.

Also, a limitation of this study is that it attempted to focus on diversity residencies. However, some of the findings and discussion may be relevant to residencies that are not diversity specific. For instance, “idle time” may be an issue for residents in residency programs that are not diversity-specific, as well as residencies that are diversity residencies. This study makes no attempt to specify what findings may also be applicable to residencies with no diversity component, and with a literature review that focuses heavily on diversity, explanations attempting to generalize the findings to residencies with no diversity component may be out of context.

Additional Suggestions for Further Research

There could be some benefit in focusing future research on the attitudes, biases, goals, and other factors of other workers at residency host institutions or among other stakeholders. While this study focuses on what is going on in the minds of the past and present residents, they are not the only people who matter. Very little if anything is written on the goals of residency coordinators, or the perception of diversity residencies held by library faculty and staff members, particularly those who would not be eligible for such programs. Also, there is no literature exploring the commitment or drain on the institution in hosting these programs. It may also be fruitful to do research into why institutions that host residencies choose to do so and what they perceive are the benefits.

Conversely, it may be fruitful to do research into why institutions that decline to host residencies, end residencies they have hosted, or have never considered hosting residencies, have made the choices that they have made.

Finally, a career trajectory study may be in order. This study could examine and analyze what becomes of those who previously served in residency programs to see if their careers post-residency have had upward mobility. To discover if residencies are transformational, it may be appropriate to determine what differences exist between those who have completed residency programs and those who have not.

This study's impact as the first known study to use inferential statistics to analyze diversity residency experiences and to interrogate the literature already produced on diversity residencies is important for its potential to inform practice beyond the anecdotal pieces that largely make up the diversity residency literature. Institutions hosting diversity residencies or planning or hoping to start diversity residencies can use this research to remedy or avoid problems with their own diversity residencies and produce better experiences for the residents and the host institution employees. Diversity residents can also benefit from this research by learning what to possibly expect and prepare to encounter during their appointments. The field of librarianship as a whole can also potentially use this research to inform recruitment and retention methods for diversity in librarianship by providing an uncensored understanding of what practitioners of color may be going through in their appointments and why they may have bad experiences and why some may choose to leave the field. Alternatively, this research may explain what is being done correctly, and should continue in order to retain practitioners of color.

Conclusion

This study sought to be among the first to generate empirical research about diversity residencies in order to inform practice and planning within these positions. Now that diversity residencies or equivalent term-limited residency appointments have existed in the United States for more than 30 years, the time for actual research-driven literature informing the policy and practice within residencies was overdue. Like all current diversity initiatives in libraries, diversity residencies require monetary and time obligations. Therefore, these diversity initiatives need to eventually have what they appear to currently lack: a measurable impact on the diversity in the field of librarianship. It is hoped that through the findings from this study, residency programs will increase retention of diverse practitioners in librarianship and produce professionals with the highest employability, therefore helping alleviate ongoing diversity problems.

REFERENCES

- About McDonald's: inclusion & diversity (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.aboutmcdonalds.com/content/mcd/corporate_careers/inclusion_and_diversity.html
- Adkins, D., Virden, C., & Yier, C. (2015). Learning about diversity: the roles of LIS education, LIS associations, and lived experience. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 85(2), 139-149.
- Ahmed, A.F. (2015). *From the griot to hip hop: oral tradition as libratory praxis in islamic black America* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. 10131987
- Alabi, J. (2015). Racial microaggressions in academic libraries: results of a survey of minority and non-minority librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41, 47-53.
- Alcorta, M.G. (2007). Why I chose a residency program. *Synergy*, 2, 3.
- Alire, C.A. (1996). Recruitment and retention of librarians of color. In S.G. Reed (Ed.), *Creating the future: essays on librarianship in the age of great change*. North Carolina: McFarland.
- Alire, C.A. (2001). Diversity and leadership: the color of leadership. *Journal of Library Administration*, 32(2/4), 95-109.

- Alston, J.K. (2010). Minerva's first born: my experiences as UNCG's first diversity resident librarian. *North Carolina Libraries*, 68(1), 14-16.
- Alston, J.K. (2016). Interns or professionals? A common misnomer applied to diversity resident librarians can potentially degrade and divide. In R. Hankins & M. Jaurez (Eds.), *Where are the librarians of color? the experiences of people of color in academia* (71-94) Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
- Alston, J.K., & Crumpton, M. (2015, January). *Ebony and ivory: addressing the social aspects of diversity initiatives*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Library and Information Science Educators, Chicago, IL.
- American Library Association. (2012). Diversity Counts 2009-2010 update. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/offices/sites/ala.org/offices/files/content/diversity/diversitycounts/diversitycountstables2012.pdf>
- American Library Association. (n.d.). Recruitment for diversity. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/diversity/workforcedevelopment/recruitmentfordiversity>
- American Library Association. (n.d.). Spectrum – scholarship overview. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/offices/diversity/spectrum/scholarshipinformation>
- Andrews, M.M., & Boyle, J.S. (2002). Transcultural concepts in nursing care. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 13(3), 178-180.

Asheim, L. (1975). Trends in library education – United States. In Voight, M.J. (Ed.), *Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 5* (pp. 148-201). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Association for Library Service to Children. (n.d.). *The importance of diversity in library programs and material collections for children*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/alsc/importance-diversity>

Association of College and Research Libraries (2012). *Diversity standards: cultural competency for academic libraries*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/diversity>

Association of Research Libraries. (n.d.). IRDW alumni. Retrieved from <http://www.arl.org/leadership-recruitment/diversity-recruitment/initiative-to-recruit-a-diverse-workforce-irdw/2525-alumni#.VfyqpN9Viko>

Ballard-Thrower, R., & Mills, G.M. (2006). Making diversity a goal through strategic planning. In B.I. Dewey, & L. Parham (Eds.), *Achieving diversity: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians* (pp. 16-32). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

Bangert, S.R. (1997). Values in college and university library mission statements: a search for distinctive beliefs, meaning, and organizational culture. *Advances in Librarianship, 21*, 91-106.

Bankhead, D. (2001). The University of California, Santa Barbara fellowship – a program in transition. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (3-6) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Bayard, L. (2009). Notre Dame's librarian-in-residence program. *Indiana Libraries*, 28(2), 16-19.
- Beaudin, J.E., Fisher, M., Knowles, E.C., & Morita, I. (1990). Recruiting the underrepresented to academic libraries. Final report of the ACRL Task Force on Recruitment of Underrepresented Minorities. *College and Research Libraries News*, (11), 1016-1022.
- Beecher, H.W. (2011). Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. In J. Adair (Ed.), *The John Adair lexicon of leadership: the definitive guide to leadership skills and knowledge* (312-23) London: Kogan Page.
- Bernstein, A.M. (2011). A Herzbergian look at academic librarians and job satisfaction. *Georgia Library Quarterly*, 48(3), 6-21.
- Berry, J.N. (2004). Knowledge river. *Library Journal*, 129(7), 55.
- Bostic, M.J. (1995). Perspectives on multicultural acquisitions. *Acquisitions Librarian*, 7(13/14), 209-222.
- Boyd, A., & Blue, Y. (2013, June 6). *Evaluating the need for library diversity residency programs in the 21st century*. Poster session presented at the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Brewer, J. (2001). Reflections of an academic library residency program coordinator. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (7-16) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Brewer, J. (2007). An overview of research library residency programs. *Synergy*, 2, 1-2.

- Brewer, J. (2010). Understanding the organizational value of post-master's degree residency programs. *Research Library Issues: A Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, 272, 23-27.
- Brimhall-Vargas, M. (2015). Where the rubber meets the road: the role of libraries and librarians in bringing equitable access to marginalized communities. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Communication, Policy*, 85(2), 193-199.
- Brown, D. (2002). The role of work and cultural values in occupational choice, satisfaction, and success: a theoretical statement. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80(1), 48-57.
- Burrows, J., Jennings, K., & Welch, B. (1990). Minority Recruitment & Retention in ARL Libraries. *Association of Research Libraries SPEC Kit 167*.
- Buttlar, L. (1994). Facilitating cultural diversity in college and university libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 20(1), 10-14.
- Caleb, P. (2014). How diversity works. *Scientific American*, 311(4), 43-47.
- Carnevale, A.P., & Fry, R.A. (2000). *Crossing the great divide: can we achieve equity when generation y goes to college*. Princeton, N.J: Educational Testing Service.
- Chan, E.K., Lota, J., Smith, H.A., & Booth, S.D. (2016). Discovering librarianship: personalizing the recruitment process for under-represented students. In R. Hankins & M. Jaurez (Eds.), *Where are the librarians of color? the experiences of people of color in academia* (71-94) Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

- Chant, I. (2014, March 25). Developing collections and serving diversity: PLA 2014. *Library Journal*. Retrieved from <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2014/03/shows-events/pla/developing-collections-and-serving-diversity-pla-2014/>
- Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity. (2007, November 16). *Key reforms from the no child left behind act – the civil rights perspective: research-based recommendations to improve nclb*. Retrieved from <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/NCLBRECWITHEXPLANATIONS73007-2Final%282%29.pdf>
- Chu, C.M. (1994). Education in multicultural librarianship. In R.R. DuMont, L.J. Buttlar, & W.A. Caynon (Eds.), *Multiculturalism in Libraries*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Chu, C.M. (1999). Literacy practices of linguistic minorities: sociolinguistic issues and implications for literacy services. *The Library Quarterly*, 69(3), 339-359.
- Cichewicz, E.J. (2001). My residency at the University of Michigan: rewards and deltas. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (37-44) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ciszek, M.P., & Young, C.L. (2010). Diversity collection assessment in large academic libraries. *Collection Building*, 29(4), 154-161.
- Cogell, R.V., & Gruwell, C.A. (Eds.). (2001). *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

- Cooke, N.A. (2014). The Spectrum doctoral fellowship program: enhancing the LIS professoriate. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 10(1), 1-19.
- Cooke, N.A., Sweeney, M.E., & Noble, S.U. (2016). Social justice as a topic and tool: an attempt to transform an LIS curriculum and culture. *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 86(1). 107-124.
- Covert, B. (2013, January 16). The U.S. gets left behind when it comes to working women. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/brycecovert/2013/01/16/the-u-s-gets-left-behind-when-it-comes-to-working-women/>
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2006). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Cruz, L. (2015, June 7). ‘Dinnertimin’ and ‘no tipping’: how advertisers targeted black consumers in the 1970s. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2015/06/casual-racism-and-greater-diversity-in-70s-advertising/394958/>
- Curtis, F.R. (1927). Colored librarians in conference. *Library Journal*, 52, 408.
- Daix, E.C., & Epps, S.K. (2001). The University of Delaware library residency program: two former residents’ perspective. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.),

- Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (131-141) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Damasco, I.T., & Hodges, D. (2012). Tenure and promotion experiences of academic librarians of color. *College & Research Libraries*, 73(3), 279-301.
- Davis-Kendrick, K.D. (2009). The African-American male librarian: motivational factors in choosing a career in library and information science. *Behavioral & Social Science Librarian*, 28(1-2), 23-52.
- Dawson, P., & Llamas, N.A. (2001). From innovative to controversial: the UCSB library fellowship. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (144-153) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- DeBeau-Melting, L. (2001). The University of Minnesota libraries' affirmative action residency program: 1991 to the present. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (17-22) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deloach, M.L. (1980). *The Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B: The Fellowships/Traineeships for Training in Library and Information Science Program: Its Impact on Minority Recruitment in Library and Information Science Education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation Theses Global. (8028063).
- Dewey, B. I., & Parham, L. (Eds.)(2006). *Achieving diversity: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians*. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

- DuMont, R.R., Buttlar, L.L., & Caynon, W. (1994). *Multiculturalism in libraries*.
Westbrook, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Fontenot, M. (2010). Diversity: a task force, survey of the literature and some possible trends for academic libraries. *Louisiana Libraries*, 73(1), 8-11.
- Future of equity and inclusion: creating meaningful change. (2013). *Allies for Inclusion: Disabilities and Equity in Higher Education. ASHE Higher Education Report*, 39(5). Retrieved from
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aehe.20011/abstract>
- Gilbert, E.D. (1999). Diversity and collection development. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1(2), 1-7.
- Gollop, C. (1999). Library and information science education: preparing librarians for a multicultural society. *College & Research Libraries*, 60(4), 385-95.
- Goss, H. (2003). Diversity at AU libraries: a resident's perspective. *Alabama Librarian*, 53(2), 11-12.
- Guerena, S. & Erazo, E. (2000). Latinos and librarianship. *Library Trends*, 49(1), 138-182.
- Hall, T.D. (2006). Best practices for placing diversity at the center of your library. In B.I. Dewey, & L. Parham (Eds.), *Achieving diversity: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians* (pp. 33-45). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.
- Hall, T.D., & Grady, J. (2006). Diversity, recruitment, and retention: going from lip service to foot patrol. *Public Libraries*, 45(1), 39-46.

- Hankins, R., Saunders, M., & Situ, P. (2003). Diversity initiatives vs. residency programs: agents of change? *College & Research Libraries News*, 64(5), 308-315.
- Haro, R.P., & E. Martinez-Smith (1978). Si se puede! Yes, it can be done. *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 53, 228-31.
- Hastings, S.K. (2015). If diversity is a natural state, why don't our libraries mirror the populations they serve? *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 85(2), 133-138.
- Hathcock, A. (2015). White librarianship in blackface: diversity initiatives in LIS. *In the Library with the Leadpipe*. Retrieved from <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/>
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 43(1), 53-62.
- Hilton worldwide: diversity and inclusion (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://hiltonworldwide.com/assets/pdfs/diversity-one-pager.pdf>
- Hipps, K. (2006). Diversity in the U.S. ARL library workforce. ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC (246): 1-2.
- Horrigan, J. (2015, September 15). Libraries at the crossroads: the public is interested in new services and thinks libraries are important to communities. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/09/15/2015/Libraries-at-crossroads/>

- Howland, J. (1999). Beyond recruitment: retention and promotion strategies to ensure diversity and success. *Library Administration & Management*, 13(1), 4-14.
- Hu, S.S., & Patrick, D.E. (2006). Our experience as minority residents: benefits, drawbacks and suggestions. *College & Research Libraries News*, 67(5), 297-300.
- Hussey, L.K. (2009). Why librarianship? An exploration of the motivations of ethnic minorities to choose library and information sciences as a career. In J. Golden, J.M. Nyce, & D.E. Williams (Eds.), *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, 28 (pp. 153-210).
- Jaeger, P.T. (2015). Diversity, inclusion, and library and information science: an ongoing imperative (or why we still desperately need to have discussions about diversity and inclusion). *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 83(3), 127-132.
- Jordan, A.D. (2001). Liberating the self through work: a personal herstory. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (59-70) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Josey, E.J. (Ed.)(1970). *The Black Librarian in America*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.
- Josey, E.J., & Abdullahi, I. (2002). Why diversity in American libraries. *Library Management*, 23(1/2), 10-16.
- Kantor, H. & Lowe, R. Class, race, and the emergence of federal education policy: from the New Deal to the Great Society. *Education Researcher* 24(3), 4-11.

- Kelley, M. (2013, February 20). Diversity never happens: the story of minority hiring doesn't seem to change much. *Library Journal*. Retrieved from http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/02/opinion/editorial/diversity-never-happens-the-story-of-minority-hiring-doesnt-seem-to-change-much/#_
- Keogh, P. (2013). Motivation for grant writing among academic librarians. *New Library World*, 114(3/4), 151-165.
- Kim, K., & Sin, S.J. (2008). Increasing ethnic diversity in LIS: strategies suggested by librarians of color. *The Library Quarterly* 78(2), 153-177.
- Kim, K., Chiu, M., Sin, S.J., & Robbins, L. (2007). Recruiting a diverse workforce for academic/research librarianship: career decisions of subject specialists and librarians of color. *College & Research Libraries* 68(6), 533-52.
- Knefelkamp, L., & David-Lang, T. (2000). Encountering diversity on campus and in the classroom: advancing intellectual and ethical development. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Sp.Sm00/development.html>.
- Knowles, E.C. (2005). Affirmative Action: The role of the LIS dean. In E. Wheeler (Ed.), *Unfinished business: race, equity and diversity in library and information science education* (pp. 73-82). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Knowles, E.C., & Jolivet, L. (1991). Recruiting the underrepresented: collaborative efforts between library educators and library practitioners. *Library Administration and Management* 5(4), 189-193.

- Lahiri, R. (1988). The human side of the library: a profile of Manipur. *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 35(2), 84-92.
- Lam, R.E. (1988). The reference interview: some intercultural considerations. *Reference and User Services Quarterly* 27(3), 390-95.
- Law, K., & John, W. (2012). Homeless as a culture: how transcultural nursing theory can assist caring for the homeless. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 12, 371-374.
- Legas, M., & Sims, C. (2011). Leveraging generational diversity in today's workplace. *Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development*, 5(3), 1-9.
- Lian, R., & Xiong, J.A. (2008). Career choice and career advancement: Chinese American librarians in the 21st century. *Chinese Librarianship: An International Electronic Journal*, 25, 1-23.
- Lipka, M. (2015, May 12). 5 key findings about the changing U.S. religious landscape. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/12/5-key-findings-u-s-religious-landscape/>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Maurer, M.B., & Coccaro, C. (2002). Creating a more flexible workforce for libraries – are leadership institutes the answer? *Technical Services Quarterly*, 20(3), 1-17.
- Mayer, J., & Terrill, L.J. (2005). Academic librarians' attitudes about advanced-subject degrees. *College & Research Libraries*, 66(1), 59-73.

- McCook, K.P., & Lippincott, K. (1997). Library schools and diversity: Who makes the grade? *Library Journal* 122(7), 30-32.
- McElroy, K. & Diaz, C. (2015). *Residency programs and demonstrating commitment to diversity*. Paper presented at the Association of College and Research Libraries Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Microsoft: global diversity and inclusion. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/diversity>
- Montiel-Overall, P., & Littletree, S. (2010). Knowledge river: a case study of a library and information science program focusing on Latino and Native American perspectives. *Library Trends*, 59(1-2), 67-87.
- Morales, M., Knowles, E. C., & Bourg, C. (2014). Diversity, social justice, and the future of libraries. *Libraries and the academy*, 14(3), 439-451.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/>
- National Park Service. (2001). Rethinking the national parks for the 21st century. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/policy/report.htm>
- Neely, T.Y. (2005). Minority student recruitment in LIS education: New profiles for success. In E. Wheeler (Ed.), *Unfinished business: race, equity and diversity in library and information science education* (pp. 93-117). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Neely, T.Y., & Patterson, L. (2007). Achieving Racial and Ethnic Diversity Among Academic and Research Librarians: The Recruitment, Retention and Advancement of Librarians of Color -A White Paper by the ACRL Board of Directors Diversity Task Force a Subgroup of the ACRL Board of Directors. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/whitepapers>

North Carolina State University. (n.d.). Diversity + inclusion at N.C. State. Retrieved from <https://oied.ncsu.edu/diversity/>

Offord, J. (2006). Recruiting a diverse library workforce. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report*, 249. 8-10.

Palmer, B. (2000). The impact of diversity courses: research from Pennsylvania State University. *Diversity Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W00/research.html>.

Perez, M.Z. (2007). From new graduate to competent practitioner: rethinking the architecture of post-MLS residency programs in ARL libraries (masters thesis). University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Perez, M.Z. (2007). Professional residencies: lessons from the healthcare industry. *Synergy* 2, 6-8.

Perry, E.B. (2006). Fostering diversity in recruitment, staffing and retention. In B.I. Dewey & L. Parham (Eds.), *Achieving diversity: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians* (pp. 69-75). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

- Peterson, L. (1996). Alternative perspectives in library and information science: issues of race. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 37(2), 163-174.
- Peterson, L. (1999). The definition of diversity. *Journal of Library Administration*, 27(1), 17-26.
- Peterson, L. (2005). Curriculum reform and diversity. In M.B. Wheeler (Ed.), *Unfinished business: race equity, and diversity in library and information science education* (163-169) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Pisano, V.H., & Skidmore, M. (1978). Community survey: why not take the eclectic approach. *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 53, 250-53.
- Plate, K.H., & Stone, E.W. (1974). Affecting librarians' job satisfaction: a report of two studies. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 44(2), 97-110.
- Residency Interest Group of the Association of College and Research Libraries. (n.d.). Residency Interest Group. Retrieved from <http://acrl.ala.org/residency/>
- Revels, I., LaFleur, L.J., & Martinez, I.T. (2003). Taking library recruitment a step closer: recruiting the next generation of librarians. *Reference Librarian*, 39(82), 157-69.
- Roy, L. (2005). Creating opportunities and opening doors: recruiting and mentoring students of color. In M.B. Wheeler (Ed.), *Unfinished business: race equity, and diversity in library and information science education* (131-148) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

- Royse, M. (2006). Practical strategies for building a library diversity program. In B.I. Dewey & L. Parham (Eds.), *Achieving diversity: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians* (pp. 46-50). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.
- Royster, M., Schwieder, D, Brillat, A.I., & Driver, L. (2016). Mentoring and retention of minority librarians. In R. Hankins & M. Jaurez (Eds.), *Where are the librarians of color? the experiences of people of color in academia* (71-94) Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
- Salkind, N.J. (2014). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- San Mateo County Public Safety. (n.d.). *Translation services when English is your second language*.
- Schomberg, J., & Grace, M. (2005). Expanding a collection to reflect diverse user populations. *Collection Building*, 24(4), 124-126.
- Sewell, B.B., & Gilbert, C. (2015). What makes access services staff happy? A job satisfaction survey. *Journal of Access Services*, 12(3/4), 47-74.
- Sheldon, M., & Alston, J.K. (2015). Post-MLS roadblocks: removing the barriers from diversity residency programs. *Synergy* 12, 6-9.
- Shorter-Gooden, K. (2013). The culturally competent organization. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 83(3), 207-211.

- Smith, E. (1974). The impact of the subject specialist librarian on the organization of the academic research library. In E.I. Farber & R. Walling (Eds.), *The academic library: essays in honor of Guy R. Lyle*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Stanley, M.J. (2007). Case study: where is the diversity: focus group on how students view the face of librarianship. *Library & Administration Management*, 21(2), 83-89.
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life. *American Psychologist*, 62, 271–286. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271
- Sutton, A.M. (2005). Bridging the gap in early library education for African Americans: The Negro teacher-librarian program (1936-1939). *The Journal of Negro Education*, 74(2), 138-150.
- Taylor, P., & Cohn, D. (2012, November 7). A milestone en route to a majority minority nation. Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/11/07/a-milestone-en-route-to-a-majority-minority-nation/?src=rss_main
- Taylor, T. (2005). Changing the faces of librarianship: the Dr. Henrietta M. Smith residency at USF. *Florida Libraries*, 47(1), 12-14.
- Trejo, A.D., & Lodwick, K.L. (1978). Needed: Hispanic librarians – a survey of policies. *Wilson Library Bulletin* 53, 259-266.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1992). *We asked... you told us*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

University of Delaware (n.d.). *Pauline A. Young residency*. Retrieved from <http://www2.lib.udel.edu/personnel/residency/history.html>.

University of Arizona School of Information (n.d.) *Knowledge river*. Retrieved from <https://si.arizona.edu/knowledge-river-0>

Ura, A. (2015, July 1). Across Texas, need grows for bilingual 911 call-takers. *The Texas Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.star-telegram.com/news/state/texas/article25966678.html>

U.S. National Library of Medicine. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.nlm.nih.gov/about/training/associate/history.html>

Verizon: diversity and inclusion. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.verizon.com/about/our-company/diversity-inclusion>

Wasserman, R. (2010). *Guidance for building communities of trust*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Weems, R.E. (1999). The revolution will be marketed: American corporations and black consumers during the 1960s. In L.B. Glickman (Ed.), *Consumer society in American history: a reader* (pp. 316-324). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Williams, V.K., & Deyoe, N. (2014). Diverse population, diverse collection?: youth collections in the United States. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 31(2), 97-121.

Wilson, C. (1963). Professional internship: a program proposal. *Library Journal*, 88(11/12), 2201-2205.

- Wilson, J.L., Meyer, K.A., & McNeal, L. (2012). Mission and diversity statements: what they do and do not say. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37, 125-137.
- Winston, M. (2005). Communication and difficult topics in LIS education: teaching and learning about diversity in the classroom. In M.B. Wheeler (Ed.), *Unfinished business: race equity, and diversity in library and information science education* (171-180) Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Wu, L.L., Chuang, Y.L., & Chen, P.Y. (2008). Motivation for using search engines: a two-factor model. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(11), 1829-1840.
- Young, C.L. (2001). Launching librarians into an academic career: the Ohio State University libraries experience. In R. V. Cogell & C.A. Gruwell (Eds.), *Diversity in libraries: academic residency programs* (104-109) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT QUESTIONS

Background information questions:

1. Are you a current or former diversity resident librarian?

Current Former I've never been a diversity resident librarian [selection would end survey]

2. Gender identity:

male female other/prefer not to answer

3. Race/Ethnicity (select which best applies):

White non-Hispanic Black non-Hispanic Asian Native American/American Indian Hispanic mixed/multi-racial Prefer not to answer

4. Age at the Beginning of the diversity residency appointment?

18-24 25-34 35-44 45 or older

5. How long ago did you complete your diversity residency?

Current resident 0-3 years ago 4-7 years ago 7-12 years ago over 12 years ago

6. Were you the first resident or in the first residency cohort at your institution?

Yes No Unsure

7. Did your institution employ more than one resident at a time when you served?

Yes No Unsure

8. Which best describes the institution where you served as diversity resident librarian?

___ Large University (15,000+ students) __ Medium University (5,000-15,000 students)
___ Small College/University (0-5,000 students) __ Public Library ___ Other (including OCLC)

Promoting Resident/Co-worker Relations

The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution thought staff buy in for the residency was of utmost importance.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the relevance of the residency well to the library faculty and staff.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

The administration and/or residency coordinators at my institution explained the job duties and expectations for the residency well to library faculty and staff.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I would felt/feel comfortable going to administration and/or residency coordinators if a coworker questioned my professionalism or my deservedness of the position.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

The administration and/or residency coordinators would defend my work record were it questioned by hostile coworkers.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Coworker Relations and Hostilities

I was well-respected by the majority of my coworkers during my residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers seemed willing to help me learn tasks and duties in the position.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers seemed willing to collaborate with me on projects.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers seemed willing to introduce me to professional colleagues and help me network.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers would at least occasionally try to dump “busy work” like stapling papers or cleaning bathrooms on me.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Negative experiences with my coworkers during the residency appointment will prevent me from collaborating with them or maintaining collegial connections with them in the future.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Microaggressive Behavior

Did any of your coworkers ever seem overly impressed by your ability to perform basic or non-challenging tasks?

Yes No

Do you feel this was because of your race or ethnicity?

Yes No

How did such incidents impact your overall job performance?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your willingness to work with those coworkers?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your overall opinion on the institution as a place to work?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

Did any of your coworkers ever question your legitimacy as a “diverse” hire?

Yes No

How did such incidents impact your overall job performance?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your willingness to work with those coworkers?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your overall opinion on the institution as a place to work?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

Did any of your coworkers make insensitive/offensive jokes or comments about your race/ethnicity?

Yes No

How did such incidents impact your overall job performance?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your willingness to work with those coworkers?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

How did such incidents impact your overall opinion on the institution as a place to work?

1) Extremely Negatively, 2,3,4,5) N/A or not at all 6,7,8,9 10) Extremely Positively

Support and Staff Buy-In

What percentage of the library faculty and staff would you say “bought into” supporting the diversity residency position?

0-25% 26-49% 50%(half) 51-75% 76-100%

My coworkers were supportive of me receiving extra travel opportunities and budgeting.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers seemed supportive of me receiving professional level pay as a diversity resident.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My coworkers seemed supportive of there being a well-paid position where a highly-experienced candidate wouldn't be considered.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Assessment

My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration reviewed best practices thoroughly to implement or improve the residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My institution's residency coordinators and/or administration communicated with other residency coordinators to assess and improve the residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My institution assessed the cultural climate of my institution and its readiness for hosting a residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My residency coordinators were dedicated to identifying and addressing shortcomings and problems related to the residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators were successful in improving the residency when needed.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

My institution's administration and/or residency coordinators solicited feedback from me to assess and improve the residency program.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Professional Job Responsibilities

At work, I was performing duties that exceeded those of a grad student intern.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I was expected to and adequately trained to publish, present, or to complete a capstone by the end of my term.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I was given opportunities and/or preparation for supervising other library personnel.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I was frequently assigned busy work that no one else wanted to do or that seemed unproductive.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I didn't have a lot of directionless, idle time

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Preparation for the Next Appointment

Work that I did as a resident mirrors job duties I see in professional vacancy announcements

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

The residency put me in position to make lasting professional connections

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I have more knowledge of library systems and software than I did prior to my residency

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I somehow gained new insights on what to do and not do when pursuing a permanent position during the residency

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I have a better idea of what a librarian does during the work day than I did prior to the residency

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I was overall better prepared to be a professional librarian after the residency than prior to it

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

Research Question 8-11

How would you rate your residency experience overall?

1) Completely Horrible 2,3,4, 5) Okay/average 6,7,8,9, 10) Perfect

I became excited about a career in librarianship as my residency progressed.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I saw librarianship as a viable profession as my residency progressed.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I sought to eventually become a department head or administrator due to my residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I pursued membership in professional librarian organizations during and/or immediately after my residency

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I was motivated to do innovative things in the LIS field during and/or immediately after my residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I considered careers outside of LIS during and/or immediately following my residency.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

I wanted/want my next job immediately following the residency to be with a well-respected institution.

1) Totally Disagree 2,3,4,5) neither agree nor disagree ,6,7,8,9 10) Totally Agree

APPENDIX B:

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW BASE QUESTIONS

The following list of questions was used as an outline for the semi-structured interview questions. As appropriate, interviewees were asked follow up questions. Questions were not necessarily asked of every interviewee in this order.

1. Please assign an overall rating to your residency experience on a scale of 1-10, ten being the highest possible score.
2. How old were you when you started the residency?
3. What is your ethnic and gender identity?
4. When and where did your residency take place?
5. Were program expectations clearly communicated to you?
6. Were job expectations and duties for the resident explained to coworkers?
7. Did your coworkers understand you were a degreed professional?
8. Did you serve as the lone resident or in a residency cohort?
9. Is the residency you served in still going, and if not, do you have ideas as to why it was discontinued?

10. Were you subjected to inappropriate jokes, comments, or assumed to have or lack certain knowledge based on your race or ethnicity?
11. Did you have mentors in your residency? Who assigned them and how were they assigned? Were the mentoring relationships effective?
12. Were you allowed to be innovative and can you cite any examples of innovative things that you did?
13. Are you still working as a librarian? Are you still working in the LIS field?
14. Were you tasked with changing the organizational culture at your institution as a resident, and, therefore, a rookie librarian?
15. Were you given the opportunity to do outreach on behalf of the library to other areas of campus, especially multicultural affairs or diversity-related student groups?
16. Please describe your adjustment to the new city/state if you relocated to a new area, as well as how the host institution aided your relocation and transition?
17. Was there a difference in how you were treated by faculty versus by staff?
18. Did coworkers seem interested in teaching you skills and collaborating with you?
19. Did coworkers seem interested in your long-term success beyond the program?
20. Were you ever misled to think that remaining with the institution after the residency may have been a real opportunity when it was not?

21. Do you believe that serving in the residency has afforded you opportunities that you would not have had had you never been a resident?
22. Was assessment taken seriously at your institution regarding the residency? Do you know how your institution went about assessing the residency?
23. Did the residency coordinators try to promote the residency to the coworkers and give them a better understanding of what it was, why it was done, and how it could help the host institution?
24. Anything I have left out that you would like to talk about?

APPENDIX C:

IRB LETTER



OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH
APPROVAL LETTER for EXEMPT REVIEW**

This is to certify that the research proposal: **Pro00051956**

Entitled: *Seeking Return on Our Investment: Identifying Factors through Multiple Regression Analysis that Contribute to the Success and Failure of Diversity Residency Programs*

Submitted by:

Principal Investigator: Jason Alston

College/Department: Mass Communications & Information Studies

Library & Information Sciences

1501 Greene Street

Columbia, SC 29208

was reviewed in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), the referenced study received an exemption from Human Research Subject Regulations on **2/2/2016**. No further action or Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is required, as long as the project remains the same. However, the Principal Investigator must inform the Office of Research Compliance of any changes in procedures involving human subjects. Changes to the current research protocol could result in a reclassification of the study and further review by the IRB.

Because this project was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, consent document(s), if applicable, are not stamped with an expiration date.

Research related records should be retained for a minimum of three (3) years after termination of the study.

The Office of Research Compliance is an administrative office that supports the University of South Carolina Institutional Review Board (USC IRB). If you have questions, contact Arlene McWhorter at arlenem@sc.edu or (803) 777-7095.

Sincerely,



Lisa M. Johnson

IRB Manager