

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Library Publications

Library

2018

Academic Librarians with Disabilities: Job Perceptions and Factors Influencing Positive Workplace Experiences

Joanne Oud

Wilfrid Laurier University, joud@wlu.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/lib_pub



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

Recommended Citation

Oud, J. (2018). Academic Librarians with Disabilities: Job Perceptions and Factors Influencing Positive Workplace Experiences. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v13i1.4090>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Library at Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

PARTNERSHIP

The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research
Revue canadienne de la pratique et de la recherche en bibliothéconomie et sciences de l'information

vol. 13, no. 1 (2018)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v13i1.4090>

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Academic Librarians with Disabilities: Job Perceptions and Factors Influencing Positive Workplace Experiences

Joanne Oud

Instructional Technology Librarian & Instruction Coordinator

Wilfrid Laurier University Library

joud@wlu.ca

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4096-9900>

Abstract

Although there has been increasing attention to diversity in librarianship, little attention has been paid to librarians with disabilities. This study uses a mixed methods approach, using results from a survey and in-depth follow-up interviews, to investigate some of the characteristics of Canadian university librarians with disabilities, their job satisfaction, their perceptions of their workplace climate for diversity and accessibility, and the factors that influence their workplace perceptions. Although librarians with disabilities report a generally high level of job satisfaction, they are less satisfied with some areas related to workplace stress and job flexibility than librarians without disabilities. Librarians with disabilities also report less confidence that their workplace is inclusive, values diversity, and is understanding of disability-related issues. Factors influencing the work experience of university librarians with disabilities include a collegial environment, supportive colleagues and supervisors, job flexibility and autonomy, clear priorities and reporting structures, reasonable expectations about workload, time pressures and short deadlines, effective structures and processes to ensure accessibility, an accessible physical environment, and, most importantly, an understanding of disability and awareness of disability-related workplace issues.

Keywords

Diversity; disability; job satisfaction; accessibility

Introduction

Diversity within librarianship is of growing interest both in the profession and in the research literature. Professional associations such as the American Library Association have developed standards for diversity in libraries, track diversity statistics, and offer scholarship and residency programs to encourage greater numbers of racialized or visible minority librarians in the profession. A growing professional literature explores the workplace experiences of minority groups within librarianship, including a number of recent studies that raise awareness and attempt to address equity concerns in Canadian librarianship (Hudson, 2017; Kandiuk, 2014; Kumaran & Cai, 2015). There appears to be increasing awareness of and attention paid to equity concerns within the profession.

Little of this diversity and equity discussion within librarianship has focused on disability, even though librarians with disabilities form a substantial minority within the profession. Estimates of the numbers of librarians with disabilities range from 3.7% in the United States to 5.9% in Canada (American Library Association, 2012; Canadian Association of Professional Academic Librarians, 2016). Despite these relatively substantial numbers, little as yet is known about the work experiences of this minority group. There are indications that librarians with disabilities may have equity concerns at work. On the surface, the situation for workers with disabilities in Canada appears positive. People with disabilities are protected from discrimination, like other minority groups, through the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, along with a variety of provincial laws specific to disability like the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. In all jurisdictions, employers are required to provide accommodation for employees with disabilities to ensure a level playing field on the job. Canadian laws are in many ways disability-friendly and progressive: courts place a burden of proof on the employer to show that barriers have been removed, while countries like the U.S. place the burden of proof on the employee to prove discrimination (Atkins, 2006). However, employment legislation appears to have had limited impact on the workplace experiences of people with disabilities. The Canadian Human Rights Commission reports that more than 50% of the complaints they receive involve disability, and 84% of those are employment-related (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2015). The high number of workplace-related disability complaints indicates that despite legislation, employees with disabilities in Canada tend to have significant equity concerns at work.

It is challenging to meaningfully address potential equity concerns for librarians with disabilities, though, without understanding more about what those concerns might be. No existing research investigates the experiences of librarians with disabilities. This study attempts to better understand some of the issues related to disability within librarianship. In particular, its goal is to better understand some of the characteristics and job perceptions of librarians with disabilities, particularly in the researcher's context of academic librarianship in Canada. The research questions for this study are:

1. Who are Canadian academic librarians with disabilities?
2. How satisfied are they with their jobs and workplace environments?
3. What factors influence this satisfaction?

Literature Review

Little research exists on librarians with disabilities. Although there is a relatively large existing body of library-related disability research, this research has focused almost exclusively on the accessibility of library services for people with disabilities (Hill, 2013). Only a few research studies have mentioned librarians with disabilities. One examined Irish library managers' perceptions about employees with disabilities, and found that managers tended to have negative attitudes towards accommodations related to changes in work patterns, such as flexible working conditions or hours (O'Neill & Urquhart, 2011). Another surveyed public librarian attitudes to having people from minority groups as colleagues, and found that respondents had an unconscious bias towards white, able-bodied librarians (Brown, 2015). No existing research studies involve librarians with disabilities directly, or are based on their perspectives. As a result, little is known about the characteristics or workplace experiences of librarians with disabilities.

A number of studies do however look at the workplace experiences of librarians, especially related to their job perceptions and work satisfaction. These studies have found that librarians tend to have a relatively high level of job satisfaction. The most frequently mentioned component of librarian job satisfaction is the intrinsic characteristics of the job itself (Leckie & Brett, 1997; Millard, 2018; Mirfakhrai, 2008; Moniarou-Papaconstantinou & Triantafyllou, 2015; Morgan, 2014; Sierpe, 1999; Togia, Koustelios, & Tsigilis, 2004). Judging by the results of these studies, librarians tend to find their work interesting and rewarding and to be highly committed to their career. Another major component of librarian job satisfaction, however, relates to their work environment. Apart from the job itself, the most frequently mentioned factors contributing to librarian job satisfaction are relationships and support from supervisors and colleagues (Elia, 1979; Leckie & Brett, 1997; Lim, 2008; Mirfakhrai, 2008; Morgan, 2014; Sierpe, 1999; Togia et al., 2004). Other factors include the ability to use job skills meaningfully (Elia, 1979; Millard, 2018; Moniarou-Papaconstantinou & Triantafyllou, 2015), job autonomy and the ability to use professional judgement (Leckie & Brett, 1997; Lim, 2008; Moniarou-Papaconstantinou & Triantafyllou, 2015), meaningful participation in planning and decision-making (Horenstein, 1993; Togia et al., 2004), and faculty status (Horenstein, 1993; Leckie & Brett, 1997). These studies help identify factors contributing specifically to job satisfaction in a library work environment. However, they tend to treat librarians as a homogenous group, without analyzing potential differences due to minority status within the profession.

A few studies do look at the job perceptions and satisfaction of specific minority groups within librarianship, particularly of racialized or visible minority librarians. Some factors contributing to job satisfaction for this group overlapped with the factors found for

librarians in general, most notably supervisor and colleague support (Preston, 1998; Thornton, 2000). Other factors influencing job satisfaction for visible minority librarians were different from those found in studies of librarians in general. These included a concern over the lack of diversity within their organizations, leading to feelings of isolation (Kumaran & Cai, 2015; Preston, 1998; Thornton, 2000). Some studies reported discrimination and racism at work, and found that higher levels of support for workplace diversity and equity, and sensitivity to the challenges faced by visible minority librarians led to greater job satisfaction (Kandiuk, 2014; Preston, 1998; Thornton, 2000). There is some evidence to suggest that perceptions of workplace equity differ. One study found a relatively high level of disagreement between visible minority and white respondents about how welcoming and inclusive their workplaces were, with white respondents having higher perceptions of inclusiveness than visible minority respondents (Kandiuk, 2014).

Disability studies research provides insights into the job perceptions and satisfaction of employees with disabilities. Many studies show that employees with disabilities have lower levels of job satisfaction than employees without disabilities (Jones, 2016; Schur et al., 2017; Snyder, Carmichael, Blackwell, Cleveland, & Thornton, 2010; Uppal, 2005). Like the research on job satisfaction in librarians, research on people with disabilities indicates that key factors influencing job perceptions and satisfaction include support from coworkers and supervisors (Schur, Kruse, Blasi, & Blanck, 2009; Snyder et al., 2010; Uppal, 2005). Like visible minority librarians, employees with disabilities report higher rates of discrimination and harassment at work (Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010; Villanueva-Flores, Valle-Cabrera, & Bornay-Barrachina, 2014), and a critical factor influencing job satisfaction is the level of workplace support for diversity and equity, particularly supervisor and colleague attitudes toward disability (Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010). Other factors influencing positive workplace perceptions of workers with disabilities include perceptions of justice and fairness at work (Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010; Villanueva-Flores et al., 2014), involvement in decision-making (Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010), and high levels of workplace autonomy and flexibility (Jones, 2016; Schur et al., 2009).

These studies suggest that librarians with disabilities may have different job perceptions and satisfaction levels than other librarians. This study builds on existing studies related to the work perceptions of visible minority librarians and workers with disabilities. It examines similar issues, but uses the perspective of disability studies to focus on the experiences of librarians with disabilities who work in university libraries in Canada. The hope is to gain some understanding of who academic librarians are, how they perceive their jobs and workplace environments, and what factors influence those perceptions.

Method

This study used a mixed methods approach. After obtaining university research ethics approval for both methods, a survey was sent to Canadian academic librarians asking about work satisfaction and the workplace climate for diversity. In the second stage, in-depth follow-up interviews were conducted with ten academic librarians with disabilities to learn in more detail about their work experiences.

Survey

The survey questions were developed to include job satisfaction and workplace diversity concepts from the disability studies literature on work, including perceptions of workload, stress, support, fairness, and job flexibility. Existing job satisfaction scales, including the Jobs in General Scale, the Job Satisfaction Survey, the Andrew and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and the Measure of Job Satisfaction scales, were examined for possible use (Ironson et al., 1989; Spector, 1985; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Traynor & Wade, 1993). Since all these scales were developed to measure job satisfaction more generally, none were judged to adequately cover all the desired concepts. Similarly, an examination of existing scales to measure workplace diversity climate was done, including the Attitudes Towards Diversity Scale (ATDS) (Montei, Adams & Eggers, 1996); all focused on gender and racial diversity, and none were found to adequately measure accessibility. Therefore, the author developed items for two scales: Work Satisfaction, and Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility. Some scale items were adapted from the Measure of Job Satisfaction scale, which was developed for nurses and includes questions especially relevant to service occupations (Traynor & Wade, 1993). Most items, however, were newly developed for this survey. Items were tested in a small pilot, and adjustments to some were made before the survey was implemented.

The survey included items from the Work Satisfaction and Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scales for all respondents. Those who identified themselves as people with disabilities were asked additional, disability-specific questions developed based on themes identified in the disability studies research on work. There are many definitions of disability, ranging from relatively specific and focused on functional limitations in specific contexts to relatively broad including a wide range of visible and invisible disabilities including chronic illness and episodic disabilities. No specific definition of disability was used for the survey; instead, respondents were left to self-identify as having a disability based on their own definition.

An assessment of online survey tools was done to determine their accessibility, and SurveyMonkey was chosen to deliver the survey. Best practices for ethical online survey administration were followed. In particular, the survey allowed respondents to skip questions or end the survey at any point without saving data, and no IP addresses were collected or stored to avoid potentially identifying data (Buchanan & Hvizdak, 2009). Since the online survey tool used stores data on servers in the U.S., respondents were informed up front that any data would be subject to American privacy laws and given a choice to opt out of the survey.

A personalized email invitation to complete the survey was sent to 1,215 librarians. A link to the online survey was sent to all librarians working in English-speaking Canadian university libraries, using names and email addresses gathered from the websites of libraries belonging to major regional library consortia (Council of Atlantic University Libraries, Ontario Council of University Libraries, and Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries), along with English-speaking university libraries in Quebec. Standard practices for maximizing online survey response rates were used, which

included sending personalized, individual emails to each respondent using an email mass mailer tool rather than sending through anonymous listservs, sending a link to the survey in the email, assuring participants of anonymity, and sending two follow-up email reminders (Nulty, 2008). A total of 268 surveys were completed, for a 22% response rate. This response rate is not high, but is enough to ensure adequate representativeness for the size of the population (Nulty, 2008).

The Work Satisfaction scale contained 27 items, each based on a 5-point Likert scale. The distribution of responses was checked, and a normal distribution was confirmed. The scale reliability was also checked and showed a high level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .933.

The Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scale contained 16 items, each based on a 5-point Likert scale. The distribution of responses was checked, and a normal distribution was confirmed. The scale reliability was checked, and showed a high level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .925. The Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scale was also broken down into two subscales: Accessibility and Inclusivity. A factor analysis confirmed that these two factors explained 57% of the variance. A few items corresponded moderately to both factors, and were assigned to the factor with the highest level of correspondence. Both the Accessibility subscale (7 items, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .853) and the Inclusivity subscale (9 items, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .897) showed a good level of internal consistency.

Since there were adequate sample sizes for each group (librarians with disabilities and librarians without disabilities) and a normal distribution of scores, between-group comparisons on scales and subscales were analyzed using parametric statistics. However, the number of respondents with disabilities (38) was too small for meaningful analysis of results or variables within that group. Therefore, the disability-specific questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Open-ended questions were coded for common themes.

Interviews

Survey respondents with disabilities were asked if they would participate in a follow-up interview. Those who agreed were sent details of the interview project and a copy of the interview questions. Ten librarians from across Canada agreed to be interviewed. For accessibility reasons, interviewees were given a choice of interview mode. Interviews took place by phone, Skype, and in-person and ranged in length from 30-45 minutes. After ten interviews it was clear that data saturation had been reached, with new participants confirming common themes raised in other interviews.

Interviews were semi-structured, with questions about the participant's workplace and any disability-related difficulties they experienced. Interviews were transcribed verbatim, with minor modifications to remove filler words like 'um.' The transcription process included participant validation: participants were given an opportunity to review their transcripts, remove or change what they had said or add more detail.

Transcripts were coded using the two-stage coding process outlined by Saldana (2016), first assigning codes and then grouping by broader themes. Participant validation was also included at this stage: participants were provided with the summary of themes and asked for comments or feedback.

Characteristics of academic librarians with disabilities: Survey findings

Demographics for the survey respondents broadly corresponded with the demographics of the academic librarian profession in Canada. Respondents were largely female, in permanent-stream, full-time positions within larger libraries, with a wide distribution of ages and years of experience. For details, see Table 1.

Of the 268 respondents, 38 or 14% identified themselves as a person with a disability. A recent Canadian census found that 5.9% of Canadian academic librarians reported having a disability, which suggests that a much higher proportion of librarians with disabilities completed the survey than librarians without disabilities (Canadian Association of Professional Librarians, 2016).

The demographic characteristics of librarians with disabilities were largely similar to those of non-disabled respondents (see Table 1). Chi-square tests were done to compare the demographic variables of respondents with and without disabilities. Only two significant differences were found: belonging to another minority group, and being in a management position. More librarians with disabilities reported also being part of another minority group, at 35% compared to 20% for those without disabilities ($\chi^2(1, n=269)=4.415, p=.036$). By contrast, fewer librarians with disabilities indicated that they held management or supervisory positions, at 18% compared to 37% of respondents without disabilities ($\chi^2(1, n=269)=5.103, p=.024$).

<i>Demographic characteristics</i>			
Variable	Options	All	Librarians with disabilities
Year of experience as a librarian	0-9	41%	37%
	10-19	35%	26%
	20 or more	24%	37%
Age	20-39	37%	27%
	40-49	35%	41%
	50 or more	28%	32%
Gender	Female	77%	79%
	Male	21.5%	16%
	Other	1.5%	5%
Do you belong to another minority group?	No	78%*	65%*
	Yes	22%*	35%*
Size of library (number of librarians)	0-9	27%	29%
	10-19	18%	10%
	20 or more	55%	61%
Management or supervisory position	No	65%*	82%*
	Yes	35%*	18%*
Permanent or tenure-stream position	No	14%	13%
	Yes	86%	87%
Full-time position	No	5%	5%
	Yes	95%	95%

* significant association (Chi-square analysis)

The large majority of librarians with disabilities reported having invisible disabilities. 72% reported that their disability was invisible, 14% that their disability was visible, and 14% that they had both visible and invisible disabilities. Most respondents had long experience with their disability, with 92% indicating that they have had their disability for more than five years. Only 8% indicated that their disability was fairly recent, at less than five years.

People with invisible disabilities can choose whether to disclose their disability to others, and respondents reported some caution in doing so at work. Only 51% said their supervisor is fully aware of their disability, while 19% said their supervisor was unaware, and 30% said their supervisor was only somewhat aware. Similarly, when asked how many of their colleagues knew about their disability, only 30% said most or all of their colleagues knew about their disability, while 13% said none of their colleagues were aware of their disability, and 57% said only a few of them knew.

Although people without disabilities often assume the availability of legal accommodations will address disability issues at work, respondents with disabilities did not show a high level of trust in the accommodation process. When asked whether they

had requested accommodation in their current workplace, 68% of respondents said no. When asked why they hadn't requested accommodation, 71% reported fearing an impact on their job, including colleague and supervisor reaction, being seen or treated differently, or negative impact on promotion or tenure opportunities. A further 17% indicated problems with the accommodation process, such as the absence of a process altogether in their institution, not knowing how to request accommodation, or feeling that the process was too complicated or stressful. Only 12% indicated that they didn't ask for accommodation because they did not feel a need to.

Respondents who did request accommodation reported mixed success and results. When asked if their request had been granted, 47% said yes, 29% said only partially, and 24% said no. Although only 25% of people (4) who requested accommodations responded that they had experienced negative consequences as a result of their request, 75% (9) listed negative consequences in the follow-up comments to this question. Negative consequences listed in the comments include a troublemaker reputation, negative reactions or comments from colleagues, threat of job loss, having people see them as less capable, and emotional distress.

Job satisfaction

In general, respondents reported a relatively high level of job satisfaction. The median score was 61 out of a possible range of scores from 27 to 135, with lower scores indicating higher satisfaction. The mean individual item score was 2.28 on a 5 point scale.

Overall levels of job satisfaction were not significantly different for librarians with and without disabilities. Independent samples T-tests showed no significant differences between the scores of both groups on the Job Satisfaction scale.

Levels of job satisfaction were not significantly different for respondents with different demographic characteristics. Independent T-test and ANOVA tests were conducted to compare scores between groups for demographic variables including gender, age, experience, size of library, belonging to a minority group, holding a management position, and working full or part-time. No significant differences in scores were found for any of these variables.

These results differ from many studies on disability and work, which indicate that employees with disabilities tend to have lower levels of job satisfaction (Jones, 2016; Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010; Uppal, 2005). The fact that academic librarians with disabilities do not have lower levels of job satisfaction may indicate that academic library workplaces contain features linked to positive work experiences.

Even though there were no significant differences in levels of overall job satisfaction, librarians with disabilities did report somewhat lower levels of job satisfaction for certain individual survey items. A comparison between the job satisfaction scores for individual items for respondents with and without disabilities was done using Chi-square tests. Although the findings of lower scores on some individual items was not enough to

significantly impact overall job satisfaction levels, they do indicate that librarians with disabilities have a higher level of concern about some aspects of their job compared to librarians without a disability. Significant differences, representing lower levels of satisfaction for respondents with disabilities, were found for:

- The amount of work-related stress I encounter ($\chi^2(2, n=269)=7.603, p=.022$)
- The degree of input I have into decisions that impact my work ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=8.953, p=.011$)
- The degree of flexibility I have in my work schedule ($\chi^2(2, n=268)=6.641, p=.036$)
- The contributions I make to the library ($\chi^2(2, n=269)=21.488, p=.000$)
- The amount of support I receive from my supervisor ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=6.153, p=.046$)
- The amount of support I receive from my colleagues ($\chi^2(2, n=269)=7.524, p=.023$)
- The degree to which I feel accepted by colleagues ($\chi^2(2, n=268)=6.507, p=.039$)

These findings are similar to previous studies of librarian job satisfaction which found that factors leading to high satisfaction included relationships with supervisors and colleagues (Elia, 1979; Lim, 2008), levels of flexibility and professional autonomy (Horenstein, 1993; Leckie & Brett, 1997; Togia, Koustelios, & Tsigilis, 2004), and contributions and participation in decision-making (Kandiuk, 2014; Thornton, 2000).

Some differences from previous findings are also apparent. Items related to workload, work stress, job flexibility, and autonomy appear to be more significant indicators of job satisfaction for people with disabilities than for visible minority librarians. These findings likely reflect the particular concerns of librarians with disabilities in dealing with the impacts of their disability at work. Disability studies research has found that people with disabilities are happier in work environments where people have supportive colleagues and supervisors and their job involves a high level of flexibility and autonomy (Snyder et al., 2010). Job-related barriers for people with disabilities include high workplace pressures to be productive, along with the internalized pressure to do extra work to be seen as 'normal,' which takes a physical and mental toll and leads to higher stress levels (Richards, Marks, & Loretto, 2016; Robert & Harlan, 2006; Roulstone & Williams, 2014).

Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility

All respondents were somewhat less satisfied with the climate for diversity and accessibility in their workplace. The median score on the Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scale was 40.50 out of a possible range of 16 to 80, with lower scores indicating higher satisfaction. The mean individual item score was 2.53 on

a 5 point scale. Subscale results were similar. The Accessibility subscale, measuring perceptions of workplace accessibility, acceptance of people with disability, understanding of disability issues, and willingness to do things differently to accommodate people with disabilities, had a median score of 18 out of a possible range of 7 to 35, with a mean individual item score of 2.57. The Inclusivity subscale measured perceptions of how well diversity and different ideas are valued in the workplace, how comfortable people are disagreeing with their supervisor, how welcoming the workplace is, how fairly employees are treated, and how flexible management is. This subscale had a median score of 23 out of a possible range of 9 to 45, with a median item score of 2.56.

Librarians with disabilities felt that their workplace was less accepting of diversity than non-disabled respondents did. Independent sample T-tests were conducted to compare the scores of respondents with and without disabilities for the Workplace Climate and Diversity scale and the Accessibility and Inclusivity subscales. Significant differences ($p < .05$) were found in the scale and both subscales. People with disabilities rated the overall climate for diversity and accessibility lower than those without disabilities in the Workplace Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scale as well as both the Accessibility and Inclusivity subscales. For details of T-test results see Table 2.

Librarians who belonged to another minority group similarly rated their workplace as less inclusive. Independent sample T-tests were conducted to compare scale and subscale scores using demographic variables. No significant differences in scores were found for gender, age, experience, size of library, or type of position (full-time or part-time). Significant differences, however, were found for those also belonging to another minority group, who gave significantly lower ratings than others in the Workplace Climate and Diversity Scale and the Inclusivity subscale, but not the Accessibility subscale. These results indicate a higher overall concern about diversity and inclusivity in their workplace than non-minority respondents, but not necessarily a higher overall concern for accessibility and disability issues.

In short, librarians belonging to any minority group, including those with disabilities, found their workplace less inclusive than non-minority librarians, although only librarians with disabilities were less satisfied with workplace levels of accessibility and disability awareness. These findings are consistent with previous research about visible minority librarians. Kandiuk (2014) found that 43% of Canadian visible minority librarians felt that their workplace did not or only somewhat valued diversity; a much higher percentage than white respondents. Thornton (2000) similarly found that African-American librarians rated their workplace climate for diversity relatively low ratings, with just over half agreeing that library management was somewhat committed to, welcomed, and valued diversity.

Librarians in management or supervisory positions had substantially better impressions of their workplace climate for diversity and accessibility. An Independent sample T-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of respondents in management or supervisory positions with those who were not. Those in management or supervisory positions gave their workplace significantly higher ratings than others on the Workplace

Diversity and Accessibility scale and both the Accessibility and Inclusivity subscales. These results show that librarians in management positions have a higher level of confidence in their workplace climate for diversity and accessibility than other groups. For details of T-test results see Table 2.

Scale or subscale	Comparison groups	Mean	Standard deviation	Difference in means	95% CI	T	P (2-tailed)	Eta squared
Climate for Diversity and Accessibility scale	with disabilities	46.53	12.89	5.50	1.88-9.13	(259)	.003	.03 small
	without disabilities	41.03	9.78			2.99		
	Minority	44.96	12.42	4.18	1.12-7.25	(74)	.022	.02 small
	Non-minority	40.78	9.65			2.33		
	Management position	39.40	9.30	-3.64	-6.16- -1.12	(205)	.005	.03 small
	Non-management position	43.04	10.77			-2.85		
Accessibility subscale	with disabilities	19.76	5.71	1.97	.429-3.53	(262)	.013	.02 small
	without disabilities	17.78	4.22			2.50		
	Management position	17.02	3.91	-1.58	-2.65- -.502	(210)	.004	.03 small
	Non-management position	18.60	4.69			-2.89		
Inclusivity subscale	with disabilities	26.24	8.29	2.98	.681-5.28	(261)	.011	.02 small
	without disabilities	23.26	6.27			2.55		
	Minority	25.82	7.74	2.81	.871-4.76	(77)	.014	.02 small
	Non-minority	23.01	6.23			2.53		
	Management position	22.30	6.19	-2.12	-3.80- -.433	(261)	.014	.02 small
	Non-management position	24.41	6.80			-2.48		

This higher level of confidence is particularly pronounced in the area of disability and accessibility. A Chi-square analysis was conducted on individual scale items to compare the scores of librarians with disabilities with those of librarians in a management position. Significant differences, with librarian managers indicating higher levels of confidence, were found on several items:

- Diversity is valued in my workplace ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=6.338, p=.042$)
- My workplace is welcoming to everyone ($\chi^2(2, n=268)=9.443, p=.009$)
- Management is flexible about making different arrangements to meet different employee needs ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=7.080, p=.029$)
- My workplace is accessible to employees with disabilities ($\chi^2(2, n=268)=8.196, p=.017$)
- My workplace is accepting of people with disabilities ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=6.677, p=.035$)
- People are willing to do things differently to accommodate people with disabilities ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=7.294, p=.026$)
- My colleagues are familiar with disability related issues and concerns ($\chi^2(2, n=267)=5.976, p=.050$)
- Management has a good understanding of disability related issues and concerns ($\chi^2(2, n=268)=8.120, p=.017$)

These differences appear to point to a particular gap in awareness and understanding of disability and accessibility-related issues between librarians with disabilities and librarians in management positions. This gap is concerning since significantly fewer librarians with disabilities reported holding management or supervisory positions. In fact, so few librarians with disabilities in the survey held management positions (7) that the group was too small to analyze in comparison with supervisory librarians without disabilities.

Some of the disability-specific questions in the survey also address the workplace climate for inclusivity. When asked about discrimination and harassment at work due to their disability, 8% of librarians with disabilities reported that they had faced discrimination, and 13.5% reported that they had experienced harassment. These are indicators of serious workplace problems faced by librarians with disabilities. However, the rates are somewhat lower than reported in other disability-related studies on higher education (Shigaki, Anderson, Howald, Henson, & Gregg, 2012).

Librarians with disabilities were also asked survey questions on everyday interpersonal interactions with colleagues or supervisors that indicated stereotypical or negative views of people with disabilities; in other words, on microaggressions. The microaggressions

in the survey were adapted from the disability-related microaggressions outlined by Keller and Galgay (2010). Responses were mixed. A substantial minority of respondents, 39% (14) indicated that they never or only rarely encountered any microaggressions at work. However, 61% of respondents (22) indicated that they sometimes, often, or always experienced at least one microaggression; 47% of respondents (17) indicated that they experienced two or more, and 31% (11) indicated that they experienced three or more. The most frequently reported microaggressions were:

- Someone minimizes my disability (33%, 12 respondents)
- Someone is uncomfortable or doesn't know how to act because of my disability (33%, 12 respondents)
- Someone assumes I am less productive because of my disability (31%, 11 respondents)
- Someone assumes I am less capable or skilled because of my disability (28%, 10 respondents)

Although little has been published about microaggressions in libraries, these findings can be related to those of Alabi, who outlines the existence of racial microaggressions against visible minority librarians based on racist stereotypes and assumptions (Alabi, 2015b). In particular, librarians with disabilities report that people minimize their experience of disability, which is similar to Alabi's finding of microinvalidations, or incidents where people deny or minimize peoples' lived reality.

Factors influencing workplace experience: Interview findings

Interviews with librarians with disabilities allowed a more detailed view of their work experiences than the survey could provide. The interviews helped explore the factors that influenced the perceptions of job satisfaction and work environment outlined in the survey. Based on factors commonly mentioned in participant responses, 10 major factors contributing to a positive work environment were identified:

- Consideration for workload and time pressures
- Autonomy and flexibility, both related to job tasks and priorities and to flexible work patterns and working hours
- Good health benefits
- An accessible physical environment
- Supportive colleagues and a team-based environment
- Clear library priorities and reporting structures

- A balance between work and employee needs
- A supportive supervisor
- Robust structures and processes to ensure accessibility
- An understanding and awareness of disability-related issues

Workload and time pressure

Interviewees frequently mentioned external pressure from the library or internal pressure from themselves to get lots of work done (“do more with less”). As one interviewee said,

I feel there's quite a lot of pressure to do work or to do certain types of work, and certain types of work are valued differently. That makes it a tough situation for anyone, and maybe for me with a learning disability... because I feel it takes me longer to do things than everyone else it would be nice if there was less workload.

A performance-oriented workplace environment can create more difficulties for people with disabilities than others, since some need to work harder and longer hours to get the job done.

In addition, several interviewees mentioned difficulties dealing with work expectations around timeliness, including quick decision making, multiple deadlines, inadequate time to prepare in advance, and dealing with requests for quick turnaround. Better planning by managers and a shift in expectations about response times would lead to a less stressful work environment for people with disabilities. One interviewee commented on the difficulties with “different demands coming from different places, a lot of email, a lot of expectations to meet deadlines, which is hard for me, I'm better with fewer immediate deadlines to deal with.” Another commented, “I find that it takes me a lot longer to do things than my colleagues, or to do them in a way that I'm satisfied with. So I think I need more time to do the same amount of work. I also have a hard time formulating responses when I'm put on the spot.” An interviewee in a management position commented on the expectations for speed in her role: “at that level, unfortunately, one of the things that seems to be valued is the ability to think really quickly and respond really quickly. So people would have a really fast conversation and want a decision immediately. And that's a bit difficult.”

Autonomy and flexibility

Autonomy and flexibility on the job are major contributors to job satisfaction for academic librarians with disabilities. Interviewees mentioned the freedom and ability to choose projects and tasks (“do your own thing”) and decide how the work gets done. This level of autonomy is especially important for librarians with disabilities, who may need to do things differently than others.

Job flexibility was mentioned by all interviewees. The ability to work flexible hours, reduced hours, or to vary work patterns (for example, teleconference or work at home sometimes) was one of the most frequently mentioned factors contributing to positive or negative workplace environments. Inflexible work hours or schedules can contribute to health concerns or issues. Flexible work schedules are important for everyone, but especially for those with variable or episodic disabilities which may not be predictable. As one interviewee said,

I think for me it's that continued flexibility, the ability to work around peaks and valleys of my own energy or my own pain.... we've just agreed that the days where I can't, where I literally feel like I can't get out of bed, I just won't. And I have so much overtime that I'll just make the call. And if by noon I feel fine then I'll come in, or work from home.

Interviewees also mentioned the importance of flexibility in how work is done and what counts as success. Giving people the option to take more than one prescribed path benefits people with disabilities who need to do things differently. One interviewee commented positively on this aspect of her work environment: "I think there's variety in how you can meet the requirements of the job, which probably makes it more accessible because people are going to struggle if you're expected to live up to this expectation of what it needs to look like." She further explained: "I need to do it differently, so therefore it's harder to compare. I can't necessarily take the same approach."

Health benefits

Several interviewees mentioned health benefits coverage as a major factor in their workplace satisfaction. Canadian universities generally have good health benefit packages for employees, which is especially helpful for people with disabilities. As one interviewee said, "we have a great benefit plan at the university so financially there's no cost around my [disability], and I haven't always been in that situation where I even had benefits at work so had to pay for things out of pocket. The financial cost can be very high."

However, some limits to benefits were reported as problematic, such as inadequate coverage for expensive hearing aids. Certain types of coverage, such as counselling, tend to be structured only for short-term support. One interviewee with a mental health-related disability explained, "I know sometimes it's just maybe a specific incident in your life that's causing you to go to counselling... so maybe 10 sessions are sufficient to deal with X incident happening, but if it's a long term thing that you're dealing with then 10 sessions isn't really enough."

Physical environment

An accessible physical environment plays a key role in a positive work environment. What makes an environment physically accessible, however, varies widely by type of disability. Interviewees mentioned factors including quiet classroom and service

settings, appropriate physical arrangement of classrooms and workspaces, close accessible parking, ergonomic furniture, and having an office with privacy, quiet, and the ability to sit or stand as needed. One interviewee with a hearing-related disability said, “A better classroom environment would help a lot. Also some of the noise at the research desk when it gets busy is kind of difficult, which is probably why I like doing one on one research appointments in my own office.” Another person commented, “From a work point of view the biggest piece is trying to have opportunities to stand once in a while... [also] that my office is appropriately set up so I can sit in a proper position at all times.” Another mentions “Having my own office makes managing my diabetes easier. I have privacy and can pretty much do anything I need to...with no fear of anyone walking in or asking questions. There's also space, unlike a bathroom stall.”

Collegial environment

A supportive, collaborative, team-based environment where people are treated with respect by colleagues was frequently discussed by interviewees as a key factor in a positive work environment. Smaller libraries, or smaller units within large libraries, were more often described as collaborative and supportive than large libraries. One interviewee described her workplace: “It’s a good workplace. People are very respectful, teamwork is very important here, and I find that if something is going on no matter what it is you can always talk to someone and someone will help you out.” Another commented, “I don’t see it as a really hyper-competitive work environment. I really feel like the people who hired me and were on my hiring committee genuinely want me to be successful.” A critical, “back-biting,” or competitive environment was mentioned by some interviewees as a major contributor to negative and stressful workplace experiences. One said, “I feel like our system and the way the tenure process works is so competitive, it feels like you're in competition with your colleagues. That's kind of a shitty thing. It's not a nice thing to feel that way.”

Clear priorities and reporting structures

Clear goals, priorities, and reporting structures were discussed as positive workplace factors, while ambiguous or conflicting goals, priorities or reporting structures were associated with negative work environments. Conflicting priorities and structures are potentially difficult for anyone, but have an especially significant impact on people with anxiety or mental health issues. As one interviewee says about her workplace’s lack of clear priorities, “everybody seems to have different ideas about what should be valued, but I don't think we completely agree on what's valuable. And that can be problematic because it's hard to prioritize my job.” Another comments on the stress caused by a difficult reporting structure: “I’m in a situation where I report to two people but four people are having a big influence on what I do or trying to direct aspects of my work, which creates a stressful environment...They don't agree with each other about what the priorities are, and there *you* are.”

Balance between work needs and employee needs

Nearly all interviewees discussed a positive work environment as one where employees are seen as people who have needs beyond work, and those needs are understood and given some priority. One explained: "I think that in general the department's pretty good about if someone is like 'I'm really stressed,' we're like 'go home, it's ok.' Work is not the be-all and end-all... It's just your job, other things are more important."

On the other hand, a stressful work environment results when work, or "the needs of the library," is consistently given priority over employee needs. Some interviewees described this situation and the difficulties it presented when they requested legal accommodation. One explained, "I did have a recent experience where my doctor said 'ok she can only work so many hours,' and I was told immediately 'I don't know if you can work here anymore.' That's totally against the law." Another described her accommodation request:

They denied the request immediately, on the basis of the operational needs of the problematic department. I feel that we could have sat down and laid out what each of us needed and come up with some kind of solution, but they just said no. I am shocked that they treated me this way when they know how deeply distressed that I am. It is like they are only interested in me as a source of labour. Which is foolish, because if they drive me to a breakdown they will lose my labour as well, we will both lose.

Having some balance between library operational needs and the human needs of employees leads to a more positive and accessible work environment.

Supportive supervisor

Having a supportive and understanding supervisor was mentioned frequently as a key factor in a positive work environment. As one interviewee said about her supervisor:

He was really good about checking in and making sure I wasn't overdoing it and not pressuring myself and is pretty good in general with all of us to make sure that our workloads are ok and if we need support somewhere with an aspect of our job to ask him about it or see if there are colleagues who can assist with something, spreading the work out a little more.

Supervisors who treat employees as professionals, give people the autonomy to do their jobs without micromanaging, who balance library and employee needs, are flexible, and who support diversity were all mentioned favorably. Inflexible supervisors who did not understand issues related to disability were mentioned unfavorably.

Structures and processes to ensure accessibility

Many interviewees commented on effective workplace structures to ensure an accessible work environment. These structures were both within the library, such as ensuring that supervisors are effective and that people understand disability-related

issues, and at the university, such as processes for dealing with discrimination or resolving issues that cannot be resolved within the library. For example, some interviewees commented on the fact that positive experiences with supervisors tended to be a result of individual relationships and not based on structural support built into the workplace. As one said, "I'm in a very good position right now, and we've got a really supportive supervisor and supportive coworkers, but I've been around long enough and been in enough workplaces to know that nothing's permanent. What would happen if that changed?" Another expressed concerns about the lack of structure to ensure that managers offer necessary levels of support:

My feeling is that it's the luck of the draw whether you get to have a decent manager or not, and it shouldn't be. There should be some appropriate oversight of managers and training, somewhere you can go to get the support that you need, and I don't feel that that's there.

Some people reported positive interactions with the library and the campus office responsible for accommodations, and some people reported negative interactions with one or both. One, who has had positive experiences with workplace accommodation in her current job, talked about the absence of processes in a previous job: "They didn't have specialized staff who knew what they were doing, and it just would have been an exercise in frustration."

One interviewee talked about concerns with her current workplace, and the difficulties she would have in resolving them due to the lack of effective processes in place: "If I did feel discriminated against it's hard to know what do to about it. We are represented by the [faculty association] but it is certainly not an effective association and we don't have a collective agreement with explicit procedures for dealing with things."

Understanding of disability issues

Most people reported having excellent, supportive colleagues, but even well-meaning colleagues sometimes created issues for them arising from a lack of understanding. One interviewee discussed how her colleagues misunderstood her needs, leading to difficulties and conflicts for her: "Everybody was nice, everybody was respectful, they thought they were helping me cope with my disability...But they thought that because they provided [assistive technology], that was all that was needed and I should be able to hear perfectly and of course it really never worked that way."

One of the biggest challenges people reported was the lack of understanding or awareness of disability and disability-related issues in the workplace, particularly from supervisors. Several commented that although their supervisor was supportive, they lacked awareness of disability issues: "I would say my supervisor doesn't really understand disabilities."

For several interviewees, this lack of awareness resulted in negative judgements about them based on their disability. As one commented of her supervisor, "She doesn't understand me and sort of deems then that I'm not up to her standards." Another with

an invisible disability related a conversation with a manager: “Some of her comments gave me the impression that she was dismissive of invisible disabilities, as though they weren't legitimate but were excuses for laziness, fear, etc.” Another reported a similar experience when requesting accommodation: “There was an assumption that if somebody says ‘I need accommodation’ it's considered that the person is lazy or they don't want to work.”

Summary and Discussion

The goals of this study were to find out more about the characteristics of Canadian academic librarians with disabilities, their workplace satisfaction, and what factors influenced that satisfaction.

Canadian academic librarians with disabilities appear to be demographically similar to librarians without disabilities. There were two major exceptions: more librarians with disabilities also belonged to another minority group, and fewer librarians with disabilities were in management positions. The large majority of respondents reported invisible disabilities, alone or in combination with a visible disability. This means that disability may not be obvious in the workplace, since people with invisible disabilities may choose not to disclose their disability. In fact, many do not. Only 51% of respondents had fully disclosed their disability to their supervisor, and only 30% had disclosed their disability to most or all of their colleagues. An important implication is that the absence of visible employee disability does not mean that disability is not present in the workplace, or that proactive awareness and attention to disability-related issues is not needed.

Respondents were generally satisfied with their jobs, and librarians with disabilities had similar levels of job satisfaction as their non-disabled colleagues, in contrast to findings from other disability studies research. However, librarians with disabilities were less satisfied than their non-disabled colleagues on individual questions related to workload, flexibility and autonomy, colleague and supervisor support, and colleague acceptance. These findings are similar to those in disability studies research, which suggest that employees with disabilities have lower levels of satisfaction with colleague and supervisor support, and higher concern for job autonomy and flexibility (Jones, 2016; Schur et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2010; Uppal, 2005).

Data from the interviews helped fill in details to help further explain the survey findings. Some of the factors with lower satisfaction levels in the survey were reinforced through their inclusion as important indicators of job satisfaction in the interviews. These include supportive colleagues and supervisors, high levels of job autonomy and flexibility, workload stress, workplace support for diversity, and an understanding of disability-related issues in the workplace. Some key factors in the job satisfaction of academic librarians with disabilities, however, emerged mainly from the interviews. These included a collegial, team-based environment with supportive colleagues and supervisors, clear priorities and reporting structures, concerns over time pressures and short deadlines, effective structures and processes to ensure accessibility, an accessible physical environment, and good health benefits.

Most librarians with disabilities had not requested accommodation in their current job. Although some people indicated that they did not need accommodation, most reported that they avoided asking because they feared an impact on their job, including relationships with colleagues and supervisors and being seen or perceived differently. This finding points to difficulties with the accommodation process at many university libraries. It also indicates some perception of stigma towards having a disability, or lack of understanding of disability in the workplace.

Librarians with disabilities felt that their workplaces were less accepting of and understanding of diversity, and especially of disability, than librarians without disabilities. This indicates a gap in awareness on the part of librarians without disabilities who feel that they understand and accept disability-related issues better than librarians with disabilities think they do. This awareness gap was especially acute in librarians holding supervisory or management positions. This group has a greater input into human resource processes and policies at their institutions, including those relating to disability and inclusive work environments. Therefore, it is a concern that they evaluated their workplaces as substantially more inclusive, accessible, and accepting of disability than those with disabilities did. This gap in management perception has also been found in the case of gender and racial diversity, where a recent survey of ACRL library directors found that directors perceived that their libraries were more equitable than other libraries in both categories (Schonfeld & Sweeney, 2017), and indicates a potential shortcoming in library management understanding of equity and diversity issues more broadly.

Conclusion

Although librarians with disabilities reported levels of job satisfaction similar to librarians without disabilities, other findings identified concerns such as climate for diversity and equity as well as the level of understanding of disability issues among staff and supervisors. This study is exploratory, and is intended only to discover on a broad level some of the workplace perceptions of academic librarians with disabilities. All the individual findings and factors addressed in this study would benefit from further research to gain a more in-depth understanding. In particular, a more detailed examination of perceptions of inclusiveness and diversity at work would help to better understand what aspects of diversity and equity librarians with disabilities are dissatisfied with and why.

Of particular concern in the findings from this study is the gap in awareness of disability-related equity issues by librarians in management or supervisory positions. If librarians in positions of influence are not able to see that the workplace needs to be more inclusive and accessible, it is unlikely that progress will be made. Therefore, one major recommendation arising from this study is that all librarians could and should improve their awareness of disability-related issues in the workplace—especially those in management positions. Workplace training would be one possible way to approach this, but including disability issues in discussions of diversity within professional associations and library schools would potentially be more effective in the long term.

The factors influencing workplace satisfaction for librarians with disabilities should be used to help library managers attempt to create an accessible and disability-friendly work environment. This study's findings indicate a need to proactively create an accessible work environment, since most Canadian academic librarians with disabilities hesitate to ask for accommodations due to cultural and attitudinal barriers, including disability-related stigma. A common belief about disability in the workplace is that accommodation will address disability issues at work. Clearly this study shows that for academic librarians with disabilities the reality is more complex. Since there are barriers to asking for accommodation, relying on accommodation to deal with disability-related issues in the workplace is inadequate. The accommodation process is also reactive, assuming a specific individual need that will be dealt with as a need arises. Proactively creating a flexible, inclusive workplace minimizes the need to deal reactively with individual accommodation requests, and would create a more positive work environment for all librarians.

References

- Alabi, J. (2015a). [Racial microaggressions in academic libraries: Results of a survey of minority and non-minority librarians](#). *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(1), 47–53.
- Alabi, J. (2015b). [“This actually happened”: An analysis of librarians’ responses to a survey about racial microaggressions](#). *Journal of Library Administration*, 55(3), 179–191.
- American Library Association. (2012). [Diversity counts 2009-2010 Update \(Document ID: 13dea8d5-5404-ef44-8544-01888b366aba\)](#). Table A-1.
- Atkins, C. G. K. (2006). [A cripple at a rich man’s gate: A comparison of disability, employment and anti- discrimination law in the United States and Canada](#). *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 21(2), 87–111.
- Brown, M. E. (2015). [Invisible debility: Attitudes toward the underrepresented in library workplaces](#). *Public Library Quarterly*, 34(2), 124–133.
- Buchanan, E. A., & Hvizdak, E. E. (2009). [Online survey tools: Ethical and methodological concerns of human research ethics committees](#). *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 4(2), 37–48.
- Canadian Association of Professional Librarians. (2016). [2016 Census of Canadian academic librarians user guide and results summary](#). Toronto.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2015). [The rights of persons with disabilities to equality and non-discrimination: Monitoring the implementation of the UN](#)

[Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Canada in collaboration with the Canadian Association of Statutory Human Rights Agencies.](#)

- Elia, G. P. (1979). The determinants of job satisfaction among beginning librarians. *Library Quarterly*, 49(3), 283–302.
- Hill, H. (2013). [Disability and accessibility in the library and information science literature: A content analysis.](#) *Library & Information Science Research*, 35(2), 137–142.
- Horenstein, B. (1993). Job satisfaction of academic librarians: An examination of the relationships between satisfaction, faculty status, and participation. *College & Research Libraries*, 54(3), 255–269.
- Hudson, D. J. (2017). [On “diversity” as anti-racism in library and information studies: A critique.](#) *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*, 1(1), 1–36.
- Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., & Gibson, W. M. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 193–200.
- Jones, M. K. (2016). [Disability and perceptions of work and management.](#) *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 54(1), 83–113.
- Kandiuk, M. (2014). [Promoting racial and ethnic diversity among Canadian academic librarians.](#) *College & Research Libraries*, 75(4), 492–556.
- Keller, R. M., & Galgay, C. E. (2010). Microaggressive experiences of people with disabilities. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: manifestation, dynamics and impact* (pp. 241–267). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kumaran, M., & Cai, H. (2015). [Identifying the visible minority librarians in Canada: A national survey.](#) *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice*, 10(2)..
- Leckie, G. J., & Brett, J. (1997). Job satisfaction of Canadian university librarians: A national survey. *College & Research Libraries*, 58(1), 31–47.
- Lim, S. (2008). [Job satisfaction of information technology workers in academic libraries.](#) *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(2), 115–121.
- Millard, D. M. (2018). [Librarians in Canada.](#) *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 3(1), 99–111.
- Mirfakhrai, M. H. (2008). [Correlates of job satisfaction among academic librarians in the United States.](#) *Journal of Library Administration*, 14(1), 117–131.

- Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, V., & Triantafyllou, K. (2015). [Job satisfaction and work values: Investigating sources of job satisfaction with respect to information professionals](#). *Library and Information Science Research*, 37(2), 164–170.
- Montei, M., Adams, G., & Eggers, L. (1996). Validity of scores on the attitudes toward diversity scale (ATDS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(2), 293–303.
- Morgan, C. (2014). [Craft and librarianship: A reconsideration of the sources of librarian job satisfaction](#). *Journal of Library Administration*, 54(8), 637–658.
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). [The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done?](#) *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301–314.
- O'Neill, A.-M., & Urquhart, C. (2011). [Accommodating employees with disabilities: Perceptions of Irish academic library managers](#). *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 17(2), 234–258.
- Preston, C. (1998). [Perceptions of discriminatory practices and attitudes: A survey of African American librarians](#). *College & Research Libraries*, 59(5), 433–444.
- Rentsch, J., & Steel, R. (1992). Construct and concurrent validation of the Andrews and Withey job satisfaction questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 357–367.
- Richards, J., Marks, A., & Loretto, W. (2016, April). [What works? Coping at work with a common mental health condition](#). In A. Marks (Chair), International Labour Process Conference, Berlin.
- Robert, P.M., & Harlan, S.L. (2006). [Mechanisms of disability discrimination in large bureaucratic organizations: Ascriptive inequalities in the workplace](#). *The Sociological Quarterly*, 47(4), 599-630.
- Roulstone, A., & Williams, J. (2014). [Being disabled, being a manager: "Glass partitions" and conditional identities in the contemporary workplace](#). *Disability & Society*, 29(1), 16-29.
- Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). London, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Schonfeld, R. C., & Sweeney, L. (2017). [Inclusion, diversity, and equity: Members of the Association of Research Libraries employee demographics and director perspectives](#), 35.
- Schur, L., Han, K., Kim, A., Ameri, M., Blanck, P., & Kruse, D. (2017). [Disability at work: A look back and forward](#). *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 27(4), 482–497.

- Schur, L., Kruse, D., Blasi, J., & Blanck, P. (2009). [Is disability disabling in all workplaces? Workplace disparities and corporate culture](#). *Industrial Relations*, 48(3), 381–410.
- Shigaki, C. L., Anderson, K. M., Howald, C. L., Henson, L., & Gregg, B. E. (2012). [Disability on campus: A perspective from faculty and staff](#). *Work*, 42(4), 559–571.
- Sierpe, E. (1999). Job satisfaction among librarians in English-language universities in Quebec. *Library & Information Science Research*, 21(4), 479–499.
- Snyder, L. A., Carmichael, J. S., Blackwell, L. V., Cleveland, J. N., & Thornton, G. C. (2010). [Perceptions of discrimination and justice among employees with disabilities](#). *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 22(1), 5–19.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713.
- Thornton, J. K. (2000). [Job satisfaction of librarians of African descent employed in ARL academic libraries](#). *College & Research Libraries*, 61(3), 217–232.
- Togia, A., Koustelios, A., & Tsigilis, N. (2004). [Job satisfaction among Greek academic librarians](#). *Library & Information Science Research*, 26(3), 373–383.
- Traynor, M., & Wade, B. (1993). [The development of a measure of job satisfaction for use in monitoring the morale of community nurses in four trusts](#). *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 18(1), 127–136.
- Uppal, S. (2005). [Disability, workplace characteristics and job satisfaction](#). *International Journal of Manpower*, 26(4), 336–349.
- Villanueva-Flores, M., Valle-Cabrera, R., & Bornay-Barrachina, M. (2014). [Career development and individuals with physical disabilities](#). *Career Development International*, 19(2), 222–243.

Appendix 1: Survey questions

1. How satisfied are you with these aspects of your job? (5 point scale: very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied)

- The feeling of accomplishment I get from my work
- The contributions I make to the library
- The contributions I make to support library users/patrons
- The amount of growth and development I get from my work
- The opportunities I have to advance in my career
- The opportunities for professional development and training
- The opportunities to develop leadership or management skills
- The amount of time available to finish my work
- My workload
- The amount of work-related stress I encounter
- My work-life balance
- The amount of pressure to accomplish a lot of work
- The extent to which I can use my skills
- The amount of challenge in my job
- The amount of time spent on tasks that use my skills fully
- The opportunities to work on challenging projects
- The degree to which I feel part of a team environment
- The amount of support I receive from my supervisor
- The amount of support I receive from my colleagues
- My colleagues' willingness to provide informal help and mentoring
- The degree to which I feel accepted by colleagues
- The degree to which I am treated fairly
- How much my ideas and opinions count at work
- The degree of input I have into decisions that impact my work
- The degree of control I have over how I do my work
- The degree of flexibility I have in my work schedule
- The amount of independence I have in my work

2. Please add any comments you have about your satisfaction with your job or working conditions.

3. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements related to diversity and accessibility in your workplace. (5 point scale: strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

- Diversity is valued in my workplace
- My workplace is welcoming to everyone
- People are willing to do things differently to be inclusive

- We try to hire people with diverse backgrounds
- Everyone is treated the same in my workplace
- Everyone is treated fairly in my workplace
- Our workplace policies attempt to ensure that everyone is treated consistently
- Management is flexible about making different arrangements to meet different employee needs
- Management is genuinely interested in employee opinions and ideas
- People with different ideas are valued in my workplace
- I can disagree with my supervisor without fear of repercussions
- My workplace is accessible for employees with disabilities
- My workplace is accepting of employees with disabilities
- Management has a good understanding of disability related issues and concerns
- My colleagues are familiar with disability related issues and concerns
- People are willing to do things differently to accommodate employees with disabilities

4. Please add any comments you have about diversity and accessibility in your workplace.

5. How many years of experience as a librarian do you have? Choices: 0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, 24+

6. How old are you? Choices: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+

7. What gender do you identify with? Choices: Male, female, other

8. Do you belong to a minority group (some examples: visible minority, Muslim, aboriginal, LGBTQ)? Choices: yes, no

9. Do you have a condition or illness (e.g. physical or mental health related) that impacts how you do your work? Choices: yes, no

10. How many librarians are there in your workplace? Choices: 0-9, 10-19, 20+

11. Are you in a management or supervisory position? Choices: yes, no

12. Are you working in a permanent stream position (tenure or continuing appointment)? Choices: yes, no

13. Do you work: Choices: full time, part time

14. Does someone close to you have a disability? Choices: yes, no

15. Do you consider yourself a person with a disability? Choices: yes, no (if respondent answers yes, continue to next section; if no, end survey)

Disability-specific questions (only asked if answer to question 15 was yes)

16. Is your disability/are your disabilities: Choices: visible, invisible, both visible and invisible

17. How long have you had your disability (or disabilities)? Choices: Since birth, more than 5 years, less than 5 years

18. Does your supervisor know that you have a disability? Choices: yes, somewhat, no

19. How many of your colleagues know that you have a disability? Choices: none, a few, most or all

20. Have you requested accommodation for your disability (or disabilities) in your current job? Choices: yes, no

If yes: was your request granted? Choices: yes, no

Did your accommodation request have any negative consequences? Choices: yes, no

If yes, what? (text)

If no: Why haven't you requested accommodation? (check all that apply)

- I don't need accommodation
- Accommodations aren't available
- I'm not sure how
- The process is too complicated
- The process is too stressful
- I don't want to ask unless absolutely necessary
- Fear of colleague reactions
- Fear of supervisor reactions
- Fear of negative impact on my job
- Fear of impact on tenure or promotion opportunities
- Fear that I'll be seen or treated differently
- Other _____

21. Please discuss any strategies related to your disability that you use to do your job successfully.

22. Have you experienced discrimination at work because of your disability? Choices: yes, no

23. Have you experienced harassment at work because of your disability? Choices: yes, no

24. How often have you experienced the following at work: (5 point scale: never, rarely, sometimes, often, always)

- Someone tries to help me, even though I don't need help
- Someone assumes I am less capable or skilled because of my disability
- Someone minimizes my disability
- Someone asks prying personal questions about my disability
- Someone makes negative comments or jokes about disability
- Someone avoids me because of my disability
- Someone is uncomfortable or doesn't know how to act because of my disability
- Someone assumes I am less productive because of my disability

25. If you have faced any other difficulties at work because of your disability, please discuss them here.

26. If there is anything else about your work experience as an academic librarian with a disability that you want to add, please comment here.

27. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up interview to help provide a more in-depth understanding of the work experiences of academic librarians with disabilities?

Choices: yes, no

28. If respondent answers yes to #27, ask: Please provide your name and contact information. (This information will be removed from the rest of your survey data, and your responses will remain anonymous)

Appendix 2: Interview questions

1. What do you do in your job?
2. What is your library like as a workplace?
3. What employee traits are most valued at your library?
4. What effect does your disability have at work?
5. How has your disability created problems or difficulties for you at work?
6. How have you dealt with these problems or difficulties?
7. What could be changed at work to help make things easier for you?
8. How has your disability helped you as a librarian?
9. Is there anything else you'd like to add about your work experiences as an academic librarian with a disability?