



Education for Librarianship

DONALD G. DAVIS, JR.

A SURVEY OF American education for librarianship in the past century requires that one begin more than a decade before a formal instructional program in the profession came into being, and bring that story to the present. Fortunately, library educators have exhibited interest in the history of their movement from its early years, and capable scholars have presented both histories of individual schools and periodic summary interpretations, as well as detailed studies of specific chronological periods.¹ The following essay attempts to draw this body of literature together and to put it into a general framework. The century of development divides into seven periods of varying length, each comprising a separate unit, but each building on the continuing issues or problem solutions of the previous period. A brief view of the state of librarianship since the mid-nineteenth century will help to establish a setting for discussion of the half-century following 1876.

THE PRELUDE: BEFORE 1876

In the second half of the nineteenth century librarians, not unlike practitioners of other professions, assumed their positions with a great variety of background preparation. The custodians of collections prepared themselves for their responsibilities according to their abilities and opportunities.² Although biographical sketches and reminiscences provide a complete spectrum of variation, several methods of preparation proved helpful. Experience gained from exposure to current library operations and from attention to the existing professional literature was the most common avenue of training. The ways in which this experience took place varied. Mary Wright Plummer outlined three common methods in 1901: learning

Donald G. Davis, Jr., is Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Texas at Austin.

through personal confrontation of library problems in one's own institution; learning by observing in another library for two or three weeks and gradually modifying its system to fit one's own; and learning by a kind of apprentice instruction, most often in college libraries, whereby one gained basic principles and practices of library practice.³

These approaches frequently were combined in a kind of informal apprenticeship in the larger libraries under the general supervision of leading librarians such as Justin Winsor and William Frederick Poole. The former suggested the following steps for organizers of libraries in 1876:

1. Procure what is in print.
2. Send to any library which is a fit exemplar, and ask for its rules and reports.
3. Take time to study all these documents and when you have got a clear idea of what a library is, and how it should be maintained, consider closely the fitness of this or that library to this or that community, or to those conditions under which you are to work.
4. If you have no time, resign your trust to some one who has, and who has a correct appreciation of the old adage that those who help themselves are soonest helped by others.
5. After studying and problems are still unsolved, write to an old librarian but do not be surprised at the diversity of opinion among experts.
6. Choose that which you naturally take to; run to it, and do not decide that the other is not perfectly satisfactory to him who chose that.
7. Whichever you have chosen, study to improve it.⁴

Among the few works devoted to librarianship from which the librarian could draw were the national surveys of Jewett (1851)⁵ and Rhee (1859)⁶ and several journals such as *Norton's Literary Gazette*, *American Journal of Education*, and *Publishers' Weekly*, established in 1851, 1855 and 1872, respectively. The latter included a regular section of particular interest to librarians. In the *Publishers' Weekly* column "The Library Corner," for February 7, 1874, appeared a letter from George Washington Fentress of the San Jose (California) Library Association—probably the first public reference in America to the need for special training in librarianship. He wrote about the need for "men educated for library work" and added "I think it is a

Education for Librarianship

distinct profession and should have special training.”⁷ However, the subject was not pursued in print until 1876.

1876 to 1919: PIONEER EFFORTS

The prospectus for the new *American Library Journal* excerpted a segment from Winsor's 1869 report of the Boston Public Library which indicated in part the purpose for the new journal:

“We have no schools of bibliographical and bibliothecal training whose graduates can guide the formation of and assume management within the fast increasing libraries of our country, and the demand may, perhaps, never warrant their establishment; but every library with a fair experience can afford inestimable instruction to another in its movitiate; and there have been no duties of my office to which I have given more hearty attention than those that have led to the granting of what we could from our experience to the representatives of other libraries, whether coming with inquiries fitting a collection as large as Cincinnati is to establish, or merely seeking such matters as concern the establishment of a village library.”

To further these and like purposes it is proposed to publish an *American Library Journal*. The rapid growth of libraries in this country makes such a medium of exchanging experience vitally necessary, and it will be a means of economizing both time and money. The *Journal* is meant to be eminently practical, not antiquarian.⁸

Not only did the journal attempt to fulfill the need for library education in the autumn of 1876, but the compendium *Public Libraries in the United States*⁹ also did its share to spread information and stimulate ideas and the fledgling American Library Association (ALA) held promise of facilitating discussion among professional peers.

While formal education for librarianship was not a subject for discussion in these efforts, each in its way contributed to the generation of interest on the part of librarians, and others, in the need for avenues to facilitate the spread of beneficial professional information and the possibility for joint professional action. These needs, implicit in the formative months of a century ago, expressed themselves explicitly within the next decade.

That Melvil Dewey represented the prime moving force for formal education for librarianship has not been questioned from his time to

the present, although his ideas and methods have led to lively debate. Building on the consensus of his peers, Dewey sought in 1879 to promote an organized apprenticeship program under the auspices of the libraries and librarians which represented the best current practice. He further suggested that "perhaps by and by we may have one central library school where all will want to finish off."¹⁰ However, the librarians involved did not demonstrate interest and the notion languished. The movement of Dewey to Columbia College in 1883 as librarian brought with it the possibility of a library school being established. Hoping to enlist the support of the American Library Association in his proposed school, Dewey presented his tentative plans for consideration at the 1883 conference in Buffalo, initiating the liveliest discussion in the organization's short history. Expressing guarded approval, the body voted "to express its gratification that the trustees of Columbia College are considering the propriety of giving instruction in library work, and hopes that the experiment may be tried."¹¹ The debate symbolized the diversity of opinion on professional training that has persisted to the present.

The launching of the School of Library Economy's first class of twenty students on January 5, 1887, was the beginning of an experiment to see whether and how librarians could be taught within a formal framework. (For two years Dewey had conducted small training classes for his Columbia library staff members, several of which soon took other positions because of their training experience.¹²) As he attempted to incorporate lectures, readings, seminars, library visits, problems, and work experiences into the curriculum, Dewey enlisted the aid of many of the eminent librarians of his day as visiting lecturers and sought to wed theoretical presentation and acquaintance with practical library operations. While the first four-month course was later expanded, the comment of a student in that first class strikes a chord familiar to later students: "The time was all too short, however, to thoroughly conquer the vast amount of detail, and the apprenticeship term was of great value in confirming our uncertain impression of what we had been taught."¹³

The future of the experiment was secured by the transfer of the school to the New York State Library in Albany in 1889 when Dewey accepted a position there following differences with the Columbia College trustees. With more freedom to develop his ideas, a pattern of library education emerged that would serve as a norm for several decades: a two-year program developing from an emphasis on practice (apprentice) work to more systematic classroom instruction.¹⁴ By

the end of the century, at least six programs of various types had come into existence and the organized profession began to monitor the preparation of its practitioners more closely.¹⁵

The ALA committee established in 1883 to watch the progress of Dewey's school made periodic reports beginning in 1885. Expanded to become a liaison body between the profession and all library schools, the committee was relatively inactive until 1900 when, under the chairmanship of John Cotton Dana, it made an analytical report on the four existing schools—Albany, Pratt, Drexel, and Illinois. This highly critical report called upon the ALA to assume a stronger role in library education and suggested the establishment of some form of endorsement to be given or withheld.¹⁶ The result was the establishment of the Committee on Library Training, which in 1903 presented a survey of the whole array of training programs and recommended the establishment of a standing committee of eight persons representing a cross section of the profession, a public listing of training agencies, development of training standards, and evaluation of schools by those standards. Although in 1906 the committee's standards and school evaluation were accepted by ALA, the information was not publicized as the committee had hoped. Lists of some schools appeared, however, in the ALA *Handbook* from 1907 until 1909.

Although the ALA seemed reluctant to take leadership in education for librarianship, specialized segments of the profession did seem prepared to do so. The short-lived Round Table on Professional Instruction in Bibliography voiced concern in 1901 regarding the overemphasis on technical training in library schools rather than on the scholarly aspects of librarianship.¹⁷ Faculties of library schools met for the first recorded time at the 1907 ALA Conference in Asheville. Although it was an inauspicious meeting, the group also met the following year with the Committee on Library Training. By 1909 the ALA established the school faculties as the Section on Professional Training for Librarianship in order to provide a forum for the discussion of all forms of library training. When the interests of the majority of section members appeared to be training classes and summer schools, the library school faculties formed their own Round Table of Library School Instructors and met for the first time on January 5, 1911, with sixteen persons from nine schools. In 1915 this body voted to become the Association of American Library Schools (AALS).¹⁸ The formation of this body outside the ALA was greeted with mixed reaction by library practitioners.

The decade following the establishment of the AALS witnessed a

great deal of activity in the organization, critical examination, and orientation of education for librarianship. Soon after the faculties of library schools began meeting separately in 1911, they needed to ascertain which institutional representatives to welcome. Not only was variation in standards great among the higher-level schools, but there were also special-purpose courses and schools at academic and technical institutions, training classes at larger libraries (primarily for their employees), and institutes and summer schools.¹⁹ The Committee on Library Training examined the schools in 1914-15 based on its low 1906 standards, and presumably all schools with at least a one-year program received visits. In 1915, chairman Azariah S. Root admitted that he was looking to the new AALS to act positively on standards. This hope was not realized, since the AALS did little more to establish its standards than to formulate common denominators of conditions prevailing in its ten charter schools.²⁰ The indecision and confusion of these years seemed resolved by ALA action in 1923.

In 1915, the Carnegie Corporation turned its attention to library education. After denying a request for funds from Melvil Dewey in 1890, Andrew Carnegie had agreed in 1903 to provide endowment funds for a library school at Western Reserve University. Having funded local libraries, the need for capably trained staff was urgent. Additional funds went to the training programs at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, Atlanta, and the New York Public Library.²¹ Alvin S. Johnson surveyed the provision of free library buildings and the state of library schools and their products, publishing his report to the Carnegie Corporation in 1916. According to Vann, "a dismal picture emerged" with regard to personnel; library schools did not fare much better.²² In 1918 the Carnegie Corporation authorized Charles Williamson to investigate library training. He conferred with sixteen librarians during the 1918 ALA conference and published his findings in *Library Journal*.²³ The paper criticized library schools, suggested several avenues of improvement, but most significantly challenged and warned the profession of its failure to bring forth a plan to assure that educational needs might be met. His suggestion of a general agency to coordinate the various training programs did not seem to evoke much discussion at the AALS meeting in March 1919, even though it had caused a stir in the profession.

1919 TO 1924: PROFESSIONAL DEBATE

Both to contemporaries and in retrospect, the annual ALA meeting in June 1919 was noteworthy. World War I, in which the profession

had honored itself through the Library War Service Program, was over. Attention turned to library service at home—the diffusion of books and libraries to inadequately served segments of the nation and the training of personnel to carry out these programs. What American organization could accomplish for efforts overseas, it could also do for itself.²⁴ Although several speakers dealt with various aspects of training for librarians of special groups, Charles Williamson, a member of the ALA committee to survey library service in the postwar environment, presented his personal reflections in “Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training” to a general session. He proposed “the organization of all training activities and facilities into one system under the general direction of an A.L.A. Training Board, with a permanent staff and a competent expert as its executive, and empowered to work out and adopt a scheme of standards of fitness for all grades of library service and to grant appropriate certificates to properly qualified persons.”²⁵ Functions of that agency would be: (1) to formulate a grading scheme for library positions, (2) to determine minimal standards of training and experience for each level and issue certificates, and (3) to examine and accredit schools meeting appropriate standards.

Focusing primarily on the certification provisions, the designated ALA committees continued to struggle with the minimum requirements for certification as a professional librarian; these inevitably contained provisions for graduation from an approved library school. When it finally appeared that neither the ALA Council nor the AALS would respond actively to attempts by the Committee on Library Training to secure standardized and modified criteria for summer school and training class programs, the committee, acknowledging its own weakness, stated that the time was at hand for ALA to “exercise a more positive influence over the various library training agencies of the country.”²⁶ After more debate, the ALA Council finally voted on April 24, 1923, “that a temporary Library Training Board be appointed by the Executive Board to investigate the field of library training, to formulate tentative standards for all forms of library training agencies, to devise a plan for accrediting such agencies and to report to the Council.”²⁷

Williamson’s report, *Training for Library Service*,²⁸ on which he had been working since 1920, appeared some four months later and helped to provide direction to the new agency, which in 1924 became the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL). The study had included fourteen “approved” schools (Albany, Atlanta, Berkeley,

Boston, Brooklyn, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Madison, Columbia, Pittsburgh, Seattle, St. Louis, Syracuse, and Urbana) as well as the school in Riverside, California. A landmark survey, similar in significance to Carnegie studies of the period in other professions, the Williamson report had a far-reaching effect on librarianship and its educational institutions. Its recommendations in summary form were:

1. There is a difference between professional and clerical work in libraries and education, and library schools should train only professionals.
2. There was little agreement among the schools as to the relative importance of subjects, and courses should be standardized.
3. A standardized entrance examination was needed.
4. Many instructors were not qualified to teach graduate students, and quality could be raised by better salaries. More full time instructors (at least 4 for each school) and more textbooks were needed. Field work is important.
5. Financial support for schools was inadequate, and each school needed an independent budget.
6. Recruitment of students was hindered by the low salaries and poor working conditions. There was no need for new schools, and the existing ones should offer scholarships to attract good students.
7. Library schools should be organized as a department of a university to maintain prestige, proper standards, and good people.
8. Library service is growing highly specialized. Schools should offer 2-year courses: the first year for general principles and the second for specialization.
9. Library workers should seek continued professional growth and improvement. Correspondence studies should be developed.
10. There were no standards for fitness for library work. A system for certification for librarians should be developed, and library schools should be standardized through accreditation.
11. Special courses should be developed to train librarians for small libraries with limited budgets.²⁹

The establishment of the BEL signaled a new direction in education for librarianship. Although Dewey organized the first library school, Williamson nearly forty years later pressed the idea that the ALA had

Education for Librarianship

a responsibility to create an agency to accredit the profession's schools. "Upon the implementation of that concept by the establishment of the Temporary Library Training Board, the pioneer period in the history of training for librarianship had come to an end."³⁰

1924 TO 1936: FIRM FOUNDATIONS

Following a year of fact-gathering through surveys, conferences, and open meetings, the Temporary Library Training Board recommended the creation of a permanent Board of Education for Librarianship to exercise general supervision over library education by fulfilling about a dozen specific functions, including determining appropriate standards, applying them to schools, and publishing a list of the accredited agencies.

The establishment of the BEL in June 1924 marked a turning point in the consolidation of American library education. Supported by the widely discussed and debated findings of the Williamson report, the board began its work almost immediately and by the end of the decade a number of positive contributions were evident. Minimum standards appeared in 1925 and 1926 for library schools, summer courses, training and apprenticeship classes, and school library curricula. BEL further sponsored two summer institutes for library science teachers, conducted a curriculum study to gain information for use in designing instructional materials, and commissioned seven textbooks on aspects of librarianship.³¹

The BEL was aided in its work by the initiation of the Carnegie Corporation's Ten Year Program in Library Service which began in 1926 in order to implement some of Williamson's recommendations. Although the corporation had been supporting four library schools since the early 1900s and had generously underwritten the BEL and its predecessor, it now provided substantial endowments to the ALA (\$2 million) and the new Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago (\$1 million), with additional funds for support. Within the next fifteen years, the corporation distributed nearly \$1.9 million to seventeen new and existing library schools, and more than \$100,000 for study fellowships.³² In many of these ventures the BEL cooperated and served in an advisory capacity to the corporation. Support of this level, particularly during the depression, sustained a period of orderly development in education for librarianship.

The *Minimum Standards for Library Schools*, adopted in 1925, included categories for junior undergraduate library schools, senior

undergraduate library schools, graduate library schools, and advanced graduate library schools.³³ The first two groups did not require a college degree for admission; the last category required both a college degree as well as completion of a one-year professional program. Although no advanced program existed at that time, during the following year the establishment of the Graduate Library School at Chicago was announced. Its purpose was to do "for the librarian's profession what the Johns Hopkins Medical School and the Harvard Law School have accomplished in their respective fields."³⁴ Thus an idea that had been generating for several years became a reality. The contributions of this school—diversely qualified faculty, research-oriented curricula, publications and conferences—have been well recognized. Graduates of the doctoral program, established in 1928, provided new leadership in library education. The founding of the Chicago school was perhaps of greater significance to education for librarianship than was the founding forty years earlier of the Columbia school.

The establishment of the BEL in 1924 and the expansion of its influence in the following decade nearly rendered the AALS defunct. After an inactive period, it came back to life in the late 1920s. While it continued to provide a forum for library school faculties to present and discuss problems in their teaching, it did not function as a *de facto* accrediting agency as it had before the 1925 standards. After 1927, its membership was determined by the schools approved by the BEL. In time, the strained relations between the AALS and the BEL mitigated. One event contributing to this was cooperation of both bodies on the revision of standards, adopted in 1933,³⁵ which reduced much of the quantitative, specific provisions of 1926 to a broadened, qualitative statement with three types of schools, one of which did not require completion of college for admission. The other event was the appearance in 1930 of the report of the ALA activities committee which suggested closer cooperation between the two bodies. By the late 1930s educators and practitioners seemed to be working together. Former board members were directing library schools, and school administrators and deans were serving on the board.³⁶

Two practitioner groups—school and special librarians—sought aid in securing appropriate training for their new members. Both groups wanted library schools to modify the traditional curriculum emphasis, aimed at producing generalists, to accommodate their peculiar demands. Neither group made much headway with either the BEL or the schools in the AALS, although the special librarians finally helped

Education for Librarianship

to spur interest in curriculum revision within the schools after 1938. The school librarians turned to undergraduate programs, which burgeoned during this period but enjoyed little support beyond the agreement on standards from the BEL.

The Great Depression caught the library schools in an expansion phase fostered by the BEL. Not until 1932 did the board reverse itself. By 1936 there were twice as many accredited schools as there had been AALS member schools twelve years earlier. Among the newly established schools was McGill University, which in 1929 became the first accredited Canadian library school.³⁷ In retrospect, the argument that librarians were in oversupply is less convincing than the fact that the depression had temporarily forced the reduction in the employment of librarians. As the need for librarians became apparent again, the schools were ill prepared to meet the challenge.

1936 TO 1951: CREATIVE RETHINKING

The late 1930s witnessed the wane of Carnegie funding, the BEL losing its early momentum, and library schools readjusting to the economic and educational pressures of the decade. The implementation of the 1933 standards and the maturation of the Graduate Library School at Chicago seemed to foster a period of reexamination, critical assessment, new proposals, and educational experimentation. A consensus seemed to develop after World War II that achieved partial consolidation in the 1951 standards.

During these years and particularly in the 1940s, at least seven major studies appeared on the subject of education for librarianship. Consisting of surveys, observations, and proposals, these reports stimulated interest in change and seemed to suggest another level of development in library education beyond that undertaken in the formal reorganization of 1924-36. Among the more significant of these studies were Munn's *Condition and Trends in Education for Librarianship* (1936), Reece's *The Curriculum in Library Schools* (1936), Wilson's "The American Library School Today" (1937), Munthe's *American Librarianship from a European Angle* (1939), Metcalf, Russell, and Osborn's *Program of Instruction in Library Schools* (1943), Wheeler's *Progress & Problems in Education for Librarianship* (1946), Danton's *Education for Librarianship: Criticisms, Dilemmas and Proposals* (1946), and Leigh's "The Education of Librarians" (1952).³⁸ These works tended to touch on common themes, such as the unfortunate dwelling on routines and "technique" in the curricula, the lack of

application of theory to real problems, the need for flexibility in curricula and emphasis on administration as a subject, the need to differentiate the levels of instruction required for various library personnel, and the great variation among types of accredited schools in quality of education.

Along with the written documents, the profession participated in some ten special conferences on library education from 1940 through 1948: Chicago, 1940; Urbana, 1943; Buffalo and Chicago, 1946; Urbana, Berkeley, and New York, 1947; Atlanta, Chicago, and Princeton, 1948. Of these, the 1948 Chicago and Princeton conferences seemed to recapitulate much of the ferment of the preceding dozen years. The University of Chicago conference featured outstanding educators and practitioners addressing themselves to general problem areas. While no consensus resulted—by design of the planners—the proceedings have become a classic. In his introduction to them, Berelson wrote: "Historians of American librarianship will undoubtedly note the years 1946 to 1950 as a period of major revision in the system of library education in this country, perhaps of equal importance to the period of the 1920s which was characterized by the Williamson Report and by the establishment of the Board of Education for Librarianship and the Graduate Library School."³⁹

The conference at Princeton University, sponsored by the Council of National Library Associations, sought to reach a consensus, and presented nine recommendations to the profession, even though it had no official power. It recommended a joint committee on education for librarianship for communication between library schools and professional groups, an expanded *AALS Newsletter*, a determined recruitment effort, accreditation by BEL of library education of all types and at all levels, leadership of the BEL in guiding new programs, a survey of the needs for special library training, an investigation of the place of undergraduate programs, expanded financial support for the BEL, and an ALA placement agency.⁴⁰

The problems of education for librarianship had come to a head in the environment of post-World War II academic growth and library expansion. By 1950, nine reasonably distinct types of library education programs could be identified. The chairman of the BEL announced that the 1933 *Minimum Requirements for Library Schools* would undergo revision as a joint effort of the BEL, AALS, and the ALA Library Education Division (an outgrowth in 1946 of the Professional Training Section and Round Table). The *Standards for Accreditation* received ALA approval on July 15, 1951, and the *State-*

Education for Librarianship

ment of Interpretation appeared the following year. The new document, (and thus the BEL) concerned itself only with the "basic program of education for librarianship covering a minimum of five academic years of study beyond the secondary school."⁴¹ While this general provision made for flexibility in various programs, the awarding of the master's degree effectively prevented undergraduate programs from achieving reaccreditation. The *Standards* represented a new plateau in professional education.

1951 TO 1960: CAUTIOUS READJUSTMENT

The basic decisions of the postwar years ending with the new 1951 standards were worked out in the decade following their approval. Although a national moratorium on accrediting delayed examination of new and established schools until 1953, by 1957 the work was completed. The new standards provided for certain variation in interpretation, but they also required a minimum of graduate-level work which forced several former undergraduate schools to upgrade their programs and others to forego accreditation by ALA.

Before the new standards had been fully implemented in the schools, an ALA reorganization divided the functions served by the BEL between two other agencies, and after thirty-two years the board went out of existence in 1956. The Library Education Division (LED) assumed responsibility for the survey and promotion of education for librarianship on all levels, and the new Committee on Accreditation (COA) continued responsibility for first professional degree programs, including standards maintenance and accreditation.⁴²

Both the BEL and the AALS had expressed concern about the expanding number of undergraduate programs. If the profession exerted no control over these, the argument ran, it could hardly complain about the results. Although library educators differed as to what stance should be taken, standards for undergraduate training received ALA council approval in 1959 and served to "guide" teacher education programs, most of which were seeking accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.⁴³

In addition to undergraduate programs, library educators began to think more seriously about those at the doctoral level. During the late 1940s, Illinois and Michigan had joined Chicago in offering the Ph.D. In the next decade, Columbia, Berkeley, Western Reserve, and Rutgers joined them. The graduates of these schools formed the base from which came the expansion of the 1960s. Prior to 1951, the three

schools with doctoral programs had awarded twenty-seven degrees; in the next decade eighty-three students earned doctorates.⁴⁴

During this decade of readjustment, library schools seemed to get a new burst of enthusiasm. Their association became somewhat more active and visible. During 1955-56 Harold Lancour served concurrent terms as chairman of the BEL and as president of the AALS. Although his far-reaching proposals to the school association did not gain immediate acceptance, they pointed the way to a more productive organization.⁴⁵ (A decade later eight Canadian schools formed the Canadian Association of Library Schools.⁴⁶) Enrollment expanded also, growing from a school average of 79 students in 1950 to 138 in 1960.⁴⁷

1960 TO 1970: DYNAMIC EXPANSION

There is no doubt that the decade of the 1960s witnessed the most dramatic growth that the profession has yet seen. The restructuring of, and the increase in demands upon, education for librarianship which took place in the previous decade set the stage for what was to come. Throughout the twenty-five years following the close of World War II, the expansion of library services grew steadily. As the standards of the profession rose, more trained librarians were needed to fill vacated or new positions in all types of libraries. In the mid-1950s a trickle of federal legislation, beginning with the Library Services Act of 1956, initiated financial support to libraries which had grown to a steady stream a decade later. These funds caused an increased need for more personnel in first public, and then school, academic, and special libraries. The programs undertaken by these appropriations encouraged outreach into neglected segments of society: the rural and urban poor, the racial and ethnic minorities, and people deprived of cultural and educational opportunities.

Having put their own houses in order, library educators acted in concert to meet these challenges. The Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education became increasingly aware of its responsibilities, and following several years of agitation by library educators, appointed in 1963 Sarah R. Reed as Library Education Specialist; she acted as liaison between the federal government and the various library education agencies. About one year earlier, nearly ninety participants had attended a four-day institute on the future of library education at the library school of Western Reserve University. Co-sponsored by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of

Education for Librarianship

Education, the institute proposed that ALA seek funding for "the study and development of a national plan to develop library schools."⁴⁸ The resulting Commission on a National Plan for Library Education took shape early in 1963. Eventually composed of some fifty members, it sought to assess the professional personnel needs of the library profession and to recommend appropriate actions to meet those needs in the years immediately ahead.

One of the concrete achievements of the commission's recommendations was the establishment within the ALA of the Office for Library Education in 1966, with the five-year matching support of the H.W. Wilson Foundation. Responsible for promoting coordination of library education activities (including accreditation) of the ALA, the office, under the direction of Lester Asheim, represented a new level of concern for education for librarianship and the utilization of library manpower. Some of the functions of general coordination delegated to the former BEL reappeared. The office's carefully prepared statement on "Library Education and Manpower," which has been widely discussed, seemed to fulfill in part the original mandate of the commission when it became official ALA policy in 1970.⁴⁹

The alleged shortage of trained library personnel had been the subject of active concern to the profession since the early 1960s, and among the suggested measures for meeting the "crisis" were an active recruitment program and the training of library technicians who could perform essential services that would free the limited number of professionally qualified people for other work. The net result of these forces was the expansion of library education programs, accredited and otherwise, from community college through doctoral level studies. In 1962 the first new library school program since 1953 was accredited, but by the end of the decade there were more.

One innovation, which paralleled the former sixth-year master's programs offered before the establishment of the 1951 standards, was the sixth-year certificate program designed to enable librarians to receive specialized and continuing education. Providing an alternative between the master's and doctoral degree programs, these options seemed to be meeting a need in the profession. The oldest of the programs was that of Columbia, initiated in 1961; by 1969 twenty had been established.⁵⁰

Recognizing the need for additional faculty to educate librarians to serve the nation's expanding library systems, the federal government provided funding for assistance in professional study, aimed pri-

marily at prospective library school faculty members, and for the support of short institutes, aimed primarily at practitioners. The Higher Education Act of 1965 supported 6,532 librarians in institutes through fiscal 1970. Federal encouragement through financial support coincided with the establishment of new doctoral programs at eleven new schools between 1961 and 1971.⁵¹

The "need for change," a slogan of the decade, reflected itself in the focus of the profession's concerns, and consequently in the curriculum of library schools.⁵² "Innovation" and "relevance" were sought through new courses dealing with information science and behavioral sciences, more emphasis on user and potential user needs in general programs, and implementation of developing teaching strategies and educational technology. In order to provide library educators with an organ for communication and dissemination of useful information, the AALS launched its *Journal of Education for Librarianship* in 1960 with the help of Beta Phi Mu, the library science honor society, founded eleven years earlier.⁵³

New subject specializations arrived during this decade and found a permanent place in the curricula of library schools. While special librarians—especially those in the fields of medicine, law, theology and music—most often turned to their respective associations to provide additional special training and continuing education, the new field of documentation or (later) information science took root in many schools. Beginning with scattered courses in the 1950s at Western Reserve and Columbia Universities, conferences, surveys, and symposia sponsored by schools, government agencies, and the American Society for Information Science had fostered by the 1960s curricular sequences and concentrations in most accredited programs.⁵⁴

Even while library education was enjoying unprecedented support, growth, and apparent success in the mid- and late 1960s, signs were beginning to appear which indicated that another period of reexamination was on the way.

1970 TO 1976: CHANGING EMPHASES

As the new decade began, library educators became increasingly aware of the implications of adverse economic and political shifts in the nation. The change in U.S. presidential administrations and philosophy brought redirection of the funds enjoyed in the 1960s. The withering of federal support quickly turned the "spring of hope"

Education for Librarianship

into the "winter of despair." The slackening pace of vigorous expansion and upgrading of educational institutions, as well as less certain support for state and public libraries, seemed to make the personnel shortage vanish just as the alleged requirements appeared to be within reach.⁵⁵ While the apparent demand for library school graduates lessened and employment became somewhat more restricted, a shift in governmental priorities from doctoral fellowships to master's level support for minority students limited the anticipated growth of the advanced programs. Nevertheless, the numbers of both schools and graduates continued to increase.

One indication of the changing emphasis within the profession was the demise of the heralded ALA Office for Library Education in 1971; its functions in greatly modified form were assumed by the new Office of Library Personnel Resources, which had much broader and diffused interests. Meanwhile the Committee on Accreditation (COA) revised the *Standards for Accreditation*⁵⁶ and upon their approval in 1972 launched a four-year period of examination and reexamination of applicant schools. Although the ALA would no longer support its coordinating agency for library education, the COA was busily accrediting programs in an increasing number of schools which had been established in the 1960s to help alleviate the personnel shortage.

The variety in the accredited programs of the various schools seemed greater than ever before as the new decade began. Not only did the curricula show individual emphasis, the teaching methodologies did so as well. No longer were teaching materials in short supply. Several newer publishers joined the traditional firms to produce an abundance of textbooks. The publication of Jesse Shera's long-awaited *The Foundations of Education for Librarianship* in 1972 is an event worthy of special mention.⁵⁷ Another important work which appeared to suggest future possibilities in professional education was the survey *Targets for Research in Library Education* which dealt with ten fields needing research.⁵⁸ A third example of a fresh attempt to relate library education to a current need was Elizabeth Stone's *Continuing Library and Information Science Education*, a survey report to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science which recommended establishment of a Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE).⁵⁹

Two studies were underway in the mid-1970s which sought to untangle some of the chaotic descriptions of the state of manpower and education needs within the profession, as well as to suggest possible courses of action. The first, undertaken by the U.S. Bureau

of Labor Statistics, attempted to analyze the current manpower situation and to project the requirements and supply through 1985.⁶⁰ The second, undertaken by Ralph Conant through a grant from the H.W. Wilson Foundation, sought to examine the needs for education for librarianship in the years ahead.⁶¹

Despite the disparagements of its more impatient critics, education for librarianship has progressed a considerable distance in the past century. Undoubtedly some of the changes made appear superficial, but the upholding and transmission of traditional practices seems to be fading quickly. The current retrenchment phase in the midst of progress gives time for reflection. The words of Lester Asheim form a fitting conclusion:

The next few years may be the period of synthesis following the antithesis of the past decade—not a complete return to an earlier and more leisurely past, but not so violent a wrench as was feared by some, and sought by others. The clues to what will happen lie, of course, in the society itself, not just in library schools, or even in the broader field of librarianship. Libraries can help shape society, but they are also shaped by it. . . . Library education, a small corner of the total society, is nevertheless a sensitive barometer of the larger whole.⁶²

References

1. This survey utilizes primarily the latter two types of sources. For examples of school histories, see Trautman, Ray. *A History of the School of Library Service, Columbia University*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1954; Callaham, Betty E. "The Carnegie Library School of Atlanta (1905-25)," *Library Quarterly* 37:149-79, April 1967; and brief sketches in *Library Journal* 62:5-35, Jan. 1, 1937.
2. Vann, Sarah K. *Training for Librarianship before 1923*. Chicago, ALA, 1961, p. 5.
3. Plummer, Mary W. "Training for Librarianship," *Library Journal* 26:317, June 1901.
4. Winsor, Justin. "A Word to the Starters of Libraries," *American Library Journal* 1:2-3, Sept. 1876, as summarized in Vann, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
5. Jewett, Charles C. *Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America*. Printed by Order of Congress as an Appendix to the Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D.C., 1851.
6. Rhees, William J. *Manual of Public Libraries, Institutions, and Societies, in the United States, and British Provinces of North America*. Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott, 1859.

Education for Librarianship

7. Fentress, George W. [Letter], *Publishers' Weekly* 5:137, Feb. 7, 1874.
8. U.S. Bureau of Education. *Public Libraries in the United States of America. Special Report. Pt. I.* Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1876, p. xxviii.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Dewey, Melvil. "Apprenticeship of Librarians," *Library Journal* 4:148, May 1879.
11. American Library Association. "Proceedings, 1883," *Library Journal* 8:293, Sept.-Oct. 1883.
12. White, Carl M. *The Origins of the American Library School*. New York, Scarecrow Press, 1961, p. 62.
13. Plummer, Mary W. "The Columbia College School of Library Economy from a Student's Standpoint," *Library Journal* 12:363, Sept.-Oct. 1887; reprinted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889; Documents for a History*. New York, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 1937.
14. White, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-102.
15. Vann, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-78.
16. American Library Association. "Report of the Committee on Library Schools, 1899-1900," *Library Journal* 25:83-86, Aug. 1900.
17. Vann, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
18. Davis, Donald G., Jr. *The Association of American Library Schools: 1915-1968: An Analytical History*. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1974.
19. Tai, Tse-Chien. *Professional Education for Librarianship*. New York, H. W. Wilson, 1925, pp. 126-30; and Vann, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-78.
20. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27.
21. Vann, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-21.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
23. Williamson, Charles C. "The Need of a Plan for Library Development," *Library Journal* 43:649-55, Sept. 1918.
24. Churchwell, Charles D. *The Shaping of American Library Education* (ACRL Publications in Librarianship No. 36). Chicago, ALA, 1975, pp. 7-12.
25. Williamson, Charles C. "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 13:120, July 1919.
26. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training. "Report, 1923," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 17:195, July 1923.
27. American Library Association. "Proceedings: Council, April 24, 1923," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 17:153, July 1923.
28. Williamson, Charles C. *Training for Library Service: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Boston, D. B. Updike, 1923.
29. As summarized in Nasri, William Z. "Education in Library and Information Science: Education for Librarianship." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 7. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1972, p. 422. See also "The Williamson Report: Comment from the Library Schools," *Library Journal* 48:889-910, Nov. 1, 1923.
30. Vann, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
31. Churchwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-41.
32. Anderson, Florence. "Carnegie Corporation of New York." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 4. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1970, pp. 200-07.

33. American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship. "First Annual Report," *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 19:238-46, July 1925.
34. Keppel, F.P. "The Carnegie Corporation and the Graduate Library School: A Historical Outline," *Library Quarterly* 1:23, Jan. 1931.
35. American Library Association. "Council, Second Session: Minimum Requirements for Library Schools," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 27:610-16, Dec. 1933.
36. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 255.
37. Morton, Elizabeth H. "Library Education in Canada." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 4, New York, Marcel Dekker, 1970, pp. 144-46.
38. Carroll, C. Edward. *The Professionalization of Education for Librarianship, with Special Reference to the Years 1940-1960*. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1970. Chapter III, "The Decade of Conferences and Surveys, 1940-1950," pp. 59-143, treats some of these studies in detail. See also Nasri, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-25.
39. Berelson, Bernard, ed. *Education for Librarianship: Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948*. Chicago, ALA, 1949, p. 3.
40. Lancour, Harold, ed. *Issues in Library Education: A Report of the Conference on Library Education, Princeton University, December 11 and 12, 1948*. Ann Arbor, Mich., Council of National Library Associations, 1949, pp. 5-6.
41. "Standards for Accreditation. . . ." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 46:48-49, Feb. 1952.
42. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-70.
43. "Standards for Undergraduate Programs" and "Guide," *A.L.A. Bulletin* 52:696-700, Oct. 1958.
44. Eyman, David H., comp. *Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science: Titles Accepted by Accredited Library Schools, 1930-1972*. Ann Arbor, Mich., Xerox University Microfilms, 1973, p. v.
45. Summers, William. "Two Decisive Decades: The Emergence of Library Education," *American Libraries* 3:792, July-Aug. 1972.
46. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-64.
47. Morton, *op. cit.*
48. "Suggestions, Recommendations, and Proposals," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 3:53-60, Summer 1962.
49. Asheim, Lester. "Trends in Library Education—United States." In Melvin J. Voigt, ed. *Advances in Librarianship*. Vol. 5. New York, Academic Press, 1975, pp. 148-50.
50. Summers, *op. cit.*, p. 793. See also Danton, J. Periam, *Between M.L.S. and Ph.D.: A Study of Sixth-year Specialist Programs in Accredited Library Schools*. Chicago, ALA, 1970.
51. Summers, *op. cit.*, p. 792.
52. Nasri, *op. cit.*, pp. 427-30, surveys the postwar changes; Asheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-72, deals with more recent developments.
53. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-03.
54. Debons, Anthony. "Education in Library and Information Science: Education in Information Science." In Allen Kent and Harold Lancour, eds. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 7. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1972, pp. 468-71.

Education for Librarianship

55. Asheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-52+.
56. American Library Association Committee on Accreditation. *Standards for Accreditation*. Chicago, ALA, 1972.
57. Shera, Jesse H. *The Foundations of Education for Librarianship*. New York, Wiley, 1972.
58. Borko, Harold, ed. *Targets for Research in Library Education*. Chicago, ALA, 1973.
59. Stone, Elizabeth W. *Continuing Library and Information Science Education: Final Report to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science*. Washington, D.C., U.S. G.P.O., 1974.
60. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Library Manpower: A Study of Demand and Supply* (Bulletin 1852). Washington, D.C., U.S. G.P.O., 1975.
61. "Ralph Conant—In Pursuit of Library Education." *American Libraries* 4:663, Dec. 1973.
62. Asheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-79. Asheim summarizes the recent past and future prospects as two others evaluated library education in their day: Wilson, Louis R. "Historical Development of Education for Librarianship in the United States." In Bernard Berelson, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 44-65; and Downs, Robert B. "Education for Librarianship in the United States and Canada." In Larry E. Bone, ed. *Library Education: An International Survey*, Urbana, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1968, pp. 1-20.

DONALD G. DAVIS, JR.

APPENDIX

AALS MEMBER SCHOOLS:
GRADUATES OF BASIC AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
FOR SELECTED YEARS

Year	Schools	Basic Programs	Doctoral Programs
1919	12 ^a	188 ^b	0 ^c
1924	13 ^d	391 ^d	0 ^c
1936	26 ^e	1,025 ^e	2 ^c
1951	36 ^e	1,793 ^e	4 ^c
1960	32 ^f	1,710 ^f	21 ^c
1970	52 ^f (48 reporting)	5,569 ^f	42 ^c
1974	62 ^g (61 reporting)	7,404 ^g	41 ^h

Institutional membership criteria in AALS consisted of ALA accreditation after 1927.

Sources of statistics:

^aAALS, *Proceedings, March 7-8, 1919* (1919).

^b"News of Schools," *Library Journal* (June-Nov., 1919).

^cEyman, David H., comp. *Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science*. Ann Arbor, Mich., Xerox University Microfilms, 1973, p. v.

^dALA, Temporary Library Training Board. *Report* (1924), adjusted to AALS members.

^eALA, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Annual Reports*.

^f*North American Library Education: Directory and Statistics, 1969-1971*. Chicago, ALA, 1972, pp. 8, 13. 1970 statistics do not include Long Island University.

^gALA, Committee on Accreditation, "Statistical Data from Annual Review Reports, 1973/74," p. 26.