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Donald G. Davis, Jr. is Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Texas at Austin; and Phyllis Dain is Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York, New York.
In 1986, in connection with the New York City conference of the American Library Association, the Association for Library and Information Science Education, as part of the centenary celebration, sponsored a symposium at Columbia University on library and information science education its status and future. An integral part of this meeting was a historical consideration of the course of education for librarianship—how we got from there to here, so to speak, and with speculation about where we go from here. The intellectual basis for the symposium is a two-part series in Library Trends—the first part, issued in advance of the meeting, is devoted to the history of library education; the second, the conference papers, focuses on contemporary issues and trends.

This Library Trends number on the history of library education is not intended to be a comprehensive or definitive treatment of the subject. Although there has been a good deal of research on related topics in recent years, much more remains to be done, as there is not yet a sufficiently large body of work to draw upon for thorough syntheses. Indeed, this Library Trends issue has been conceived as a vehicle for the presentation of original research and theoretical speculation as well as summaries and evaluations of existing research and thought. The aim was to gather together a group of thoughtful, intellectually sophisticated essays on a variety of themes and topics. Some papers were commissioned de novo; others are based on research in progress or on topics on which prospective authors have already written substantially.

A number of the papers take fresh points of view and have tried in a pioneering manner to integrate research in other fields with the study of our own professional education. The results constitute early attempts and initial steps to bring interpretations of our history into the mainstream of current historical and sociological thought. The conception of library education is deliberately broad, encompassing formal and informal modes and a variety of settings—library schools, libraries, and professional associations, among others. We hope that all the contributions will provoke new thought and further exploration.
The Assessment of Dewey’s Educational Work

Melvil Dewey is, without question, the person most responsible for establishing formal education for librarianship in the United States. On 5 January 1887, after more than three years of planning, he opened the doors of the first library school in this country, the School of Library Economy at Columbia College in New York City. His work in the school was extensive. He developed its curriculum through a trial-and-error method and arranged for a number of outside lecturers. By his own accounting he presented more than 60 percent of the formal class sessions conducted by its resident staff during the lecture terms in its first two years. He also nearly singlehandedly wrote and published a journal, Library Notes, that served as a serial textbook for the school. And, between late 1888 and early 1889 when Columbia College withdrew its support for the school, Dewey reestablished it at the New York State Library in Albany, New York. Dewey’s personal involvement in the school began to diminish as early as 1889, but his influence was such that the school continued for years afterward in the course he had originally set for it.

Dewey’s contribution to early library education also went well beyond his own school. He was untiring in his efforts to explain, extol, defend, and promote library education throughout the larger library community. His own school also became an effective educational model by virtue of its graduates becoming staff members of the burgeoning
new library education programs. Between 1887 and 1920, graduates of Dewey’s school went to no less than eleven of the other fourteen library schools that would eventually survive the early period, supplying at different times no less than fifty-three faculty members. Of those, eleven also served as directors or associate directors in seven of the schools. Graduates also became teachers at different times in no less than thirty-five less substantial educational programs including summer schools, library training classes, and library association training programs.

Although there can be no question about Dewey’s role in establishing and shaping formal education for librarianship, assessing the character of his contribution is quite another matter. Critical studies, beginning especially with Charles C. Williamson’s *Training for Library Service* in 1923, have tended to indict the early period in library education and Dewey himself for not bequeathing the right kind of education to the library profession.

Two points in the indictment are typical. First, early library education has been faulted for not being integrally connected to the collegiate academic community—for not absolutely requiring college graduation as an entrance requirement and for not requiring a collegiate academic environment for its conduct. Second, the education that Dewey and others passed along has been heavily criticized for being centrally concerned with technical matters rather than with abstract knowledge; for functioning merely as systematic programs of apprenticeship in which chiefly clerical skills were taught. In many respects these two basic criticisms of early library education are redundant. Education that is noncollegiate in its bearing and education that is merely “technical” are simply two different ways of saying the same thing—that such education is in some way anti-intellectual (or at least a-intellectual) rather than professional.

A third criticism that arose after the beginning of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School and especially after the 1951 ALA accreditation standards is that the same early educational programs were not research-oriented. This is a moot point, however, since widespread research has been a more recent development in almost all social service professional fields. One may just as well criticize Charles C. Williamson as Dewey for a lack of emphasis on research.

The foregoing indictment has not been restricted to library education. The same investigations have attempted to show that the library profession itself must shoulder much of the blame for the way library education developed. Williamson stated the logic of this conclusion as early as 1923. Subsequent investigations, especially those of Vann and White, have attempted not only to document library education’s early
vocationalism but also to show how and when library education eventually got off its original sidetrack and onto the main line of preparing for professional-level work. Vann emphasized the interactions that took place between the wider library community and library educators. White portrayed the struggles of the early period in light of the rise of formal technical education. He concluded that early library education was a form of the "apprenticeship school" where the basic elements or skills of an occupation were taught through class instruction. Teaching was based on breaking down the work to be done into a series of normative precepts or activities. Its goal was to produce "master craftsmen" who were versed in the "ABCs" of a set of practices.

All such interpretations of the early period of library education, while useful—particularly in their review of details—are essentially marred and troubling as historical works. They have tended to adopt a prescriptive, hindsight point of view in which present-day views of library education have become the basis for examining past library education. The result has been to examine early library education for what it was not or to portray early library education in light of categories imposed on it.

The overall effect has been to represent the early period as a matter of embarrassment. Vann guarded somewhat against a negative tone by summarizing the entire process as one of "positive progress" [emphasis added]. But that does not entirely erase the effect of many other statements in her work that emphasize blame-taking. White too stops at one point to suggest that there was some redeeming value in the educational efforts of the early period. But his three paragraphs of only faint praise do little to ameliorate what otherwise is highly methodical and categorical finger pointing. When extended to its limit, it results in statements like Rayward's where he concluded that when Dewey began formal education for librarianship he also "set it back fifty years."

The principal loser in this approach to the early period has been Melvil Dewey. Critical portrayals of Dewey as an educator have taken so much away from the man as to make him out to be a misguided and even devious founder who pursued narrow and limited ends. Perhaps this portrayal was to be expected—a reaction especially of the 1960s and 1970s to earlier laudatory accounts of his work. The result is that Dewey's role in the development of library education has continued to be clouded. A corrective approach could be undertaken, but it must emphasize that complex of goals and vision of the library movement out of which his educational work arose.
Dewey and Library Education through 1885

If one of the marks of an educator is the way he or she integrates an educational objective with broader cultural issues, then one of the most distinctive features of Dewey’s approach to library education through 1885 is the lack of such a perspective in his work. His attempts during this period to characterize such issues as the social role of the library and the nature of professional work, professional training, and professionals are plainly few in number, and for all practical purposes insubstantial. For example, in the very first issue of the *Library Journal* in September 1876, Dewey addressed a series of such issues, but only briefly and in some respects as little more than echoes of the opinions of other library leaders who expressed the same ideas in much greater detail and depth. Thereafter until 1886 he barely returned directly to these topics at all.⁸

Dewey directly broached the idea of formal library training in his 1879 article on the “Apprenticeship of Librarians.” Here too one finds little more than an enthusiastic suggestion. For example, he advanced the idea that a professional librarian consisted of what a person brought into the field combined with what was added to that person through special training. But his attempt to enumerate what each side of this equation consisted of was at best only skeletal. On the first side were certain naturally endowed qualities as well as a general education. Other synonyms for the same things were being a *scholar*, being *very learned*, and having *mental and cultural training*. He then described the other side of the equation with such terms as *practical business qualities*, *administration*, *enterprise*, and *business capacities*, all of which he summed up in the phrase *the practical details of library economy and administration*.⁹

Two other key statements during this same period were his spoken words to the 1883 Buffalo ALA conference in which he formally proposed a school of training and the school’s first “Circular of Information” issued in 1884. These key statements do not indulge in anything resembling an overview that justifies library education. Neither do they add anything substantive to what Dewey had already said in 1879 regarding the first side of the equation denoting a professional. He did expand his ideas on the second, or training, side but even those were not firmly fixed. For example, in 1883 Dewey gave a fourfold list of topical areas to be covered in the school—i.e., practical bibliography, books, reading, literary methods. By 1884 these topics were relegated chiefly to library instruction courses for college students and replaced by a long,
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undifferentiated, and admittedly incomplete list of specific library activities and problems.10

Given that by 1883 Dewey was the chief proponent of formal library education, one may reasonably ask, why was he also so vague about matters of such obvious educational import? Issues of that kind are ordinarily thought of as being at the heart of an educational endeavor and essential to professional education. Some insight into how Dewey viewed such matters is provided by considering how Dewey had approached librarianship up to this point in his life.

Although in 1876 Dewey had joined with other mostly older and more experienced librarians to found the American Library Association and promote library development and the library "profession," Dewey plainly did not approach librarianship in the same way that they did. His older contemporaries, already entrenched as librarians, tended to see librarianship as what went on in individual libraries and the library movement as the cumulation of all of those individual situations. The resulting social role of the library movement was also viewed primarily as a local matter and stressed the mental cultivation of the citizens of the town.

Dewey appears not to have had any arguments with such views and in fact from time to time echoed them in his own opinions. What captivated his interest more, however, was a much grander conception that focused not on the individual library and its social role but on all libraries together as a single, interrelated entity of national scope. Together they made an inherently dynamic and developing system of libraries. Together, in fact, this system constituted the library movement. Of course, in 1876, the conception was still only a potentiality because the system had yet to be organized. Dewey considered organization to be possible, and further, he saw himself as the chief organizer. Even his idea of organization had grand features. For example, he did not consider organization simply to mean any single agency such as the ALA. Rather it referred to overall organization where particular libraries, agencies (including the ALA), and individuals came together in one corporate structure for the purpose of engaging in decisive action toward a common goal. The source of Dewey's vision of the library movement and of his idea of overall organization is not hard to discern. He patterned it after the business developments of his own day and conceived of the entire library system in much the same way a contemporary entrepreneur saw the organization of a system of manufactures and markets related to a particular product.11
That Dewey should base his view of libraries on his understanding of business organization is understandable. His own experience in an individual library—a total of about three years at the small Amherst College that were taken up especially with technical innovations related to efficiency—was relatively limited. Furthermore, when Dewey moved to Boston in 1876, he did not go as a librarian. He went specifically to promote his library organization ideal and to pursue the business of selling library and other educational supplies. In fact, he viewed library supplies as simply one element within the overall system. Within that context, he gave particular attention to the standardization of library work aids and operations. In his view, no overall organization of the library movement could take place without such standardization because standardization was the basis of efficiency and only efficiency could provide the kind of organizational power needed. It was this aspect of the library movement that truly excited him and gave him considerable promise of a good living and notable influence. And it was this vision of the library system and library organization that Dewey pursued with unparalleled enthusiasm during the period to 1883.

Dewey’s initial approach to library education bears the same hallmarks. Formal library training was only another way of being systematic and efficient in supplying a needed element in the overall system. In this respect, providing trained librarians differed only slightly from the efforts of, say, a railroad company in calculating the need for and ensuring the supply of an adequate number of trained locomotive engineers, or in fact, from Dewey’s efforts to supply standardized library forms. The existing means for supplying trained librarians was dependent on informal methods of apprenticeship and was inadequate. Between 1879 and 1883 Dewey had attempted a partial solution to the problem of supplying library personnel when he operated an employment bureau for librarians and something akin to a consulting service in which he supplied temporary personnel to local libraries for special tasks such as the cataloging and classification of their collections. But those efforts did not overcome the lack of organized training.

When Dewey accepted the Columbia College librarian-in-chief post in 1883, there is every reason to suppose that he saw the position and the library itself as a vital means to further his corporate conception of the library movement. That same motivation also helps to explain why he promoted a training school there from the start. If, indeed, training had traditionally taken place informally in libraries in the form of apprenticeship, what better opportunity could present itself than to have a library of respectable means in which to supply librarians to the movement. What would be original was to make the training a
systematic school of apprenticeship rather than an informal affair—so much the better for efficiency.

Moreover, what would the course of study involve except those technical matters that Dewey had been immersed in for the previous seven years—"all the special training needed to select, buy, arrange, catalogue, index, and administer in the most economical way any collection of books, pamphlets or serials." Indeed, this is precisely the view of libraries that Dewey had had during the previous period. A library was, for all practical purposes, little more than a collection of objects and a system of operations. One need only peruse Dewey's writings from this era to see how deeply preoccupied he was with such matters. Further, his experience as a librarian seems not to have gone beyond such mechanical concerns. For example, before 1883 he seems never to have experienced fully the moment-by-moment administrative responsibility of a library of any complexity or size. Nor had he been exposed personally to the kind of work with readers that prodded the typical active librarian to mull over and rationalize the social importance of library work.

With this background it is quite understandable that Dewey did not at first devote much effort to broader educational issues—e.g., to ponder the qualities of the ideal librarian, or to delineate the appropriate qualifications of applicants for a school or, in fact, to work out an overall justification for such an educational venture. Such questions were those of thoughtful and long-experienced librarians and educators. When Dewey went to Columbia College in May 1883, he was clearly neither of these. Rather, his outlook had been limited to that of a shaker and a mover for a more or less impersonal and very businesslike approach to a vast and growing system of libraries and their needs.

The Impact of Columbia

There can be little doubt that Columbia changed Dewey with respect to these matters. Here for the first time he had administrative responsibility for a library of respectable size in an institution of some importance. And here too for the first time his businesslike expression of the corporately structured library movement came face to face with educators who struggled with issues to which Dewey had previously paid little attention.

The first thing that Dewey had to face with respect to his proposal for a library school was the lack of immediate action. Dewey was used to making quick, firm decisions, but in this matter the college board took a full year to consider and finally approve the program. In the interim
Dewey busied himself with the Columbia College library itself, in many respects gaining experience that he had not previously had.

The Board of Trustees of Columbia approved the library school in May 1884. However, with their approval and with Dewey’s almost immediate publication of a circular of information concerning the school, it is clear that a meeting and blending of the businessman’s and the educator’s points of view had already begun to take place. For instance, Dewey’s systematic organizational emphasis was reflected in his remarks in the “Circulation of Information” on the new program insofar as they defined library administration as “the modern improved system of library management,” one that had, in fact, been “reduced to a system.” But the educator’s views were also present. The proposal for the school referred not simply to learning a mere mechanical-like system of library management, but also to the more substantive idea of “a thorough education in the principles of library administration.” And the educators emphasized the social context of the educational venture when they spoke not only of graduates qualified “to take charge of the very numerous public libraries of the country,” but also of the result of being “be instrumental of great public good.”

Dewey’s own words in his circular likewise gave evidence of greater sensitivity to educational issues, particularly his effort to list the teaching methods to be used in the school and to indicate the educational tone of the school. The list of methods is impressive, emphasizing as it does the discussion and exploration of ideas and applications related not only to the library as an operating system of objects and processes, but also to the library as a public agency within its social environment.

Although Dewey had issued a circular of information almost immediately, he could not immediately open his school. The board had set the opening of the school for October 1886, almost two-and-one-half years away. Dewey put this new period of waiting to good use by working through the educational issues involved. From 1884 to 1886 he tested his educational plan on the Columbia library staff by conducting special library training classes for it. He also brought his ideas and plans once again to the ALA, this time in the form of his circular and at least a portion of Columbia President Barnard’s report. The association’s committee on the school reported the results of their discussions of these documents at the 1885 annual conference at Lake George. Their concerns focused on two educational issues: the relationship of the school’s work to a college course, and the possibility that the thoroughness of its technical content might mislead the graduates as to their abilities. In the end the committee concluded that the proposed school was likely to be more serviceable than any other existing method in providing trained
personnel for libraries. But they did not wholly endorse it because even with the greater wealth of details that the new documents provided, what they pinpointed and simply raised as fundamental educational issues had not yet been addressed. Thus they closed their report by calling for a still more definite plan.  

**Dewey the Educator**

Dewey's subsequent statements regarding the school and its relationship to librarianship as a profession signal a definitive change in his educational work. These statements begin with his notable address to the Association of Collegiate Alumnae in March 1886 entitled "Librarianship as a Profession for College-Bred Women" and continue in his "Circular of Information" for 1886-1887 (summer 1886) and his *Library Notes* (June 1886-June 1888). In the actual program of studies in his school, especially during its first two years (January 1887-June 1888), Dewey dealt with the more fundamental issues that he had not addressed previously. In fact, so obvious was his attempt to meet these issues, one may say with confidence that the period from 1886 through 1888 was the point at which Dewey the educator emerged.

Dewey's enhanced educational views may be conveniently viewed as an attempt to formulate a more complete rationalization of the social role and importance of libraries and library work, and as an attempt to delineate the qualifications necessary in a professional librarian. The latter may be further divided conveniently into personal qualities, the relationship of personal qualities to college work, and qualifications that would be gained from special training.

**Rationalization for Library Work**

The initial and perhaps fundamental area in which Dewey's enhanced educational views are evident pertains to his efforts to provide an extended rationalization for the nature of library work. In his March 1886 address, Dewey summarized the social role of the library and library work by portraying it, as he had in 1876, as "an essential part of our system of education." The difference between his earlier statement and his 1886 views was that here he attempted to support his assertion by an appeal to the ideas upon which it was founded. At the base was "the book," that vehicle of recorded knowledge that was important not simply for its capacity to transmit information but for its power to put readers in touch with the very best minds of the past. Books—that is, the best books—were powerless, however, until read with purpose. When read with purpose, books became instruments of education. That meant
that they would foster the acquisition of "systematic knowledge and consistent powers of thought." The result would be to elevate the character of the reader and to make his or her life "better worth living." In terms of the mental-discipline philosophy of education that this view reflected, purposeful readers would be in the process of having their mental and moral faculties or powers sharpened. And in so doing they would become cultivated and educated.

Viewed this way the reading of good books was not simply a useful tool in education. It was the chief tool of education, one imbued with enormous power. In Dewey's words: "Reading is a mighty engine, beside which steam and electricity sink into insignificance." Moreover, given this view, the nature of the educational system was itself more strictly defined. The very core of that system was reading, its goal being not simply the elevation of individuals through reading, but even more so the inculcation of reading as a personal activity so that what might have begun as school exercises would eventually develop into lifelong self-education.

The practical difficulty of this was that the public schools often had their students for too little time to accomplish education's goal. But that is where the library stepped in. The library served as the complement to the public schools, efficiently supplying the best books and advising on their use in those instances in which people no longer attended school. "The school STARTS the education in childhood; we [i.e., librarians] have come to a point where we MUST carry it on." The library was, in effect, an equal partner with formal educational institutions. And this pertained not simply in the general realm among popular libraries, but in the realm of higher education as well. "With the reference librarian to counsel and guide readers, with the greatly improved catalogues and indexes, cross-references, notes and printed guides, it is quite possible to make a great university of a great library without professors."21

The Qualifications of a Librarian

The second area in which Dewey expanded his thinking on educational issues during the 1886-1888 period was his statements on the qualifications of a librarian. That this should have occurred is not surprising. Dewey could hardly have created a grand rationalization of library work without also reflecting on the qualifications necessary for the persons who were to accomplish the work. In this respect one may assume that librarians involved in the work had to be at least equal to the task at hand. Furthermore, if the tasks were of a high rather than menial character (and one cannot fail to see this in Dewey's statement of
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ideals), then so also must the librarians' qualifications match that loftiness.

At the same time, any close examination of the character of library work as Dewey described it will reveal that it involved a wide range of activities, not all of which were lofty. And with each activity, the potential existed that different levels and types of qualifications were required. That Dewey and some of his contemporaries recognized these contradictions is apparent in overtones from their written statements. For example, the ALA committee on the library school in 1885 divided library work into clerical, bibliographical, and administrative aspects. Ultimately, however, although Dewey hinted at how specific qualities were appropriate to the various kinds of library work, he did not during this period make any hard and fast correlations between kinds of work and qualities. Instead, he focused principally on the overall characteristics of the ideal librarian and related them to the total range of library work.

Following the division he first made in 1879, Dewey also divided the qualifications of the ideal librarian into two general groups—i.e., those acquired by the person apart from library work and brought to it; and those acquired in the form of special training for library work. The first are essentially personal, having to do with general aspects of a person's character and mind; the second are essentially technical, having to do with specific skills and ideas related to the library work at hand. Although during 1886 one will find differences in the renditions Dewey made of what belonged on each side of this equation, by 1887 and early 1888, Dewey had more or less developed in class lectures a standard way of referring to the matter. The librarian could be referred to (1) as a man, (2) as a scholar, (3) as a bibliographer, and (4) as a library economist.

The first two of these made up the first, or personal, side of the basic equation. Qualities related to “the man”—that is, to a person's character—included heredity (the “stock” one came from is important), health (if not good, a person “cannot work as many hours nor with as much vigor”), one's social manners (such things as tact, personal magnetism, and personal activities above reproach), and one's mental abilities (“an accurate habit of mind, order, method, system, housekeeping instinct, executive ability”). Qualities related to being a “scholar” or having general education (of which Dewey concluded, “the more the better”), included first of all languages (German first, then French, Latin, Italian, Spanish, and Greek); second, history or general literature; and finally, something of political economy, political science, fine
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arts, and popular science. Although the entire list of subjects appears cut and dried, it would be erroneous to suppose Dewey viewed it that way. He may well have been this specific in response to the 1885 ALA committee's enumeration of a similar list. When Dewey discussed education more directly with his students, he was careful to dispel any grocery-list impression of what he meant. For example, in April 1887 he referred to education by commending to the students an idea that Ernest C. Richardson had presented twice during the term—that learning referred to encyclopedic knowledge, a systematic approach and structure of the entire universe of knowledge. The following January, Dewey stressed the same idea even more fervently, suggesting that to have encyclopedic knowledge meant to have a wide knowledge of books, that is, of their subject contents. 23

In the end, the most striking feature of his list of qualifications is the general kind of person the elements signified when taken together. That kind of person may be summarized in the phrase, "cultivated and educated," an apt description not simply of an ideal prospective librarian, but of any person who, in the words of the educational philosophy already referred to, had (or were in the process of having) their mental and moral faculties disciplined and cultivated and who had become uplifted in character. In fact, enumerating such qualities represented Dewey's effort to depict this kind of a person. More important, Dewey's emphasis on the cultivation of personal qualities in his overall rationalization of library work closely matches the ideals of the mental-discipline model of education. In short, one could not expect librarians to work effectively in the library as an educational uplift movement unless they themselves were educated and cultivated.

Personal Qualifications and a College Education

Dewey's view of personal qualities is also important in that it better helps one to understand his attitude to the relationship between library education and college. It is obvious that Dewey saw a college course as a principle means by which an individual might gain the character and education central to this side of the equation. This attitude is basic to his encouragement of "college-bred" women to enter librarianship. He could say of their college training that it "has given them a wider culture and broader view with a considerable fund of information...as almost nowhere else." Or again, "a four years' course successfully completed is the strongest voucher for persistent purpose and mental and physical capacity for protracted intellectual work." 24 This valuation of college is also reflected in his 1886 "Circular of Information" on the school. In portraying an idealized preparation for library work, he noted that the
foundation should be a regular college course.25 Still Dewey resisted making a college graduation an absolute requirement for admission to the school. Instead, he simply noted that applicants would need to present evidence—through diplomas, certificates, or examinations—that the qualifications on this side of the general equation were present.26

Recent interpretations of Dewey's refusal to make college graduation an absolute admission requirement have implied that his resistance arose from his viewing library work as principally a clerical occupation that did not require the intellectual milieu of a college education. Evidence for this attitude is often centered on the 1885 ALA committee statement that "by far the greater part of the librarians in actual service have not enjoyed, and will not in the future enjoy the benefits of a college training, and yet they prove most admirable librarians."27 It is erroneous to assume that the committee and Dewey as well meant that what is ordinarily thought to be the result of a college education—learning and the formation of good character—was thereby not also required for library work. Dewey's enumeration of what characteristics a person brought to library work as well as virtually all contemporary library opinion viewed general learning and good character—the cultivation of the mental and moral powers—as absolutely basic requirements for the profession. Librarians who had no college degree were not viewed as successful because librarianship required no more than clerical and technical skills gained from other than a college course. They were viewed as successful apart from a college course precisely because they had gained the education and culture otherwise. In other words, college was not the only or even chief source of persons with those qualities.

The foregoing conclusion accords with the status of college as a social institution in the late nineteenth century. College attendance and graduation had not yet become the national social phenomena that they became afterward or today. During the two decades from 1870 to 1890 the approximate number of new college graduates annually rose at about the same rate as the general population—from about 10,000 annually to about 15,000, an increase of 50 percent; the general population increased from some 40 to 63 million, or about 58 percent. But the real figures are very small. Each year for this period, new graduates represented only about 1 in 4000 persons. When the ALA committee suggested that a college education was enjoyed by very few persons, they were simply stating a reality.28

A college education also did not enjoy the public esteem that it has gained since. College programs were going through a period of great
change. The older classical curriculum and philosophy of mental discipline had many adherents. But they were both being severely challenged by new philosophies related to social utility, research, and newer definitions of liberal culture. As a result, public estimates of the value of a college education—particularly in an age when the image of the self-made man was so prevalent—were often disparaging. Even Dewey suggested as much when he stated in his 1887 advice to applicants: "Obviously one might pass a rigorous examination for scholarship, and yet be totally unfitted to take charge of a library; while some of our best candidates have long since forgotten how to demonstrate most of Euclid's theorems or to conjugate the irregular Greek verbs." This was, of course, an offhanded reference to the classical college curriculum. Given these realities, it is understandable that Dewey and other practicing librarians questioned whether formal college graduation should be required of librarians or that library education should need to function within a college as the only or even best educational environment.

Technical Qualifications and the School Program

The final area in which Dewey's educational views show considerable enhancement had to do with the second group of qualifications of the ideal librarian—i.e., those coming from special training. Following the pattern that Dewey developed during 1887 and 1888, he divided these qualifications into two subgroups—those related to bibliography and those related to library economy. They may also be spoken of in terms of the actual curriculum of Dewey's school since he viewed the qualifications as the direct result of a formal training program.

When Dewey first seriously proposed the ideal of a school in 1879 and referred to the librarian's qualifications in terms of "enterprise and business capacity," and "the practical details of library economy and administration," there can be little doubt that what he had in mind was learning a variety of technical details related to the standardization of routine work. The tasks to be mastered were, in fact, "all the work doing from day to day in all its details." And the best way to learn such work was to "have practice in doing each part of it under careful supervision." The best name for this was, indeed, a school of systematic apprenticeship.

That focus on detail expresses very well Dewey's 1879 view of the library movement and library work. It also expresses very well his personal curricular focus eight years later when his school opened. In fact, Dewey's interest in such matters continued throughout his career in library education. A summary of his lecture subjects during the 1887-1888 lecture semesters of the school show that with few exceptions,
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he kept almost exclusively to such matters. Notable among the topics he personally covered was the systematic and orderly plotting of procedures for the acquisition, organization, and preparation of books for the shelves. Lecturing on such operations called for extensive—even minute—attention to detail, a fact affirmed in his lectures on bookplates and book embossing and on the ins and outs of the accession record. He was also very concerned with the planning and equipping of library buildings. Accordingly, his lectures dealt extensively with such matters as heating; lighting; ventilation; book hoists; book carts; shelving (including how to place shelves around windows and the calculation of depth, height, and width of furniture); reading tables; chairs; lamps; measures to insure safety against fire; and the overall planning for and use of floor space. He was also very interested in catalogs and classification. But when lecturing on those topics he almost invariably approached them in terms of their physical aspects and processes.

Although Dewey's personal interest began and continued in such matters, one can see that between 1884 and 1886 Dewey's sense of the overall qualifications of a librarian gained from special schooling and, therefore, the curriculum of his school had begun to extend beyond just those issues. This awareness is suggested by the appearance—in both the 1884 and 1886 circulars of the school—of such topics as the goals and purposes of libraries and issues related to obtaining legislative and general public support for libraries. What appears to have most expanded his awareness, however, was the experience of conducting the school itself, especially its first session from January to April 1887.

The school officially opened on 5 January 1887. Originally planned as a twelve-week session to be completed by the end of March, it was eventually extended to the end of April. The basic curriculum consisted of lectures, visits to libraries and library-related agencies, and supervised individual work sessions—the latter for practice in the most important library economy routines. In addition, the school required written assignments on special projects and discussion sessions related to the lectures and visits.

The regular staff of the school consisted of Dewey, Walter S. Biscoe, and George H. Baker. Biscoe was from the cataloging department and Baker from the reference department of the Columbia College library. Dewey and Biscoe gave lectures, led discussions and visits, and evaluated the major written assignments while Baker apparently limited his work to giving lectures. In addition, Mary Salome Cutler from the library staff (and possibly with other female library staff members as well) conducted the practice sessions. In addition to the regular staff, Dewey obtained the services of a large number of guest lecturers including notable and
experienced librarians, others whose specialties were of value to librarianship (e.g., G.E. Stechert, an importer of foreign books who lectured on that topic; Charles E. Sprague of the Union Dime Savings Bank in New York City who discussed accounting), and Columbia College faculty members.  

The chief difficulty of this initial session appeared almost immediately and remained a persistent problem for the entire four months. Dewey, whose forte had always been efficiency and systematization, failed miserably in organizing the curriculum into a systematic, rational sequence of learning experiences. A sequential reading of the lecture headings of the staff reveals almost no logic in their relationship except within very limited groups. Further, the original schedule—which was to have practice sessions from 9:30 to 10:30 A.M., lectures from 10:30 until noon, and extra lectures and meetings in the afternoons—appears to have suffered some disruption by library visits and special lectures. Apparently not all the guest speakers who had originally said they would appear were able to or chose to appear. Dewey appears to have taken whomever he could get whenever he could get them. Far more important, Dewey appears never to have worked out the logic of the guest speakers' topics and kinds of presentations with respect to the overall curriculum. He exercised little control over the content of guest lectures and did not attempt to weld them into a sequential whole. The overall impression is, in fact, of a curriculum as a hotchpotch. It may well have been inspiring and useful to the students, but it had all the marks of something put together day by day as the school progressed.

Before the session was over, however, Dewey apparently had been prodded to consider more seriously the idea of the curriculum for special training and with it the related topic of the qualifications of a librarian that arose from such a course. While doubtless there were several sources of his thinking, one certain source that appears is Ernest C. Richardson and particularly a lecture he gave on 14 April 1887 on what constituted "library science." In his outline on the matter, Richardson subsumed all issues related to a librarian's educational accomplishments under four topics: linguistic (i.e., the learning of languages), cyclopedic (i.e., a broad survey of knowledge in general), bibliographic (i.e., learning about books both internally and externally), and economic (i.e., library economy, or learning how libraries operate). Economic was subdivided into the topics acquisition, preservation, and utilization which in turn were subdivided into various topics related to purchasing books, organizing them, circulating them, etc.
Richardson's thinking on the matter might well be criticized in its own right. But its importance was not so much in what he included as in the systematic way he proceeded. A week later Dewey enumerated for the first time in a systematic way the fourfold list of qualifications of a librarian mentioned earlier (and referring to Richardson's ideas at least at one point), which in turn were partly reminiscent of Richardson's words. Later, when the March issue of Library Notes was issued (probably in May), Dewey noted that changes for the following year were specifically directed at the content of the program including planning in advance for specialist lectures on languages and literature and enhancing the position of bibliography in the total program. His suggestion that library economy and bibliography together were simply subdivisions of a larger area called library science, while not following Richardson's ideas precisely, certainly shows a growing awareness on Dewey's part of a broader outlook on the curriculum than he had had previously.37

It also appears evident that Dewey in a very real sense "discovered" the area of bibliography during the first session and as a result became enthusiastic about developing it further as an element of a more systematically drawn curriculum. His own statement that the bibliographical lectures were "one of the market successes of the last year" simply testifies to what were in fact the best organized and most substantive lectures of the session. That his own interest in the topic continued is evidenced by his attempt the following year to submit even that area to more rigorous analysis and enumeration, dividing the topic into the subtopics of physical bibliography and intellectual bibliography and attempting to characterize each in turn.38

In summary, by the end of the first session Dewey's sense of the content of the curriculum and what he meant by the technical qualifications of the ideal librarian had expanded enormously. The curriculum of the second year more than showed that he was willing to put his new ideas to the test. The lecture contents were much better ordered.

A final issue to be broached in attempting to understand Dewey's approach to the qualifications of a librarian and, more specifically, to those that comprised the technical qualifications, is to what degree the program devised represented what later critics have called a clearly technical or clerical orientation that was taught and, in the words of White, that was especially concerned with imparting the ABCs of practice. There can be little doubt that the school, in part representing Dewey's original approach to the library field, incorporated much that was centered on clerical routine. This was particularly true of the
practice-session work. Furthermore, Dewey himself constantly made note of the fact that the school's program was practical and technical.

At the same time there was a very sizable representation of topical matter and educational method that can only be termed idea-oriented, intellectual, and even theory-based, although not recognized as such or so named. Evidence of this comes especially from the content of many of the lectures given in the school. Of these, the most consistently notable are the lectures of Biscoe and Baker and of some of the guest lecturers on what might loosely be called bibliography. These lecturers did not simply list books but also presented the nature of the works themselves or the nature of a field of knowledge. 39

Other areas of notable "intellectual" content included a number of the lectures on cataloging by Biscoe and several outside lecturers who discussed cataloging issues instead of simply setting standards of practice (including one by Biscoe that strikingly begins by discussing the objects of a catalog), the large number of lectures by guest speakers (including S.S. Green, C.M. Hewins, W.E. Foster, and A.R. Spofford) that broached the issue of the educational role of libraries and the issue of fiction, and lectures on language and literature. 40

Lectures on library economy issues also were not solely restricted to "routines." For example, W.A. Bordon, in an extensive presentation on charging (i.e., circulation) systems, began by systematically listing twenty-five purposes for which circulation records were kept. He followed this with an enumeration of the equipment available for making circulation systems and an extensive classification of users by sex and occupation. The latter was for keeping records that would correlate the social characteristics of users with book use. Finally he discussed fifteen different strategies of circulation record keeping, showing what equipment was needed and what combinations of purposes were met. Even Dewey, when going beyond obvious issues or routine to those of overall administration of building specifications, went about his lectures with an obvious air of exploring issues rather than simply pronouncing on so-called accepted methods. Notable in this respect was his response at the end of a lecture by C.E. Sprague on the philosophy of double-entry bookkeeping of how the specific values of books, including their depreciation, could be recorded in a double-entry system. 41

All of this suggests that at least for its first two years, Dewey's school was conducted on a plane somewhat different than has been otherwise imagined. To this, however, one also may add the fact that categorically assigning this new venture to that class of apprenticeship schools that created master craftsmen by teaching them the ABCs of practice was in many respects logically impossible. The one thing that is everywhere
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evident in the school is that there were few if any ABCs of practice to be had. In fact, one of its most striking contributions was to forge what might be called the ABCs of practice where previously there had been none, and this by a process of trial and error, discussion, examination, and reflection. This is at least the case for bibliography where the notion of “reference” had not yet evolved into anything resembling standard lists of reference books. And it was true for cataloging, where many of the issues related to appropriate bibliographic data and name form that one might have thought were settled by this period clearly were not.

It should be noted that besides creating such areas, Dewey’s school played a significant role in the creation of a literature for librarianship. Dewey’s use of his Library Notes is in fact portentous in this regard. Not only did Dewey use it as a vehicle for his own writing, but also as a vehicle for publishing some of the lectures given at the school and as a compendium where several sides of some issues might be expressed. One may reasonably assume that it was at least partly involved in establishing the phenomenon important to any field that the knowledge content of an area to be taught must ultimately become a literature to be read and digested.42

Dewey’s Heirs

Given the foregoing discussion of Dewey’s own development as an educator and, within that context, the establishment of the Columbia School of Library Economy, it remains only to draw some generalizations regarding those who followed him, both immediately and at some distance in time. It seems obvious that Dewey’s most immediate heirs—including especially those most responsible for his school after 1889 when he himself began to lessen his own direct involvement in it and those students who took the example of his school into other library education programs—continued to refine and develop what he had begun. It is also true, however, that Dewey’s immediate heirs had to contend with significant changes that brought into question the work that he had begun.

First, the “library movement” itself went through a distinct period of institutional differentiation. Institutional differentiation refers to the way the library as a social institution is conceptualized by both those within it and those outside it. In this period, change included differentiation with respect to types of libraries. Commonly spoken of in the late 1880s as popular and scholarly (both were “public” in contrast to others that were private), libraries were reconceptualized in terms of the more familiar nomenclature (established by the 1920s) of college, public,
school, and special libraries. This change also included the differentiation of kinds of library work. By the 1920s the most important differentiation was that of distinguishing clerical from professional work.

The second change of significance during this same era was the rising importance of the college in American society. In contrast to what was said earlier about the college of the 1880s, by the mid-1890s and unabated thereafter, the social acceptance of a college education skyrocketed. Whereas between 1870 and 1890 there was about one new baccalaureate graduate each year for every 4000 in general population, between 1890 and 1910 that ratio had already increased to one for about every 2500; by 1920 to one for about every 2000; and by 1930 to one for about every 1000 persons. In addition, the content of a college education changed significantly, taking on ideas related to social utility and research, and adopting new, higher standards.43

The third important change that took place in this era was the rise of the “specialist” in American life. The most immediate effect of this change on the library movement was (in conjunction with the institutional differentiation of the library) the creation of a drastically altered conception of what the social role of the library was. Notable in this respect was an increasing emphasis on service as delivery of information to an increasingly more complex array of users. When one adds to this picture the rise of the importance of a college education in American life, it should not then seem surprising that Charles C. Williamson could find in the 1920s not only that the person most appropriate to the profession of librarianship “is most likely to be found in those who have completed a college course,” but that the truly professional work of such a person is not to be found in the mere act of organizing objects and processes (which Williamson caricatured as clerical routines) but rather lies in service to patrons based on extensive subject knowledge and the administration of the library in terms of its service goals.44

In sum, by the 1920s, the phenomenon of the library within American society had changed sufficiently to bring into question almost the entire complex of factors which provided the basis of Dewey’s first library education program. When one adds to those changes others that have occurred since the 1920s—notably, the rise of research, the rise of electronic technology, and the rise of an information revolution—one might reasonably conclude that Dewey’s relationship to his heirs of the present day is a moot point.

In at least one issue, however, the struggle between learning and advancing the idea content behind a service profession and learning and advancing the skills needed to render those ideas effective, Dewey
Melvil Dewey remains ever-present. The lesson of "Library Hand" courses is archetypical. Dewey's inclusion of library hand in his library school curriculum has long been the object of amusement. It has been spoken of in hindsight as an indication of the clerical practice and therefore the nonintellectual orientation of early library education. Dewey, however, was not as ignorant as this kind of judgment implies. The chief technology for bibliographic control during the 1880s was handwriting. And if that technology was to be effective it had to be efficient and well done. This meant that some effort to control handwriting was not only useful but absolutely essential if the broader goals of the library were to be met.

In a similar manner, one may imagine a day well in advance of the present when the computerized technologies and ideas of the present and the skills they involve—e.g., programming, word processing, keyboard operation, online searching and algorithms, database construction—will have long been superseded by still more advanced technologies. Will the present-day inclusion of these curricular matters be at that future time an object of derision and an occasion for pointing out how obviously "nonintellectual" library and information science education was in the 1980s? The fact is that any professional education outside of one that perhaps exists only in the realm of pure intellect will necessarily struggle with balancing the needs of learning and advancing what is known at present with the skills needed to render that knowledge operable. Certainly there can be no shame either in attempting to achieve this balance or in accepting the fact that past educators also attempted to do the same. If Dewey bequeathed anything to the present-day library realm, it was surely this educational struggle.
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The Socialization of Library and Information Science Students: Reflections on a Century of Formal Education for Librarianship

WAYNE A. WIEGAND

An Exemplar: Clara Mable Brooks

On 16 October 1913 John B. Wallbridge—lawyer, notary public, and secretary of the Hoopeston (Illinois) Public Library Board of Trustees—penned a friendly letter of thanks to Phineas L. Windsor, director of the Illinois State Library School at Urbana. "Miss Brooks has now been 'on the job' for two weeks," he wrote, "and I am pleased that she is giving excellent satisfaction." Wallbridge was speaking of Clara Mabel Brooks, a 1912 graduate hired from Windsor's school after she had been socialized by the curriculum and faculty to make the quick changes Wallbridge found so satisfactory. He noted especially how "she has instituted several very necessary changes and improvements. I wish to thank you for securing this estimable and efficient librarian for us."

Characteristics Wallbridge did not mention, however, were taken for granted by the two men, even though these characteristics were as important as Brooks's professional abilities to the 5000-member community that consisted of eleven churches, three policemen—"two of whom are not actually necessary"—no saloons, and no public "graft." For several days after her arrival in Hoopeston on 1 October, Brooks was introduced to the town's prominent citizens by Mr. and Mrs. Wallbridge, with whom she temporarily boarded. More than fifty people, she later noted, had asked her about her religious preferences. Within a week she attended a Universalist gathering and shortly thereafter found perma-
nent quarters in a residence of “a good local family.” Once this white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant had passed community muster, she began to work. 2

Brooks took charge of an institution that dated back to 1872 and found its origins in the efforts of local women’s clubs. In 1905 the library had assumed quarters in a handsome new structure funded by Andrew Carnegie, but board members were not satisfied with the leadership in the library. Brooks’s predecessor had regularly returned funds to the board at the end of every fiscal year. The institution deserved better; trustees wanted someone who could deliver quality library service to match the library’s quality quarters. Only then could the library assume its rightful place among the community’s cultural and educational institutions. That was why they hired a graduate of a library training program; they wanted to show they were willing to mobilize community resources to fund good library services.

Clara Brooks quickly demonstrated her professional expertise by harnessing her library training. She rearranged furniture in the circulation area to make the system more efficient and easier to control; she created a government documents collection by erecting shelves in two unused cloak rooms; and she established separate quarters for children’s library services and collections. Although the board applauded her efforts, she was impatient to do more. The public catalog was a mess, she thought. Books were classified by abridged Dewey, but her predecessor had made “so many exceptions and variations according to her own ideas” that Brooks became “quite dizzy” from searching. She hoped to standardize the system, and especially to superimpose American Library Association subject headings on the dictionary catalog. 3

The 9000-volume collection itself was cause for concern. Brooks’s predecessor had neglected the children’s collection, allowed fiction to soar to nearly 80 percent of circulation and made all selections from publishers’ catalogs. The new librarian’s response was automatic. She immediately entered subscriptions to Publishers’ Weekly and Booklist magazine, both of which her training had told her provided authoritative guidance on the latest quality cultural and intellectual literature. She also began buying books through A.C. McClurg and Company of Chicago—a jobber which offered libraries substantial discounts through volume purchasing from publishers. In fact, McClurg regularly checked Publishers’ Weekly and Booklist to help maintain accurate inventory control. Finally, Brooks began a subscription to the H.W. Wilson Company’s Abridged Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature—an index to twenty-two widely circulated magazines. The Reader’s Guide itself then became a selection aid for new subscriptions. With
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these reputable collection development tools to assist her with library acquisitions, she could feel reasonably sure that the Hoopeston Public Library would be providing its community with the "best" new literature on the market.

Brooks had every right to feel proud of her accomplishments. She had been an immediate match with the character of the community; she had increased Hoopeston's interest in the institution under her care; she had carefully applied the expertise taught her in library school to improve its services; and she had used the selection tools that identified the newly published literature possessing cultural and intellectual authority in order to build a quality collection. Illinois State Library School Assistant Director Frances Simpson wrote her on 10 October that she "could not have done better" if she had the "entire library school faculty back of [her] to advise her."4 Simpson's praise acknowledged that Brooks had passed a second test. She had been successfully socialized by her formal library education—i.e., her response to the actual working environment had been conditioned in the Illinois State Library School.

Analyzing this small episode in the history of formal library education may be instructive for contemporary generations. Like most professions during the past century, the library profession has looked to an increasingly circumscribed formal education to outfit professional aspirants with the values, attitudes, and accumulated knowledge the profession applies to its work, and then after graduation to demonstrate them all in the workplace. Naturally, much of this socialization process takes place in the classroom; but what occurs there is also directly affected by forces pressing the curriculum from outside. Each force deserves a closer look on the occasion of formal library education's centennial. Much has already been written on the subject but is based largely on professional perceptions forged in the 1950s and 1960s, and fails to benefit from the steadily growing body of literature on professionalization published in the 1970s and 1980s. A careful reading of this literature may provide a more relevant analytical (albeit still theoretical and speculative) framework which will enhance our understanding of the origins and impact of the socialization process in contemporary library education.

The Literature on Professionalism

In a summary of the literature on professionalism, Andrew Abbott has found that post-World War II schools of thought generally cluster into four groups.5 The functionalists—represented in the writings of Talcott Parsons—believe professions "function" to control the relat-
tionship between professional and client. The structuralists—exemplified by Harold Wilensky—discount functions and concentrate more heavily on the structure of professions, which they find more compelling. Monopolists—led by Magali Sarfatti Larson—argue that professions deliberately attach themselves to bureaucracies to exert dominance and authority in order to improve professional status and power. For analyzing the socialization processes which have historically taken place in formal library education, however, all of these schools of thought have obvious flaws that limit their usefulness.

A fourth school of thought, just emerging from the mix of published literature, offers more promise by concentrating on what Abbott calls "the cultural authority of professions." In recent years sociologists of professions have increasingly questioned the concept of "progress" toward some form of scientific accuracy and have reexamined professionals' role as agents of that progress. Scholars now openly acknowledge that professions are not value-free, and certainly not the disinterested communities altruistically dedicated to serving the public that they say they are. Often, in fact, professions seem to serve their own interests first. Abbott joins others calling for more attention to each profession's area of authority in order to test traditional definitions.6

Paul Starr expands upon this approach in the first section of his award-winning book, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine.*7 He argues that: "Authority incorporates two sources of effective control: legitimacy and dependence." In order to work, legitimacy requires client obedience; dependence resides in the client's fear of "foul consequences" if he does not obey. Starr says that "cultural authority refers to the probability that particular definitions of reality and judgments of meaning and value will prevail as valid and true." Cultural authority can also be carried by objects like the Bible, reference books, and works of scholarship.

Librarianship and Cultural and Intellectual Authority

Starr's definition of cultural authority can easily be applied to librarianship. For thousands of years the librarian's primary responsibility has been to acquire, maintain, and preserve objects of cultural and intellectual authority. For the past 100 years, library science students have been told the same thing. What is seldom discussed—but which becomes apparent from reading contemporary scholarship on the professions—is that librarians have relied heavily on outside experts or on accepted literary and intellectual canons to identify these objects.8
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Only after obtaining outside sanctions, only after applying the standards prescribed by conventional literary and intellectual canons, do librarians acquire the authority objects in order to apply their particular expertise—they catalog, classify, and circulate the authority objects to preselected publics that are then invited to benefit from exposure to them. And these publics appear willing to grant that at least on occasion a library's collections contain some authority they have determined is relevant to their lives. To paraphrase Starr, the publics attribute varying degrees of legitimacy to the collections and build up varying degrees of dependence upon them. For the past 100 years, library science students have been taught how to acquire, classify, catalog, and circulate library collections and where to look for guidance in selecting sources of cultural and intellectual authority.

Exercising expertise on authoritative collections mandates the existence of an institution in which that expertise can be applied and the collections housed. The institution—generally called a "library"—requires support from outside sources if no fees are charged for services provided. In the United States, this support in recent years has come most often from government coffers. For the past 100 years library science students have been studying the library from a variety of angles—its physical plant, organizational structure, funding sources, and the principles of administration needed to run it.

Objects of cultural and intellectual authority, professional expertise, and an institution sanctioned and supported by the government in which all this takes place—all of these elements were present when Clara Brooks scored her quick successes at the Hoopeston Public Library in October 1913. The local community supported the Carnegie library, Brooks applied the expertise she had learned at the Illinois State Library School, and the selection aids she used had already applied prescribed standards set by conventional canons to identify the accepted objects of cultural and intellectual authority which she wanted to circulate to her community. Thus the analytical model which surfaces from the scholarship on professions published in the last ten years seems to have relevance for studying the library profession.

Agates, Pumpkins, and Character

To this mix, however, one more element might be added to augment the model's validity for analyzing the socialization process in the formal education system which supplies the library profession with new members. Often this element escapes attention because it stands for a set
of requirements for admission to library schools. Although these requirements have changed significantly over the decades, in this essay they shall be gathered and discussed under the general term *character*.

Paul Mattingly, in his study of nineteenth-century schoolmen, discovered that educators' professional ideology had its origins in their belief in *character*—at that time defined as a "moral potential within each person [that] was somewhat susceptible to improvement and refinement given the proper influences." Mattingly's words sound very close to Melvil Dewey's oft-quoted quip about a human's inherent qualities—"You can polish an agate, but not a pumpkin." In fact, late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century library schools were very concerned with the "character" of the people they admitted to their programs. They believed only recruits possessing the right kind of character would enjoy professional success. For her time and in her place, Clara Brooks obviously passed that test. She was a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant woman who matched the social, cultural, and, in this particular case, religious profile of the community she sought to serve.

Character, institution, expertise, and objects of cultural and intellectual authority—each of these elements can be seen in the socialization process designed to inculcate the profession's values, attitudes, and accumulated knowledge that has taken place in formal library science education over the past 100 years. Each also deserves extended discussion in order to measure its impact more thoroughly and to locate its role more accurately in the profession's historical development.

On 5 January 1887 Melvil Dewey opened the doors of his School of Library Economy at Columbia College. Dewey himself penned the admission requirement: "Any person of good moral character presenting a satisfactory certificate or diploma, or satisfying the director by personal examination that he has sufficient natural fitness, ability, and education to take the course creditably...may be admitted to the class." People meeting Dewey's standards of character, in other words, were admitted to a program taught primarily by nonscholar generalists steeped in practical experience.

To develop a professional expertise, Dewey's students listened to lectures on cataloging methods, classification schemes, and circulation systems that were delivered by such highly regarded practitioners as Charles A. Cutter, Samuel Swett Green, William I. Fletcher, and Dewey himself. Library students then practiced the methods they had learned under the watchful eyes of several members of the Columbia College Library staff. To secure a good understanding of the institutional framework in which methods were applied, students also listened to several prominent administrators like William Frederick Poole, Jose-
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Thus Nelson Larned, Reuben Guild, and Justin Winsor expound on library buildings, organization, and the fundamental principles of library administration. Finally, to make sure his students became acquainted with the appropriate written products of cultural and intellectual authority, Dewey invited Columbia College faculty members (e.g., political scientist John W. Burgess) to lecture on the state of bibliography in their own separate fields.

The Ideology of the "Library Spirit"

If the analytical framework discussed previously is applied to Dewey's school, one might conclude that students who completed the program had been socialized to: (1) honor the dictates of outside professional expertise on the appropriate publications carrying cultural and intellectual authority; (2) practice an expertise unique to their own profession; and (3) accept the validity of the institution in which it all took place. And since the students had been screened for moral fitness, they already possessed adequate character to carry forward what Dewey called the "library spirit"—a powerful ideology which argued that the authority inherent in a library collection housed in an institution legitimated by the state would, when coupled with the librarian's special professional expertise, develop a dependency among the members of the mass public who sought to continue their education beyond formal schooling.

For generations thereafter, Dewey's school, its curriculum and admission requirements became the standard against which all subsequently established library schools measured themselves. That the ideology he espoused was convincing is obvious from the careful way other schools mimicked his system. It was no coincidence that most were run by former Dewey students.

Responsible professionals have always felt obligated to improve existing methods of delivering services, and historically library educators have proved no exception. Debates on the appropriate way to improve the socialization process took several forms. Most library schools acknowledged they could augment the character of professionals by increasing admissions standards; but the salaries librarians were able to command, and the vacancies crying to be filled, forced them to compromise. Disputes on authority were less common, since authority of the objects librarians collected was determined largely outside the profession. When disputes did occur, however, they generally paralleled debates raging in scholarly circles.11
Authority and Library School Curricula

Disagreements over the appropriate proportion of curricular attention to be given to expertise and institution were more frequent. In the early twentieth century, administrators argued that library schools were spending too much time acclimating students to cataloging and classification methods, not enough time to principles of administration. In 1906 E.H. Anderson, Dewey's successor at the New York State Library School, called for greater attention to the "phases" of library management "which call for executive and administrative ability." In 1916, Cornelia Marvin, director of the Oregon State Library, admonished Mary Wright Plummer, director of the New York Public Library School, to improve student skills in the business routine of library systems. "It has always been my experience that librarians are lacking in business knowledge," she wrote, "and I think it would be a splendid thing if [students] might have this emphasized a little."

"I think you are a little hard on library schools," wrote Everett Perry, director of the Los Angeles Public Library Training School, responding to a similar criticism Marvin made three years later. In 1919 the Los Angeles curriculum fit into four broad categories: (1) technical courses, which covered cataloging, classification, and accessions; (2) bibliographical courses, which included book selection, reference, special subject literatures, and public documents; (3) administration courses; and (4) miscellaneous courses, including the history of books and libraries and "current" library literature. The categories themselves reveal an obvious push of forces. By World War I the library as an institution had assumed a standard organizational profile which included reference and cataloging departments, and that organization in turn exerted an influence on technical and bibliographical courses. Miscellaneous courses were designed to inculcate some of the "library spirit" felt during turn-of-the-century growth years by "demonstrating" the historical—and contemporary—benefits that libraries, their collections, and services had on the social environment in which they coexisted.

Faculty members also contributed to the process. Generally, they were professionals steeped in practical skills who themselves had been socialized by an apprenticeship system designed to perpetuate the status quo. What literature faculty members did publish applauded the library spirit or made use of empirical research that generally addressed the expertise considered necessary to manage collections or the institutions that housed them. And by example faculty members reinforced that
lesson on their students—the modern library professional was a non-scholar generalist.

Supporting this curriculum and faculty were several regularly revised textbooks now considered classics. Alice B. Kroeger's *Guide to Reference Books* and John Cotton Dana's *Library Primer* took their places among students' required reading in such standard library periodicals as *Library Journal*, *Public Libraries*, *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, and *Booklist* magazine, and alongside work with the latest editions of the *Dewey Decimal Classification* and Charles A. Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*. Textbooks taught students to accept the legitimacy of the library institution, to embrace its self-assumed obligation to collect the objects of cultural and intellectual authority that external experts had identified as socially valuable and to develop an expertise unique to the library profession.

Still the profession expressed discontent with the socialization process. Other professions, like law and medicine, seemed to be drawing better students, certainly better male students, which many male librarians viewed as the major obstacle preventing librarianship from assuming a more prominent position within the community of professions. Another dimension to the problem related to students' basic character. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam pointed out in 1906 that questions of character revolved around events occurring before students ever got into the schools.16 Enough other librarians eventually agreed that by the time Charles C. Williamson published his now classic *Training for Library Service* (1923), he actually gave voice to an accelerating momentum. He wrote: "One of the most fundamental conclusions of this report is that professional library training should be based on a college education or its full equivalent."17 A liberal arts education, in other words, would certify the library school graduate's character level upon which librarians could build a stronger profession. Although not always openly stated, it was nevertheless generally accepted that a college graduate had a deeper understanding of the classic objects of cultural and intellectual authority than a noncollege graduate, and that the former was better able than the latter to apply prescribed standards set by contemporary literary and intellectual canons to determine which newly published works ought to become authority objects worthy of acquisition.18 Consequently, it was assumed, college graduates could interpret library collections to readers seeking advice much better than could nongraduates.

Williamson offered a second major conclusion. "The professional library school should be organized as a department of a university along
with other professional schools, rather than in public libraries, state or municipal.” By 1923 the compromise between the ideal and reality was obviously no longer acceptable. Not only could librarians expect the quality of their profession not to improve substantially unless library school graduates had a college degree, the whole process of socializing aspiring professionals with the requisite character ought to take place within a university setting. The force of the arguments Williamson made was compelling; within a decade, library training schools affiliated with public or state libraries had disappeared. The profession had welcomed the university’s intervention into the socialization process of library science students as a marked improvement. For the next twenty years most criticisms of library education aimed at living up to the ideal. By the end of World War II several library schools were even insisting that applicants be in the top half of their graduating classes or show a “B” average. Some librarians assumed character could be graded.

While library schools steadily pressed for a more reliable way to measure the character potential of students they admitted, the profession was not idle in its attention to improving the socialization process within the curriculum. By applying the analytical framework discussed at the beginning of this essay, it appears that the primary goal was to increase the quality of instruction designed to build expertise, yet leave relatively untouched basic assumptions about the legitimacy of the institution in which this expertise was practiced and the authority of the cultural and intellectual objects around which the expertise revolved. The 1951 “Standards for Accreditation” that the American Library Association applied to library school master’s degree programs provide a convenient set of guidelines with which to test the analytical framework. Carl White has suggested that “the standards obligate the library school, in cooperation with its parent institution, to transmit the cumulated knowledge and intellectual skills required to maximize the social usefulness of libraries.” His summary of the curricular reflections of this elevated sense of obligation is revealing.

One area White called an innovation was the development of subject bibliography courses. Library educators acknowledged that the literature in all fields had grown exponentially since the turn of the century, and they felt students somehow ought to be exposed to these literatures as much as possible. Their belief rested on an assumption that such exposure would make students better professionals—as reference librarians, literature searchers, and collection builders—and might induce more students to undertake subject bibliography as a branch of study once they became professionals. When matched against Paul Starr’s definition of objects of “cultural authority,” however, it appears
that subject bibliography courses made little attempt to draw students into a debate over the validity and truth—claims of the sources that the library profession sought to control bibliographically. Determining the authority of sources covered in these courses and setting the standards with which they were to be measured continued to reside outside the profession.

White suggested that: "Technical services represented another curricular innovation, or at least a new way to treat several traditional subjects." Study of technical services required students to analyze the process of cataloging and classification—both tasks requiring professional expertise that librarians had practiced for decades—and then to locate that process within an institutional work flow. Close analysis of this innovation, however, reveals consistency with the analytical model articulated in previous pages. Students were not required to question the need for the expertise, nor the legitimacy of the institution to which it was attached. Rather, the change was imposed by perceived institutional necessity. The curriculum, in other words, responded to organizational changes that took place in the institution. Like subject bibliography, technical services courses can hardly be considered fundamental changes in the process of socializing library science students.

"Library services" constituted a third area of curricular attention. Courses fitting this heading were designed to acquaint students with the different types of library services provided by different kinds of libraries; they also asked students to consider whether all of these services combined supplied a system adequate to the nation's needs. Implicit in the latter was a belief that gaps existed which librarians needed to address. Students were encouraged to think about expanding the institution, the authority objects it housed, and professional expertise applied to extending the library to previously unserved groups. More efficient methods of delivering library services would accelerate the effort to fill gaps; students were encouraged to search for them.

Finally, the imposition of the 1951 standards also brought the introduction of several courses White fits under the general title of "Foundations of Librarianship." Here again, implementation of these courses rested on a belief that libraries provided essential services which, unfortunately, much of society had not yet acknowledged. Closer study of the origins of libraries, it was assumed, would provide students with the information necessary to demonstrate the library's true contribution to the groups holding social, political, and economic power which had not yet recognized or were ignoring the library. Grounding students in the foundations of the profession to which they sought entrance would arm them with effective, accurate ammunition for the uphill battle.
WAYNE WIEGAND

White himself acknowledges that "foundations" courses were created to do for students in the mid-twentieth century what the "library spirit" did for students in the late nineteenth century. Hindsight suggests that the ideology which argued that the authority inherent in the collection, housed in an institution supported by the state and served by the special professional expertise of the library community, remained intact. The socialization process may have been raised to new levels of communication and legitimated by higher education when the 1951 standards were implemented, but measured against the analytical framework discussed here, the basic process does not appear to have changed much since Dewey opened the doors of the Columbia College School of Library Economy on 5 January 1887.

Quality and Library School Curricula

More than three decades have passed since the American Library Association imposed its 1951 standards on library education and cemented a socialization process that was evident from its origins. Library and information science schools now operate under a revised set of standards brought into force in 1972. Each library school is expected to meet acceptable qualitative standards in six broad areas: (1) program goals and objectives; (2) curriculum; (3) students; (4) faculty; (5) governance, administration and financial support; and (6) physical resources and facilities. Only the first four will be checked against the analytical model.

Character. The definition of character has changed over the decades since Melvil Dewey first began his search for "agate." By the mid-twentieth century educators had become convinced that exposure to a good undergraduate liberal arts curriculum would develop the kind of moral character and personal ethics which would serve as a sound foundation for most types of professional service.

Library schools operate on the same premise. In the last twenty years they have increased admissions requirements by introducing new standards of measurement for comparison. Insisting that applicants have an undergraduate grade point average of 2.75 on a 4.00 scale is not uncommon. Applicants are also expected to take the Graduate Record Examination and score above 900. Both moves were enacted to improve the character of students seeking admission to library and information science programs or at least to maintain those levels in an era of grade inflation. Nonetheless, complaints by library school faculty about the quality of students in their classrooms are still common. Lack of skills in communication, both oral and written (two skills considered essen-
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tial to any professional work), are now causing many to question the validity of GPA and GRE scores as adequate measures of professional potential.

Authority. Because students bringing a 2.75 GPA and 900 GRE score are expected to know the major published works of cultural and intellectual authority and to be acquainted with standards implicit in the dominant literary and intellectual canons, library and information science school curricula continue to concentrate student attention on methods of controlling this vast literature; students study subject and area bibliography, and learn how to verify new works of authority. They are not expected to participate directly in determining what works carry authority. That task is left to experts from other fields.

In other words, students are still being socialized to trust the opinions of authority experts from outside fields as a foundation for the library's decisions about what to include and what not to include. To an outside public which believes librarians "know books," this may come as a shock. A more accurate statement might be that librarians know how to apply the standards dictated by conventional canons that have been developed outside the profession, or they know where to find the opinions of disciplinary experts better situated to "know books" in their own areas of authority. Except for tools unique to librarianship, library science students are not socialized to make "authority" decisions.

Institution. The overwhelming majority of graduates of library and information science schools still get their first professional positions in institutions called "libraries." Thus it is only natural that the institution continues to exert a significant influence on curricular development. Unlike the professions of medicine or law, the library profession is oriented toward a corporate rather than a competitive environment, and the communal nature of the institution in which librarians work is reflected throughout the curricula that socialize library students.

Most library and information science schools have retained in their core curricula considerable attention to the administration of libraries. Nonetheless, complaints about library school graduates continue to come from practitioners perplexed with the graduates' inability to fit easily into the institutional structures that have developed in the last century.

In 1984 twelve library and information science educators spent three weeks in a research library institute at the University of North Carolina that was sponsored by the Association for Research Libraries and funded by the Council on Library Resources. Practitioners who spoke to the educators about curricular change identified two issues as
crucial—(1) generate in library and information science students a greater ability to work effectively in groups, and (2) increase their capacity to cope with stress and ambiguity. Practitioners considered both of these skills essential to the success of research library institutions.

Students themselves intuitively acknowledge this institutional pull on their curricular experience. If not required, most feel obligated to take at least one administration or library organization course. In some schools this pull is magnified by a required clinical experience. That the entire socialization process addressing the institution in the curriculum may be imposing unconscious parameters on students' perceived set of options is not often openly admitted.

**Expertise.** Because expertise separates the library and information science profession from other professions, it continues to receive the majority of contemporary curricular attention. Students spend much time studying methods of acquiring, arranging, storing, retrieving, and circulating objects of cultural and intellectual authority. They become acquainted with some of the newer methods of delivering traditional services that technological innovations introduced to library institutions—i.e., services like automated circulation and security systems, file construction and database management, computerized cataloging, and reference work. Seldom do students explore beyond these professional boundaries, however. Library and information science school curricula do not socialize them to think that way. And all of this is reinforced by example—by a faculty which is encouraged and rewarded for applied research. The author of a cataloging text has a better chance of substantial royalties and professional recognition than the author of a scholarly monograph on the foundations of academic librarianship. The faculty member skilled in conducting effective workshops on microcomputers in the library will draw more and larger audiences than the faculty member concerned with professional ethics. Students assimilate this quickly, and the socialization process is complete.

**Conclusion**

Library education has experienced significant changes since 5 January 1887, but the analytical framework applied here and grounded in the most recent scholarship on the professions suggests that the changes have not been fundamental in nature. Character, expertise, and institutions have shifted with the times, but apparently not the source of authority around which the other three revolve. Curricular modifica-
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Socialization have generally followed the dynamics of a changing environment affected by outside forces like the introduction of new technology and improved methods of administration. Contemporary library and information science students are being socialized to cope with these changes so that their response to problems is appropriately conditioned when they enter the profession. A century after formal library education began, library science students can be described as college graduates learning the expertise considered necessary to maintain and improve services within an institution housing objects of cultural and intellectual authority.

Clara Brooks was also socialized to respond to a situation. She possessed a certain character considered appropriate to her time and place, applied an expertise she learned in library school that was consistent with turn-of-the-century librarianship, ran an institution supported by local tax dollars, and sought to fill it with the objects of cultural and intellectual authority that had been identified by outside experts as "valid and true." By the standards of her profession and her employers, she scored significant successes. Although the standards of measurement may have changed since Brooks entered library school, the socialization process she experienced seventy years ago appears to bear a striking resemblance to contemporary library and information science education.
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Women in Library Education: Down the Up Staircase

MARY NILES MAACK

Over the past century women have played a variety of roles in library education. Not only have they consistently made up the majority of students, but they have also distinguished themselves as founders of schools, as deans, directors, or principals, as instructors, and as members of those ALA committees that set the standards by which schools were to be accredited. Although the names of numerous women appear in the historical studies on library education (by Carroll, Churchwell, Davis, Houser and Schrader, Vann, and White) the indexes to these works reveal very few references to women as a group. The approach taken by these historians can be defended on the grounds that women leaders worked closely with their male colleagues in creating and reshaping library education. In fact, it could be argued that women were fully integrated into the field and did not view their contributions as somehow related to the issue of gender roles.

Although it is important to emphasize that women have always been a part of the mainstream in library education, there is also an interest in considering how their participation in the field has changed over the past one hundred years. As one examines both the rank and proportional representation of female library educators, it soon becomes apparent that their power and influence have decreased dramatically. At the turn of the century, women directed three of the four existing schools, but in 1984-1985 they held only 32.3 percent of the deanships of accredited programs and occupied less than half of the
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tenured posts in these schools. A great deal of research needs to be done before the complex—and often paradoxical—nature of these changes can be fully documented and analyzed. Due to the limitations of time and space, this essay represents only the first, preliminary effort to extract data on women from relevant biographical, historical, and quantitative studies and to place information from these scattered sources within a feminist historical framework.

Central to this discussion is an examination of women's status in library education. Here status is used in the expanded sense suggested by Joan Kelly-Gadol who defines the concept "to refer to women's place and power—that is the roles and positions women hold in society by comparison with those of men."\(^2\) Kelly-Gadol goes on to observe that the historical study of women's status demands a new approach to periodization:

Indeed what emerges is a fairly regular pattern of relative loss of status for women precisely in those periods of so-called progressive change....To pursue this problem is to become aware of the fact that there was no "renaissance" for women, at least not during the Renaissance. There was, on the contrary, a marked restriction of the scope and power of women.\(^3\)

In a very similar way, women's loss of status as leaders in library education occurred over a time period normally perceived as one of continuing professionalization and upward mobility for the field. Houser and Schrader point out that most writers "firmly believe that...various events [in the history of library education] and the apparent 'growth' they represented were incremental, a kind of relentless natural progression."\(^4\) Because this "progression" resulted in the restriction of women's power in terms of their access to deanships and a reduction of their representation on the faculty (especially in the tenured ranks) a new chronological framework is needed in order to reevaluate the "landmarks" in the quest for graduate education as they affected the nature and scope of women's activities.

For the purpose of this essay three distinct periods have been identified. The first period begins in 1887 with the participation of women as students and lecturers in the first library training class; it ends in 1923 with the opening of the Paris Library School which was set up by Sarah Bogle and staffed by a talented group of female librarians from the United States. During this period of missionary fervor, women did not hesitate to assume roles as pioneers and innovators in the crusade to establish formal library training programs.

This era of expansion and experimentation was followed by a period of transition—as library schools began to move from the less
discriminatory environment of large libraries and four-year institutions into a university environment where women were often excluded from the faculty or relegated to the lowest posts. The period from the creation of the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) in 1924 until the drafting of the new standards in 1950 was a time when female library educators fully participated in the changes that were occurring in the field, and noted women served on the subcommittees whose work was to place library education firmly at the master's-degree level. Nonetheless, as women began to fall behind in the number of doctorates earned, they were also losing ground in their leadership of the field.

The final period begins with the approval of the 1951 standards and is marked by a demographic shift as women were progressively replaced by men—both in deanships and in the ranks of tenured faculty. This masculinization was not curtailed until recently, despite a resurgence of feminism in the late 1960s. Although there were many social, cultural, and psychological factors that led to a predominance of men in library education, the masculinization of the field can be linked to the leadership role played by library schools in the major universities where antifeminist biases have had a long, well-documented history.

Missionaries and Mentors 1887-1923

On 5 January 1887 when the first eager class of library students assembled in makeshift quarters above the Columbia chapel, they were quite unaware that Dewey had been forbidden to use any existing college classroom because he had insisted on admitting women to the all-male campus. Dewey's effort to provide instruction to this first class of seventeen women and three men was quite audacious in a college described by one of his first female apprentices as being, at the time, "almost as hermetically sealed to women as a monastery." Although the presence of female students is generally cited as the chief reason for the expulsion of the library school from the masculine precincts of Columbia, Sarah Vann has observed that without women, Dewey could have scarcely created a library training program at all. She points out that Dewey's experiment would have been imperiled had he attempted to maintain a school for only three male students. Vann continues: "Thus, despite the administrative crisis which was engendered and which was solved only by Dewey's transference of the school to the New York State Library, the anomaly is that women, in their ready acceptance of formal training, were largely responsible for the continuation of the first formal training program and others which were developed afterward."
Dewey retained the directorship of the library school after its transfer to Albany, but his multiple responsibilities as state librarian and secretary to the New York Board of Regents led him to delegate much of the work at the school to a devoted group of assistants who had followed him from Columbia. In his biography of Dewey, Fremont Rider remarked that these five women and two men actually "conducted the school while he [Dewey] inspired it," and by 1901 a good friend noted that Dewey seldom met classes and had lectured fewer than four times in the course of the year. Throughout Dewey's tenure at Albany, it was Mary Salome Cutler Fairchild, vice-director of the school, who was responsible for its day-to-day operation. Known as an inspiring lecturer as well as a competent executive, she had begun teaching cataloging to the first library training class in 1887. During her sixteen years at Albany, Fairchild was assisted by three of Dewey's first female protégées—Florence Woodworth, a capable administrator; Ada Alice Jones, who taught cataloging; and May Seymour, a specialist in classification who also lectured on library printing and editing. These women were "part of that group who were resolute in their commitment to systematic instruction instead of apprenticeship."

This new approach was also advocated by Mary Wright Plummer, a graduate of the 1888 class at Columbia. After working two years in the Saint Louis Public Library she accepted an appointment at the Pratt Institute Free Library where she immediately began laying the foundations of the second American library school. Plummer believed that the goal of library education should be "the training in principles and the education of the judgement of the individual so that he may apply these principles in any given case and not fall back helplessly on cut-and-dried methods." Following her return from a year-long leave of absence devoted to visiting European libraries, Mary Wright Plummer began to organize an extended program at Pratt. In 1896 a second year of instruction, patterned after European library education, was offered to students who wished to work in large, scholarly libraries. These students took courses on ancient and modern continental literature, the history of books and printing, and Italian, as well as bibliography, advanced cataloging, and "a general survey of larger matters of library administration." Three years later Plummer inaugurated another second-year program for a very different specialty—children's librarianship.

Mary Wright Plummer's innovative work at Pratt soon brought her recognition as a leader of the library training movement, and in June 1901 Library Journal featured her article on past accomplishments and future prospects in the field. Already she was predicting a need for
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specialized training, and although she never advocated college graduation as an entrance requirement at Pratt, she emphasized the need to "raise the standard of library work and bring it within the scholarly sphere." She commented: "It is my hope that some day our leading universities may have chairs of librarianships, with courses similar to, though perhaps more extended than, that given by Dr. Dziatzko at Göttingen, and that mature college students may be able to elect college work that will combine naturally with these courses."12

Emphasis on solid scholarly training was also a major theme in the writings of another library school founder, Katharine Sharp. Regarded as one of the most promising students at the New York State Library School, Sharp had begun organizing a library exhibit for the Columbian Exposition when the president of Armour Institute asked Dewey to recommend the best man in America to set up a library and organize a library training program at his institution. Dewey then launched Sharp on a career in library education with his famous reply: "The best man in America is a woman and she is in the next room."13

Although she soon succeeded in expanding the training program at Armour to two years, Sharp was eager to move the school to a university setting. In 1897 she accepted the offer from the University of Illinois to transfer her school to Urbana where she would hold the title of full professor and would serve as director of the university library as well as head of the library school. Sharp favored this arrangement because she believed that library school instructors should be involved in practical work but she also attempted to have the school recognized as a collegiate unit separate from the library. Although she was unsuccessful in her efforts to obtain a status for the school that was comparable to other professional schools (such as the College of Law), by 1903 she had managed to raise the entrance requirements to three years of college work. Sharp never received sufficient support from the university to establish a graduate program that would fulfill her goal of training individuals for the highest positions, but through her example and commitment she did succeed in inspiring several women who were to play a leading role in library education. One of these was Harriet Howe who praised Sharp for her "criticalness, concentration, accuracy...judgement, adaptability, professional knowledge, and forcefulness."14

Although Sharp was in many ways an exceptional woman, she undoubtedly benefited from the stimulating atmosphere during her student days in Albany where she interacted not only with the director and faculty but also with gifted classmates like Alice Kroeger, who founded the library school at Drexel Institute in Philadelphia; and Mary
Mary Maack, who set up a similar program in Boston at Simmons College for women. Three later graduates of the New York State Library School (two women and one man) also contributed to the spread of library education by founding schools in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Berkeley.

Although a few other men were also instrumental in setting up library schools, two-thirds of the fifteen schools created prior to 1920 were organized by women (see table 1). Imbued with the ideals of a new movement, these women displayed a great deal of initiative and entrepreneurial spirit rather than the timidity and passivity that were considered feminine attributes in the late nineteenth century. One woman, Mary Wright Plummer, even established two schools, while another, Anne Wallace Howland, created the first library training program in the South at Atlanta Public Library (subsequently transferred to Emory University) and later accepted the call to reestablish the program at Drexel which had been closed from 1914 to 1922.

While most of these female library school founders had formal library training, their academic backgrounds were quite diverse. Two women possessed advanced degrees—Katharine Sharp, with a master's from Northwestern, and Mary Jane Sibley, the director of the Syracuse program who had no library training but had earned a doctorate in 1892. At the other extreme was one woman who had studied with private tutors and others whose highest diploma came from a public high school or a female seminary. Some women attended colleges like Mount Holyoke or Wellesley, but not all of them had graduated. Among the latter group was Mary Wright Plummer whose wide reading, extensive travel, and publications (poems, essays, and children's books as well as works on librarianship) made her one of the most distinguished members of the field. Shaped by an era when very few women had the opportunity to finish college, Plummer and her successor at Pratt, Josephine Rathbone, opposed the requirement that all library school students have a college degree. Rathbone was outspoken in her defense of the principle of "maintaining an open door for the exceptional woman who had gained from other experience the knowledge and culture...that college is supposed to give [author's emphasis]."15

Although the existing biographical studies of this first generation of female library educators offer few clues about their attitudes toward the women's rights movement, they could certainly be considered "feminist" in their commitment to training women for leadership roles in librarianship. Both through personal example and through encouragement of talented female protégés, they expressed the belief that women could make a valuable contribution to the field. Katharine Sharp, for example, has been frequently cited for her influence on students such as
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TABLE 1
Library School Founders 1887-1919

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Library Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia/New York State Library School (NYSL)</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Melvil Dewey (1851-1931)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Mary Wright Plummer (1856-1916)</td>
<td>NYSL 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Institute</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Alice B. Kroeger (1864-1909)</td>
<td>NYSL 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour Institute/University of Illinois Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Katharine Sharp (1865-1914)</td>
<td>NYSL 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Frances Jenkins Olcott (1872-1963)</td>
<td>NYSL 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Reserve</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Mary E. Robbins (1865-1939)</td>
<td>NYSL 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>William Brett (1846-1918)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic/Emory University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Electra Doren (1861-1927)</td>
<td>NYSL 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Mary E. Hazeltine (1868-1949)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Dr. Mary J. Sibley</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Public Library</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Mary Wright Plummer (1856-1916)</td>
<td>NYSL 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>William E. Henry</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Public Library/USC</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Everett Robbins Perry</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis Public University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Harriet E. Sawyer</td>
<td>Pratt 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Sydney Mitchell (1878-1951)</td>
<td>NYSL 1904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alice Tyler (who later directed the Western Reserve library school), Harriett Howe (who founded the library school in Denver), and Margaret Mann (who became famous for her role as a library educator as well as an expert on cataloging). Much later Mann recalled that Sharp "never lost an opportunity to share with her students all the learning she had acquired; her influence was not just a passing incident in their lives—it was something that went far deeper; she aroused in them a certain determination to succeed and gave them glimpses of things far beyond their own work and their own horizons [emphasis added]."\(^6\)

Influenced by Sharp, Mann herself became known as a gifted teacher whose emphasis on the underlying principles of cataloging inspired dozens of students in the United States and in France where she served as a faculty member at the Paris Library School. This training program for French librarians was sponsored by ALA and was organized by Sarah Bogle, the association's assistant secretary. Trained at Drexel in 1904, Bogle, like Mann, was part of the dynamic first generation of library school graduates who "saw ahead of [their time] things that were not and created them.\(^7\)

The opening of the Paris Library School in 1923 proved a fitting culmination to this "missionary phase" of library education; it also marked the end of an era when ability and enthusiasm were considered more important than academic credentials. Margaret Mann, who was described by William Warner Bishop as "the best teacher of...[cataloging] to be found anywhere,"\(^8\) did not have a college degree and neither did Sarah Bogle. However, both were highly thought of by French colleagues and students who appreciated their intelligence, broad culture, and professional experience.

Bogle, a former director of the Carnegie Library School in Pittsburgh, had already achieved a national reputation as a library educator by the time she began her assignment in Paris. Although she could not remain full time in France, she made frequent trips to the school and conducted a voluminous correspondence with Mary Prescott Parsons, the resident director. Bogle also continued to correspond with former students and staff even after the program closed in 1929. When Sarah Bogle died three years later, she was warmly remembered by her French students for "that faith in our mutual aims that...she was able to infuse into all of us.\(^9\) At the time the curriculum in Paris was developed by Bogle, she was serving as secretary to the Temporary Library Training Board of ALA. Deeply immersed in all of the issues surrounding the dramatic reform of American library education, she designed the curriculum of the new school in accordance with ALA's "recommendations..."
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...for a one year graduate library school, but the subject matter and method of presentation...were necessarily adapted to European conditions."

Because of her position at ALA, Bogle also played a pivotal role in the United States where she took part in the reform movement triggered by Charles C. Williamson's highly critical evaluation of library education. After conducting a thorough study in 1920-1921, Williamson clearly showed that few of the fifteen existing schools had adequate faculty or facilities to measure up to other graduate departments or professional schools. This he felt was partly the result of a failure to distinguish between the clerical and the professional aspects of librarianship. Although library educators did not agree on how or whether to eliminate all clerical components from the curriculum, no one seems to have objected to Williamson's statement: "Largely because it is generally looked upon as clerical, library work has come to be known as 'women's work.' Men generally, and women to a large extent, do not think of it as offering a desirable career."

Elsewhere in his two reports, Williamson showed considerable ambivalence toward the effect of women on the field. In the confidential report of 1921 he went furthest, stating: "Consideration should also be given to the need of checking the feminization of library work as a profession." Nonetheless in 1923 Williamson denied the claim that too many women graduates left librarianship (due to marriage) by pointing out that "the figures show men graduates drop out of the profession in about the same proportion as women." On the other hand, he was against giving aid to the proposed school in Portland due to "the objection to staffing the school by women because of its tendency to deter men from entering." Williamson's general remarks on faculty were also colored by this ambivalence. Later in the 1923 report he commented that "library school instructors are seldom forceful and convincing. Most of them are women;...many...are not college trained." He also observed that "the tendency has existed from the beginning for library schools to be more or less dominated by a single personality." Here he failed to add that that personality was often a very forceful, energetic woman.

Preoccupied with the issue of new entrance requirements, the potential for graduate level study, and the question of university affiliation, the leading library educators who responded to Williamson's report ignored or chose not to address its implications for women in the field. While some of the responses published in Library Journal were noncommittal (simply concentrating on minor errors or changes in
their programs) on the whole educators were less defensive than might have been expected. A collective statement from the faculty of New York State Library School criticized the report for its "pervading note of disparagement," and Anne Wallace Howland, director of the Drexel library school, remarked that despite definite financial limitations, "the progress made by library schools in the thirty-three years covered by Dr. Williamson's report may well be a matter of pride." However, Howland also referred to the report as "an excellent survey...constructive in its suggestions"—and she saw it as marking "an epoch in the history of the development of library training only less important than...the first library school at Columbia in 1887." Mary Hazeltine, founding director of the library school at the University of Wisconsin, also found the report "constructive and stimulating" while Tommie Dora Barker, director of the Carnegie library school in Atlanta, remarked that "none would underestimate the importance of the report in setting forth an ideal to be attained."27

Williamson's ideal, "that the professional library school should be organized as a department of a university," provoked much discussion before it was completely accepted by the field. However, virtually no attention seems to have been given to item "2" that contained this recommendation:

2. Library schools are noticeably lacking in the prestige enjoyed by professional schools generally. The reasons for this condition seem to be:
   (a) The smallness of the library school;
   (b) The brevity of the course;
   (c) The predominance of women in the faculty and student body;
   (d) The preponderance of teachers having only the rank of instructor; and
   (e) The total lack of anything recognized as productive scholarship.

University library schools developed on the lines laid down in this report should gradually overcome these handicaps [emphasis added].28

Although library schools were to remain relatively small, their eventual integration as graduate units of major universities did serve to overcome many of the other "handicaps" including the "predominance of women in the faculty."

**Between Two Spheres 1924-1950**

The creation of the ALA Board of Education for Librarianship in June 1924 is generally regarded as the first major step toward imple-
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menting the recommendations of the Williamson report. The Minimum Standards for Library Schools adopted by BEL in 1925 did allow for the accreditation of "junior undergraduate library schools," including four programs which were attached to public libraries in Atlanta, New York, Los Angeles, and Saint Louis. However, this proved to be a temporary compromise in the inexorable movement toward university affiliation. While such programs were technically allowable as "Type III" schools under the revised standards of 1933, most of the schools that were attached to public libraries had either closed or had gained university affiliation by this time. Library schools accredited under the 1933 standards included undergraduate programs in women's colleges and technical institutes, but leadership in the field soon fell to the "Type I" schools which required a bachelor's degree for admission and were located in major research universities.

The shift from general approval of a diversity of educational programs to acceptance of the graduate school as the most appropriate standard was occurring in many other fields as well as librarianship. Patricia Albjerg Graham points out that this movement in higher education, which began in the mid-1920s, had a very negative impact on the status of women in academia:

For a brief period, from approximately 1875 to 1925, a strikingly heterogeneous array of acceptable and praiseworthy institutions existed in America. This coincided with a crucial period in the history of women and aided in their advancement....This [period] was followed by the reemergence of a monolith, the research university, which became the new ideal type....A single standard of higher education received public sanction and acclaim. A direct result was that institutions traditionally based on other standards had to choose between emulating the now almost universal model or resign themselves to providing alternatives without widespread public and professional support....This loss of variety was more serious for women as a group than men.

Although the unique standard of the master's degree in librarianship was not adopted until 1951, at the time when the first graduate library programs were being created in major research universities, their parent institutions already had a long, if not distinguished, tradition of discrimination against women. This was dramatically illustrated in 1921 when Committee W of the American Association of University Professors conducted a demographic survey of 145 member institutions. This study revealed that there were no women faculty at twenty-seven of the one hundred coeducational schools; in the remaining seventy-three schools, women held less than 3 percent of the full professorships, if the highly feminized fields of home economics and physical education were
eliminated. This situation did not improve over the next two decades. In her seminal study of women in science, Margaret Rossiter concluded that "the period from 1920 to 1940 was for academic women, despite all their initial political protests and overall numerical expansion, one of social and psychological containment." 31

During this same period there was renewed debate on women's role in the library field. Although few writers went so far as to deny that women had proven themselves capable professionals, there were frequent recommendations that more men be recruited into the field. Certain writers argued that it was "logical" for male librarians to occupy the highest posts in the college or university setting. In 1938 one male librarian noted that the number of library school deanships held by women was relatively large, given the fact that "in all probability nearly all the other divisions of the colleges having library schools are headed by men [emphasis added]." 32 That same year, another man observed in a letter to *Library Journal* that "the masculine character of a college faculty seems to call for a male librarian." 33

Two library school directors, Tommie Dora Barker of Emory and Florence Curtis of Hampton Institute, also entered into the *Library Journal* debate. Barker stressed that women had "given a good account of themselves as administrators" while Curtis felt that an "outstanding woman" should have a chance at a high-level post. 34 However, as director of the only accredited school for blacks in the South, Curtis was also very sensitive to the handicaps of social discrimination. She observed: "A man can go to men's organizations as a member, not just a speaker. He is also welcome to join discussions in hotel or dormitory rooms, at a smoker or a men's 'get-together' [where] matters of policy are often settled...." 35

Although Curtis unfortunately offered no solution to these disadvantages, she perceptively identified a social reality that was to shape and constrain women's participation in academia—particularly in those institutions with graduate library schools. One of these institutions was the University of Michigan which, like many other prestigious universities, had well-established sexually segregated faculty clubs. One noted female scientist recalled "that she was forbidden to eat dinner at the Michigan Faculty Club, even when she was the after dinner speaker, and was refused admission to another such club when she was again the honored guest." 36 Perhaps it should not be surprising that each of the five library programs accredited as "Type I" graduate schools under the revised 1933 standards (California at Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, and Michigan) had a male dean or director in 1937.
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The most influential and the most controversial of these graduate schools was the doctoral program created at the University of Chicago in 1928. At the time, many library leaders—both men and women—failed to see any need for a doctorate in library science. However, among the strongest advocates of an advanced graduate program in Chicago was Sarah Bogle who was then secretary of BEL.

Another influential woman supporter at ALA was Harriett Howe who, as executive assistant of BEL, frequently took over the duties of secretary when Bogle was out of town. Prior to her appointment at BEL, Howe had had many years of experience in library education. She began her teaching career under Katharine Sharp at the University of Illinois and then went on to hold positions at Western Reserve University and Simmons College. In 1927 Howe had the unique distinction of being the only woman and the only individual with a library degree named to the faculty of the Graduate Library School (GLS) at the University of Chicago. Although Howe's appointment as associate professor was viewed by some as a "peace offering to ALA," she played an active role in the program, developing courses in young people's reading, school librarianship, and cataloging. After four years Howe accepted an offer to create a new library school at the University of Denver. On leaving Chicago, Howe acknowledged that "she felt no sympathy with the purposes of GLS and was most unhappy there."

Other women who were subsequently appointed to the GLS faculty often continued to teach in the areas developed by Howe. One notable woman appointed during the first two decades of GLS was Frances Henne, a specialist in school libraries and work with children, who began as an instructor in 1940 while she was a doctoral candidate. A few other women who were to become well-known library educators also undertook doctoral study in Chicago during this period. Among the earliest of these was Susan Gray Akers who earned her doctorate in 1932 after presenting a thesis on the relation between theory and practice in cataloging. Akers began her work as a member of the first class of 1928-1929 which included Eleanor Upton, a research fellow from Yale, who earned the first doctorate in library science in 1930. "Apparently no male students attended the GLS during the academic year beginning in 1928," much to the "disappointment" of Dean Works. However, the paucity of men was no longer an issue by the end of 1935 when the total number of male doctorates was double the number of women (see table 2). During the period between 1930 and 1950 women averaged just over one-third of the doctorates awarded at Chicago. Unfortunately their total percentage of all doctorates in library science was to remain close to this level for many years.
TABLE 2
ADVANCED DEGREES AND PUBLISHING ACTIVITY OF WOMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Master's Degrees Earned by Women GLS-CHICAGO</th>
<th>Doctoral Degrees Earned by Women GLS-CHICAGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1935</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1940</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1945</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1950</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: The number of degrees earned at the University of Chicago GLS is taken from *Inquiry, The Graduate Library School at Chicago*. (ACRL Publications No. 42). Chicago: on *Library Quarterly* is based on tabulations of all substantive articles—i.e., editorials, letters, book reviews, etc.
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An analysis of all GLS graduate degrees reveals that women obtained two-thirds of the master's degrees awarded prior to 1950. Although their record here was much better than for the doctorate, it should be recalled that women then made up 86 percent of library school students in undergraduate programs and accounted for about 90 percent of all practicing librarians. There is no simple explanation for the fact that while men made up only 10 percent of the field at large, they obtained nearly one-third of the master's degrees and two-thirds of the doctorates awarded at Chicago. However, John Richardson's review of the Carnegie Fellowship statistics showed that "as a group...women at Chicago were 13 percent less likely to receive fellowships than their counterparts at other library schools."\(^{40}\)

A lack of fellowships was not the only deterrent to potential female graduate students, but the impact of financial aid in general needs to be more thoroughly investigated—particularly in the years following World War II. Lilli Hornig points out that during this period "G.I. benefits were unavailable to women, and many other types of both graduate and undergraduate scholarships were designated exclusively for men. Unlike their male counterparts, women as a rule could pursue advanced study only at their own expense [emphasis added]."\(^{41}\)

While discriminatory practices in the award of library fellowships may have been one factor that discouraged women from obtaining library science doctorates, other cultural and social constraints were probably of equal importance. As the GLS faculty set out on the quest to define the boundaries of an elusive new discipline called "library science," did women in the field begin to experience the role conflicts that had long faced women scientists and researchers? As Margaret Rossiter observes, women's aspirations and opportunities in the scientific world were determined "not simply in the realm of objective reality, of what specific women could or did do, but covertly, in the psychic land of images and sexual stereotypes, which had a logic all its own."

Rossiter\(^{42}\) further comments:

Even as women’s educational level rose and their own role outside the home expanded, they were seen as doing only a narrow range of "womanly" activities, a stereotype that linked them to...noncompetitive, and nurturing kinds of feelings and behavior. At the same time the stereotype of "science" was seen rhetorically as almost the opposite: tough, rigorous, rational, impersonal, masculine, competitive, and unemotional....Women scientists were thus caught between two almost mutually exclusive stereotypes: as scientists they were atypical women; as women they were unusual scientists.
This same idea was expressed earlier by the noted anthropologist Margaret Mead who wrote in 1935 that a female had two choices—either she proclaimed herself “a woman and therefore a less achieving individual, or an achieving individual and therefore less a woman.” Did librarianship, as a service-oriented, nurturing career create less role conflict for women than the prospect of conducting research in the emerging discipline of library science? Margaret Knox Goggin, who obtained her doctorate from the University of Illinois library school, later recalled that when she began her graduate work in the 1940s she “thought all women who got doctorates were sort of blue-nosed intellectuals, non-feminine, with all those stereotypical traits you think of as doctorates.” Whether or not such attitudes were widely shared by other female library educators, they apparently were less motivated to pursue doctoral study than their male colleagues.

A number of women who obtained doctorates from the University of Chicago during this period continued their interest in research. Among this group was Eliza Atkins Gleason (first dean of Atlanta University library school) whose well-regarded study, *The Southern Negro and the Public Library*, was later published as a monograph by the University of Chicago Press in 1941. Gleason and several other Chicago alumnae (such as Susan Akers, Frances Henne, and Margaret Herdman) also contributed articles to *Library Quarterly* (*LQ*). From 1931 to 1950 a few other female educators were among the contributors to *LQ*—notably Harriet Howe at Denver and three women faculty from Columbia: Alice Bryan (who taught research methods), Harriet MacPhearson (assistant professor of cataloging), and Margaret Hutchins (who wrote the first article to discuss the application of modern educational theories for the teaching of reference).

Although women authors made a number of significant contributions to *Library Quarterly*, the eighty articles written by women during these two decades represented just 18.3 percent of all articles in *LQ* (see table 2). Since *LQ* was the only research journal in the field at this time, the small proportion of articles by women might be seen as an indication that most female faculty did not devote their energies to research. This may have been the result of personal choice, lack of research training, or heavy responsibilities in other areas (teaching, administration, career counseling and placement, or professional activities). Another factor may have been the fact that publication had not yet become the criteria for tenure and promotion in most schools.

Although women had already lost ground in terms of graduate study and research, in 1948 female faculty still occupied a majority of positions in all the schools established before 1900 except for Columbia.
When C.C. Williamson became the dean of the new Columbia library school in 1926, the faculty he inherited from the schools at Albany and at New York Public Library consisted of five women and two men. During Williamson's deanship (1926-1943), the percentage of women on the faculty began gradually to decline, and by 1948 women held less than half of the full-time teaching posts.

Columbia's changing faculty ratio was typical of the process that had been occurring in other Type I schools. When these five schools are taken together, women occupied just twenty-one (42 percent) of the forty-nine positions. However, only one woman held a full professorship, as compared to eighteen men at that level. Even at the University of Illinois, where women still made up the majority of the faculty, all three full professorships were held by men. The reason for this disparity could be partly related to the increased emphasis on advanced degrees. At Illinois none of the female library school faculty had earned doctorates. Furthermore, when the faculty of all five schools are considered, only two women held doctorates whereas twenty men (71 percent of the male faculty) had earned this degree (see table 3).

By 1948, these Type I schools had already begun to establish new priorities which were to shape the criteria for hiring and promotion elsewhere. However, the increased emphasis on research and publication was not eagerly embraced by everyone in the field. One woman who served as a faculty member at the University of Illinois from the 1930s to the 1950s viewed this change as difficult to accept. She recalled: "I believe that I was always more a reference librarian teaching her beloved craft to successive groups of students than a college professor....I never liked sitting on committees or in faculty meetings and the doctoral program with its reading of dissertations...and long nerve-racking oral examinations wore me out." Mary Biggs comments that there must have been many others caught in this transitional period when the traditional values of the profession were not explicitly rejected, but were no longer as important as the academic criteria imposed by the university.

Even though women library educators expressed considerable ambivalence toward their new role in graduate-level research, many were in favor of the movement to make the master's degree the entry-level professional qualification for the field. While much of the published debate over the issues relating to graduate-level study in librarianship was dominated by faculty from the Type I schools, the first institution to initiate the new fifth-year master's program was the University of Denver. In 1947, under the leadership of Harriet Howe,
### TABLE 3

**WOMEN FACULTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Columbia/NYSL*</th>
<th>Pratt Institute</th>
<th>Drexel Institute</th>
<th>Illinois-Urbana*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total No. (Percent)</td>
<td>Total No. (Percent)</td>
<td>Total No. (Percent)</td>
<td>Total No. (Percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Women</td>
<td>Faculty Women</td>
<td>Faculty Women</td>
<td>Faculty Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-1905</td>
<td>10 7 (70)</td>
<td>12 8 (66.6)</td>
<td>6 4 (66.6)</td>
<td>5 5 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>11 7 (63)</td>
<td>6 4 (66.6)</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>6 5 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>13 6 (46)</td>
<td>6 4 (66.6)</td>
<td>12 8 (66.6)</td>
<td>12 8 (66.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates those schools designated Type I after 1933

Sources: Library school catalogs
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Denver developed a plan whereby the core courses would be given at the undergraduate level and would be prerequisites for students entering the master's-degree program. The "Denver plan" attracted widespread attention and soon "became the prototype of the 'new pattern' of library education." Howe, who is credited with designing the core curriculum concept in the 1980s, was also named to the BEL subcommittee on curriculum and degrees. Even before the BEL subcommittees had begun to draft the new standards, eight schools had followed Denver's lead and were offering a fifth-year master's degree in 1948-49.

The Demographic Shift 1951-1985

The standards adopted by ALA in 1951 allowed for some individual variation, "but they also required a minimum of graduate level work which forced several former undergraduate schools to upgrade their program and others to forego accreditation by ALA. In addition, the new standards stated that the library school "shall be an integral part of the parent institution." Although the interpretive guidelines accompanying this statement allowed that the university librarian could serve as the administrative officer of the school, most schools (including Columbia) severed their administrative links with the library and became separate professional schools or graduate departments. This step achieved the fulfillment of Williamson's ideal and completed the transition that had begun in the 1920s when seven of the fifteen schools were directly attached to a state or public library. (In addition, two of the schools then affiliated with institutions of higher education were actually administered by the chief librarian, while a third was under the state library commission.)

A number of female library educators who had begun their careers under the old system—with different expectations and rewards—found themselves in a much less hospitable academic environment. Nonetheless, most library schools accredited under the new standards would still have been considered feminized in relationship to their parent institution where women made up a small minority of the faculty. By 1955 women occupied only 22 percent of the teaching posts in higher education, but in major research universities, like Chicago, Columbia, and Berkeley, there were even fewer women. Patricia Graham contends that other institutions soon began to follow in the lead of the prestigious universities by selecting male professors.

At the faculty level, the difference between women's opportunities and men's have been most noticeable....An institution that was trying
MARY MAACK

to move up the prestige ladder, then, was well advised to recognize this fact and treat its own faculty women accordingly. After World War II several of the women's colleges made a deliberate effort to increase the number of men on their faculties, presumably in the hope that this was a sign of improved quality, or at least, status.

A similar trend was also observed in professional schools, particularly those in fields where the majority of practitioners were women. In 1964 David Riesman commented:54

When a field wants to raise its status, it may do so by avoiding “guilt by association” with teaching-oriented or service-oriented women. For instance, schools of social work,...have been gaining in prestige by securing men as their deans and there is now talk of men in the deanships of colleges of home economics, positions earlier reserved for the “founding mothers” of such institutions.

Were these same policies consciously or unconsciously followed in the field of library education? As a small school or department on a large campus, the library school was not only somewhat marginal and vulnerable, it was also an anomaly among graduate departments due to the predominance of women students and faculty. Given this situation, did deans and senior faculty members actively seek to recruit and promote men in an effort to make their unit conform more to the gender norms of the university? The hypothesis that they gave preference to male job applicants, offered greater encouragement to men students, and awarded more doctoral fellowships to men than women must be tested by further research. Such a study would demand investigating fellowship records (especially those from the Higher Education Act, Title II-B program), examining the minutes taken by award committees and search committees, and interviewing male and female faculty including those without doctorates.

While much further research is needed to show whether active discrimination occurred, documentation already exists that shows women's loss of power and prestige in library education. For example, an examination of lists of library school directors reveals women have not held a majority of the deanship positions since 1948 (see table 4). It, must not, however, be implied that women were totally excluded from power. During this period a number of female deans became known for national leadership in specific areas such as audiovisual media (Margaret Rufsvold, Indiana); adult education (Margaret Monroe, Wisconsin); international cooperation in school librarianship (Jean Lowrie, Western Michigan); the advancement of black librarians (Virginia Lacy Jones, Atlanta University); the use of satellite communications (Margaret Knox Goggin, Denver); and continuing education (Elizabeth
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Stone, Catholic University). Although many others could also be cited for outstanding achievements, this should not obscure the fact that women's proportion of deanships decreased significantly at the time the number of accredited library schools was increasing.

**TABLE 4**
**Deans, Directors' and Principals of North American Library Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number &amp; Percentage Headed by Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14 53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15 44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10 31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21 32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Library school catalogs, the Williamson Report, and lists of schools published in the *Journal of Education for Librarianship/Journal of Education for Library and Information Science.* For 1921 principals as well as directors are considered, making a total of eighteen individuals. From 1960 on, Canadian schools are included.

Moreover, it must be noted that while women have held deanships in some of the larger schools with doctoral programs, *over a twenty-one year period (1960-1981) no woman ever held the title of dean or director at Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, or Michigan.* These institutions, which were formerly the Type I schools, gained additional prestige during the 1950s by developing or continuing their doctoral programs in library science. Although there is no consensus on the ranking of the best schools, Danton has shown that these five schools consistently appeared among the top ten programs in six out of eight evaluations of library schools conducted between 1956 and 1982.

In a thorough statistical profile of library school deans, Raymond Kilpela has found a strong indication that the trend in these schools has been emulated elsewhere. He observes:

Nineteen of the 29 United States library education programs which have held A.L.A. accreditation throughout the entire period from the fall of 1960 to the spring of 1981 have not had a woman as dean within a span of more than 20 years....At the beginning of 1981,...women
were outnumbered by men by a ratio of one to four. What might be termed almost token representation of women among the deanships of the accredited library education programs continued to exist.

Another element that emerges from Kilpela's study is the fact that 46.1 percent of the women deans serving between 1960 and 1980 had earned a doctorate as compared to 75.7 percent of their male counterparts. Since major research universities rarely appoint individuals without the doctorate to a deanship, the pool of viable female candidates would have been smaller in those institutions.

The fact that men who earned doctorates in library science from 1925 to 1971 outnumbered women by a ratio of two to one has also had a direct effect on the gender shift in library school faculties because the rapid expansion of schools occurred during the period when only one-third of those holding doctorates in the field were women. In 1960 women still occupied a majority (55.4 percent) of the 168 faculty positions in the thirty accredited schools, but by 1978 they held only 282 (40.9 percent) of the 689 positions in fifty-nine accredited schools. Although the proportion of women faculty with doctorates increased from 19.4 percent in 1960 to 55.2 percent in 1979, they were still behind male faculty whose proportion with doctorates increased from 48 percent to 75.4 percent during the same period. In 1979 a survey showed that the proportion of women in library doctoral programs had risen to 51.6 percent.

Although the growth in the pool of potential female faculty with doctorates is some cause for optimism, the recent closure of several accredited programs will mean fewer openings, as well as competition with experienced faculty for certain positions. Meanwhile, the fact that more women faculty presently hold the doctorate should mean that there will be one less barrier to their normal advancement. The importance of this can be seen especially at the associate professor level. In 1960 women held 71.4 percent of all associate professorships, despite the fact that three-fourths of them had not earned the doctorate; by 1978, female faculty held only 41.3 percent of the positions at this level, but nearly two-thirds of these women had the doctorate. During this time the degree had virtually become a prerequisite for any tenure-track appointment in many schools.

Although the doctorate alone is no longer sufficient to insure promotion to an associate professorship in most institutions, women with the advanced degree also have a fairly good record of scholarly productivity as shown by a survey of women with library science doctorates conducted by Doris C. Dale. This study of 161 women (approximately one-half of the population) found that 45.9% had written at
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least one book, 32.2% had written a monograph, 81.3% had written a journal article, 40.9% had written a chapter in a book, 52.1% had written a review and 65.2% had delivered a paper.64

Dale's findings would suggest a much higher rate of publishing among these women than had generally been shown for female library science faculty. Table 5, which combines the findings of two bibliometric studies and one citation analysis, indicates that women faculty (who

### TABLE 5

**Publishing Activity of Women Library School Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Percentage of Women as Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1977/vols. 29-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Library Journal</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Library Quarterly</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Library Trends</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1977/vols. 16-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RQ</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1977/vols. 7-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Science Citation Index</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most-cited library science faculty--1965-1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Journal of Education for Librarianship</td>
<td>33.3*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes all first female authors; all other figures refer only to women faculty as a percentage of all library science faculty authors, and include second authors, etc.

occupied approximately 40 percent of all full-time positions in accredited schools during this time) wrote roughly one-third of the articles which were contributed by library educators to *RQ, Library Trends*, and *Library Journal*.

The tendency to recruit male faculty from administrative positions in academic libraries may account for women's poorer representation in *College & Research Libraries*, but the fact that they wrote less than one-fifth of the *Library Quarterly* articles contributed by library educators is much harder to explain. A more recent study has shown that women authored about one-third of the articles appearing in the *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, but few women appeared among the most cited authors in that journal. Furthermore, in an analysis of library educators appearing in *Social Sciences Citation Index* (a source biased in favor of information science), Robert Hayes lists only eight women (20 percent) among the forty most cited authors.

It should be noted that the three studies just discussed may not adequately represent faculty publishing activity in certain areas such as children's work, history, school librarianship, and cataloging—all areas in which many women have specialized. Nonetheless, these three studies cover enough major journals to offer a strong indication that women faculty have been less successful in publishing than their male counterparts.

If women are to advance in universities where research and publication are often the most important criteria in promotional decisions, they must attempt to confront those barriers that have inhibited their performance in this area. In a discussion of general factors inhibiting research in library schools, Pauline Wilson has identified three types of obstacles: (1) time barriers, due to heavy expectations from the field for leadership in professional association activities and continuing education; (2) funding barriers, both in terms of external and internal support; and (3) personnel barriers, resulting from lack of interest in research and/or lack of research training.

Although Wilson did not address the question whether these barriers might have greater impact on women than on men, in a subsequent article she raised the issue of professional socialization. She concluded that library educators "do not fully understand that they are professional academics not professional librarians....They have not fully internalized the norms that govern the behavior of university faculty." If women faculty members come into teaching with more years of library experience than their male colleagues, then the length of professional socialization may have an impact on their attitudes and the relative priority they give to research, teaching, and service.
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No recent study has been published on the professional background of library educators, but a 1964 faculty survey by Leontine Carroll showed that almost half of the men were under forty-five years of age as compared with 28 percent of the women. This would suggest that during the 1960s women faculty may have had considerably more library experience than their male counterparts.

Carroll's study also found that women taught more courses than men, thus suggesting that they may have had to devote more time to class preparation and related activities. The type of courses taught by men and women has also followed different patterns. An analysis of teaching specialties covering the years between 1965 and 1983 found a "tendency for women to specialize in the teaching of services for children and young adults, cataloging and classification, whereas men have tended to specialize in information science, research methods, library automation, and the history of books, printing and libraries." The authors of this study linked teaching specialties to wider sex-role socialization, observing that "the trend for female educators to specialize in service for children is compatible with women's traditional role of caretakers, just as the tendency for males to specialize in information science, research and quantitative methods, automation and management is compatible with the traditional male role of 'inquirer' and 'builder'."

This study also showed that there was considerable cross-over in certain areas, and that a number of teaching areas were sex-linked some years but not in others. These findings would suggest that although women may have had their interests channeled into certain "feminine" specialties, there have been few barriers to prevent them from working in any aspect of the field. In general, territorial segregation by gender in library education would seem to be much less marked than hierarchical segregation that has severely limited women's advancement to full professorships and deanships.

Paradoxically, women have found more opportunities for national leadership and recognition within professional associations than in the university setting. By and large, female faculty have been fairly well represented on the executive committee of the Association of American Library Schools (now the Association for Library and Information Science Education—ALISE). Although their proportional representation as presidents of this association is slightly low (45 percent) a total of thirty-two women have been elected to this office (see table 6). National recognition has also come to female faculty through the Beta Phi Mu award which honors outstanding contributions to library education. In
the thirty-two years since this award was first established, it has been
given to fourteen women (43.7 percent of all recipients).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Women Presidents</th>
<th>All Presidents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1916-1928/29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929/30-1938/39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939/40-1946/47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947/48-1958/59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959/60-1967/68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69-1977/78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79-1985/86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Women in library education have also played an important role in ALA, holding many offices and chairing numerous committees. From 1915 when Mary Plummer was elected as the second woman president of ALA, a number of female library educators have held this office including Alice Tyler (1920), Josephine Rathbone (1931), Frances Lander Spain (1960), Florinell Morton (1961), Mary Gaver (1966), Jean Lowrie (1973), Elizabeth Stone (1980), and Brooke Sheldon (1983).

These dynamic educators, who have gained widespread professional recognition for their ability and leadership, have undoubtedly served as mentors and role models for many female students and for younger colleagues. However, pride in their accomplishments should not obscure the fact that there is now a much smaller proportion of women in senior posts than there was a generation ago. In this regard, the conclusion reached by Richard Kilpela deserves repeating: "The decline of female representation among the accredited program faculties for a professional field so heavily dominated by women poses a problem requiring the attention of the entire profession and the library school administrators along with their faculty selection committees."
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This issue has already received attention from the ALA Committee on the Status of Women. Over a decade ago this activist group called for library schools to appoint more feminist women faculty who could serve as role models for female students. Even though women continued to lose ground in the 1970s, at virtually every school there are still female faculty who serve as mentors, encourage promising students, and, like Katharine Sharp, inspire in them "a certain determination to succeed." However, until more of these women advance to senior posts and deanships, the library school will simply continue to mirror the anti-feminist biases of academia and cannot serve as a catalyst for equalization in the university and in the profession at large.

Conclusion

As the history of women in library education is reassessed from a feminist perspective, it is apparent that each landmark in the quest for a more scientific profession was in fact a major setback for women. Williamson's statement that the preponderance of women faculty was a "handicap" that would be overcome by integrating library schools in male-dominated universities proved to be quite prophetic. Leading female educators, who were also concerned with improving the quality of library schools, failed to perceive themselves as "handicaps," nor were they aware of the many institutional handicaps they and their successors would face in the university environment. Women like Mary Wright Plummer and Katharine Sharp—both proponents of scholarship rather than narrow technical training—believed in the underlying principles of liberal education and scientific objectivity. In retrospect, women's naive, idealistic faith in the university, combined with their preoccupation with upgrading the field, may have led them to disregard the strong sexist biases in academia.

Although it seems that few female library educators opposed setting more rigorous academic standards for their schools, even fewer perceived the significant change in the role they would have to play if they wished to rise to senior ranks within the university. Their blindness to this issue may have been due both to lengthy socialization in a field that emphasized service over scholarship, and to the fact that as librarians they had experienced less territorial and hierarchical segregation than other women in science and academia. In any case, a feminist evaluation of the movement which transformed schools of library service into graduate departments of library and information science can only conclude that the professionalization of the field had a very negative impact on the status of women faculty.
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Such a statement, however, does not deny that this same movement had many positive effects on the field by enlarging the profession's knowledge base, expanding and enriching the students' educational experience and perhaps increasing the general status of librarianship. Nor does a feminist reassessment of the past century in library education necessarily imply a rejection of the new role of library school faculty as the academic segment of the profession whose responsibility is to advance knowledge as well as teach. Instead, this analysis simply attempts to reaffirm the past accomplishments of women leaders and to examine those factors that led to a decline in their status and power—in order that those now in the field might become more aware of historical patterns and hidden obstacles.

In a preliminary survey drawn largely from secondary sources, it would be premature to identify the most significant causal factors among the many social and cultural variables that shaped women's role in library education. It is possible to define two different types of negative variables that can be described as barriers and restraints. Barriers are the external forces—such as overt or covert discrimination—that make entry and advancement in the field more difficult for women than for men. Restraints are the internalized patterns of behavior and attitudes that result from gender socialization.

The role conflict that was hinted at by a few of the women cited earlier raises certain questions about the restraints women may place on their aspirations as well as questions about gender-related duties that they often assume or are assigned in the workplace. Have women in library education followed the pattern of other female faculty who generally devote more time to teaching than research? Have library school administrators usually assigned heavier counseling and committee work loads to women? Do many female library educators feel that they were, at some point in their careers, faced with the choice of reorienting their personal and professional values or accepting second-class status as junior faculty or untenured lecturers? If so, did they consciously choose to accept or reject the reward system of their parent university?

Whether individuals made this crucial decision consciously or by default, the fact that women collectively lost ground must also be linked to the question of sexual discrimination. Although there is strong evidence that most major research universities failed to integrate women faculty into the academic hierarchy, the declining proportion of tenured women in library schools cannot in itself be taken as proof of discrimination. In addition to investigating whether discrimination existed in awarding financial aid and in hiring and promotional procedures, it is
important to examine the issue of mentoring. The senior faculty, deans, and directors who act as gatekeepers of the field may not overtly discriminate against women by requiring them to meet higher standards, but these gatekeepers may nonetheless engage in covert discrimination by encouraging male students to pursue doctoral study, providing younger men with access to the "old boy" network, and actively recruiting male faculty.

Affirmative action has limited such practices which had formerly been accepted procedure at many universities until they were challenged by academic women in the late 1960s. Within library education the impact of affirmative action has been somewhat difficult to assess. Over the past decade (fall 1975 to spring 1985) women have made significant gains at the level of the deanship (from 19.7 percent to 32.3 percent) and at the assistant professor rank (from 46 percent to 61.1 percent). However, their overall gain was less than one percentage point, due in part to a decline at the associate professor level (from 46 percent to 36.2 percent).

Unfortunately the prospects for equal representation or compensation do not seem likely in the immediate future. As in the past, the 1984-1985 ALISE survey showed that for academic-year appointments, salaries for men (at all levels except lecturer) exceeded those for women in the sixty-four schools reporting. Furthermore, women held a majority of faculty positions only at the three lowest ranks—assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer—all positions that are less likely to carry tenure. Despite their gains in the deanship, including recent appointments at prestigious schools such as Illinois and North Carolina, in 1986 women directed only five of the twenty American library schools with doctoral programs. As library education enters its second century, the questions remain whether there are fewer opportunities for women or whether there are fewer women who are willing to grasp opportunity.
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A Century of Students

WILLIAM LANDRAM WILLIAMSON

In 1888, twenty-two students of the first library school class graduated from the New York State Library School. They were the first of almost 200,000 who would complete a year of successful study at one of the leading library schools in the United States during the next century. This paper considers those students—their numbers, their qualifications, and their changing characteristics. It relies, by necessity, primarily upon published information: i.e., studies by C.C. Williamson, J. Periam Danton and LeRoy C. Merritt, Eugene Wilson, and Louis Round Wilson, the directory of the New York State Library School, the reports of ALA’s Board of Education for Librarianship and Committee on Accreditation, and reports of the Association for Library and Information Science Education. To the extent that these publications do not adequately represent the facts about students, this article will require revision in the comprehensive study that so evidently needs to be done. Anyone who undertakes such a study will be frustrated, of course, by the gaps but also will be impressed by the richness of information that cries out to be analyzed. I am indebted to Denise Anton for her help in organizing the facts about the students at Albany. Readers should note the caveats detailed in the next section that are important to keep in mind when using the information and conclusions in this article.

William Landram Williamson is Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin—Madison.
Caveats

Certain caveats need to be kept in mind throughout the reading of this article. Rather than qualifying statements repeated throughout, these general cautions are given here. First, the students considered are only those who attended schools generally recognized by ALA. Large numbers of students have attended, and many have become capable librarians but they are not included here. In general, graduation is understood to mean completion of at least one year of study; not always was a certificate or a degree awarded. Even though the figures used here are based upon a loose definition of graduation, it is certain that the number enrolled was larger; some evidence suggests the number enrolled may have been half again greater than the number graduated. Modern-day readers should remember that it is only in the past thirty-five years that admission to a library school almost invariably required possession of a baccalaureate degree. Many graduates prior to that time possessed less prior education than four years of college. It was common in many schools for students in the certificate course to attend along with students in the degree course.

The second major warning is that the statistics are certainly not correct: complete and unambiguous information is simply not available. It is assumed that the general patterns, trends, and proportions are representative of reality even though the specific numbers are often wrong. An effort has been made to rely upon the same series of statistics for as many successive years as possible, on the assumption that the definitions and biases of recording and reporting will be kept constant. Unfortunately no single published series exists, and none of the three major sequences of statistics is complete. Some figures are inserted from isolated, single sources and others are simply extrapolated from available data. Thus the reader is warned not to rely literally upon this report, though the general picture and broad relationships are believed to be reasonably close to reality.

The Beginnings—1887-1900

By 1900 the New York State school, with its thirteenth class, had graduated 269 students. Of those 269 graduates, 219 were women and 50 (19 percent) were men. Dewey's long-legendary welcome to women as librarians is well demonstrated by the record. Yet men too were welcomed and the New York State school over the years attracted more men than typically attended other schools.

In those early years a college degree was not yet an admission requirement. But the student body as a whole had substantially more
preparation than the minimum required. Fully half of the students had a baccalaureate degree and another two in ten had at least some college work. Only one-third lacked any preparation at that level. Among the advanced degrees were eighteen master's degrees and four doctorates—two in medicine, one in divinity, and one in philosophy. It was a broadly educated student body, with the proportion of the college-bred increasing over the years. In 1900, only two of the entering students lacked any collegiate background. In 1902, when admission began to require a baccalaureate degree, the decision was essentially a reinforcement of a condition that was well on its way to realization.

Between 1887—when the first students came—and 1900, students arrived from twenty-four states and six foreign countries. The largest contingent (about ninety) came from New York. Second, with forty-six students, was Massachusetts. Contributing more than ten but fewer than twenty were Connecticut, Illinois, and Ohio. Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island sent more than five. Other states represented were California, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Wisconsin. One student each came from the states of Tennessee, Utah, and from the District of Columbia. Three students came from England and one student each came from Australia, Canada, Germany, and Sweden.

When it was time for the graduates to take jobs, they went generally to the same states but not exclusively so—nor, of course, was it true that an individual coming from a particular state was necessarily the one going to work there. The largest difference was that for the District of Columbia, which contributed only one student but recruited nine—a reflection of the federal libraries there. Pennsylvania too was a substantial gainer. Wisconsin, which sent three students, hired five. Georgia, Montana, and Virginia each hired a librarian without having sent a student at all. Illinois sent nineteen and got back fourteen. States that got back quite substantially fewer than they had sent included Maine, Vermont, and—rather dramatically—Ohio, which sent fourteen students but hired only three.

About half of the graduates went to work in public libraries, about one-quarter of them went to academic libraries, and about one in eight went to special libraries. Only two in a hundred went to school libraries. And more than one in ten took no library job—most frequently as a result of having gotten married.

The statistics conceal important particulars. Those first classes included many notables: Edwin H. Anderson, who succeeded Dewey at
the head of the school and later directed the New York Public Library; James I. Wyer, who succeeded him; Mary Wright Plummer, who directed both the Pratt Institute and the New York Public Library schools; Katharine L. Sharp, who founded the Armour Institute school that she moved to the University of Illinois; Phineas L. Windsor, who followed her at Illinois; and George Watson Cole, who, as the head of the Henry E. Huntington Library, became one of the premier librarian-bibliographers.

Along with the stars were some who left library work rather soon and were never heard from again. Many others occupied positions of considerable prominence. Isadore G. Mudge eventually became the reference librarian best known in the nation as the editor of the guide to reference books that had been inaugurated by her fellow alumna Alice B. Kroeber. Dorcas Fellows was highly influential over the years as editor of the Decimal Classification. Judson T. Jennings headed Seattle's public library as George Bowerman did the one in the District of Columbia. As a whole, the graduates of those years constituted an extraordinary group.

Expansion—1900-1921

By 1900, the New York State school was no longer the only one and it was joined by others before 1921. Pratt Institute in Brooklyn (1890), Drexel Institute in Philadelphia (1892), and the University of Illinois (transferred in 1897 from Chicago where it had been founded in 1893 as part of the Armour Institute) had all begun to prepare librarians by 1900. Two decades later, new schools had joined in the task, though the school at the Drexel Institute had been closed in 1914 having graduated 371 students, 2 of them men. New schools by 1921 were the Carnegie Library School of Pittsburgh created in 1916 from a training school for children's librarians begun in 1901; the Simmons College school in Boston (1902); Western Reserve in Cleveland (1904); the Library School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta (1905); the Library School of the University of Wisconsin (1906); the Syracuse University Library School (1908); the Library School of the New York Public Library (1911); that of the University of Washington (1911); the Riverside, California, Library Service School (1913); the Library School of the Los Angeles Public Library (1914); the Saint Louis Library School (1917); and the University of California—Berkeley (begun in 1919 in succession to the California State Library School that had been established in Sacramento in 1913).

By 1921, in the landmark report associated with his name, Williamson reported that these schools had graduated almost 5000 students. Of
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the 4664 recorded, only 276 (6 percent) were men and 60 percent of them had come from the New York State school. Only three other schools had attracted any substantial numbers of men—the New York Public Library's school, Pratt Institute, and Illinois (which had become an important school serving the Midwest). Nearly half of the fifteen schools had never had a male student. More than 60 percent of all graduates were still working in libraries; the proportion of men remaining was slightly greater than that of women. In his analysis, Training for Library Service, Williamson studied the charge that educating women was wasteful for they were likely to marry and leave the work. Proving himself the worthy successor to Dewey that he was to become, Williamson rejected the charge entirely, pointing out that almost as large a proportion of the men too had left library work, though for other occupations. Besides, he said, even those women who did not remain in their library positions often continued to serve the profession in other capacities such as being board members of libraries. Still, he evidently thought it was desirable to have men in the field. He also argued strongly for increased salaries for qualified librarians, since only in such circumstances could the schools hope to attract a fair share of the best-qualified students.

The standard of qualification represented by the prerequisite of a baccalaureate degree was still not being met by most of the schools even by 1921. Only the New York State school and the University of Illinois had that prerequisite. Three other schools—i.e., Simmons, Washington, and California—made sure that their graduates held the degree by awarding it at the end of a four-year collegiate course that included library studies. In other schools associated with institutions of higher education, it was possible for a student to combine studies so as to earn a degree rather than the certificate received by others. Of the 1921 graduates, a bit fewer than half had a college degree upon graduation. In the schools other than the five that demanded a degree in advance or provided it at graduation, the proportions of admitted students holding a degree ranged from the low of 12 percent at Atlanta to the high of 54 percent at the New York Public Library. All of the schools that did not require a degree for admission sought to ensure a minimum in broad general preparation through an entrance examination, exempting applicants who held degrees. These examinations, concentrating on history, literature, current events, general information, and facility with foreign languages, reveal the nature of the subject background desired. Surely, as evidence about later students shows to have been true, the preponderance of library school students must have come from backgrounds in the humanities and social sciences. With schools spread
across the country from Boston, New York, and Atlanta to Los Angeles, Berkeley, and Seattle, students no longer were forced to travel long distances from their homes for library training.

More directly comparable to the facts about the first thirteen years of New York State Library classes than this generalized, national summary is the information about the classes of that same school during the twenty-one years from 1901 to 1921. The average number enrolled per class (twenty-one in the earlier period) grew to twenty-nine. The total for this longer period was 610 students of whom 129 were men—about the same ratio of one to five that had been true before 1900. With very few exceptions, students were admitted to the New York State school only if they had a baccalaureate degree. Advanced degrees earned before admission included forty-nine master’s degrees, two M.D.s, and four Ph.D.s. The twenty-eight foreign degrees probably included a number that represented advanced study.

As had been true between 1887 and 1900, the largest contingent (179) came from New York, and again, Massachusetts (with 51) was second. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan once more were leading contributors—more than twenty students. States sending more than ten students were Vermont, California, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, Illinois, Missouri, Maine, Wisconsin, and Washington. In all, students came to New York from thirty-six states and Hawaii. Students came also from Canada (seven), Denmark (four), China (two), and from Norway (which sent a total of twenty-six students in those years).

When the graduates took jobs, about the same number remained in New York as had come from that state. Again, a disproportionately higher ratio went to work in the District of Columbia as well as in Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and West Virginia. States that did not send students but which employed graduates were Florida, Montana, North Dakota, Idaho, South Dakota, Georgia, and Virginia. States that sent substantially more students than they got back as librarians were Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Tennessee. Only one of the seven Canadians went back home to work immediately and only sixteen of the twenty-six Norwegians. Probably many of those from foreign countries eventually returned to their homes after having had work experience in U.S. libraries, as some of the Norwegians did in emulation of Haakon Nyhuus, who in the nineteenth century worked in Chicago at the Newberry Library and the public library before returning to become Norway’s great librarian-pioneer.
Reforms—1921-1950

In the years immediately after 1921, the patterns of library science education changed considerably. The Williamson report itself was the product of the Carnegie Corporation's shift of its philanthropy from constructing library buildings to improving the quality of the service within them. Some grants went directly to library schools but the main effort was directed toward fundamental change, much of it to be achieved through support of new programs of the American Library Association. One of the agencies created, the Board of Education for Librarianship, brought a new structure to the field, provided a means for the establishment of national norms, and encouraged the establishment and growth of library schools, especially within the framework of universities as Williamson had strongly recommended.

Before the end of the decade, the number of schools had risen to twenty-five, including a new Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago. The changes were not revolutionary, however; the students were much the same in their general characteristics as their predecessors. Requirement of a bachelor's degree for admission became more general than it had been, but that stringency was ameliorated in two ways—(1) the recognition of a sort of library school (the so-called Type III school) that provided a major in library science within the framework of a four-year undergraduate program, and (2) the admission of students without a degree for a certificate course that was offered in parallel with the degree course. Students tended to choose library schools in their own states. With the very special exception of the Hampton Institute for black students, every school in 1938 had its largest single student contingent from its home state. Only Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, and Peabody attracted students from as many as fifteen other states. In the mid-1930s, more than one in ten of the entering students possessed degrees representing five or more years of study, more than three-quarters had the bachelor's degree at admission, and more than nine out of ten had completed three years of undergraduate study. Even though those in leading positions in library education spoke often of the need to recruit students with mathematics and natural science backgrounds, close to eight in ten undergraduate degrees were in the social sciences and humanities, and English and history together continued to be the subject background of more than half of all students. Females constituted 86 percent of the students of the twenty-six schools in the academic year 1936-1937, and this proportion remained generally stable until the war halved the proportion of males as it reduced the numbers of all students in higher education. The students tended to be
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in their mid-twenties. A substantial cohort of students entered the library schools directly from college, but the typical age suggests a year or so of work experience before entrance. A number of the schools discouraged applicants above the age of thirty, a policy that no doubt helps to explain the median age of twenty-four at California for the years between 1920 and 1948 and the mean age of twenty-seven at Illinois between 1926 and 1936. For those same years at California, the record of the first job by type of library showed a change from the proportions of the first years at the New York State school. Public libraries attracted 42 percent, academic libraries 30 percent, special libraries 18 percent, and school libraries 10 percent. A bit fewer than one in ten did not go to work at all or, if they did, not in libraries.

Following World War II, the library schools and their students changed gradually in response to underlying social and economic trends. The total numbers of students grew only moderately at first and then were set back a bit once again by the revival of the draft in reaction to the Korean War. In the 1940s, even though it was a war period, the number of graduates for the whole decade—about 14,000—was very slightly higher than in the 1930s. In the 1950s it increased a bit to 16,000.

About 1950 most schools switched to a new master’s-degree program. This change was a response to the anomaly of a graduate program that resulted in only a second bachelor’s degree. Under the 1933 standards, these so-called Type II programs confused employers and the profession about the significance of the degree—particularly for salary determinations in the schools, where pay scales tended to be closely tied to amount of academic study completed. In addition, many felt that professional librarianship required graduate-level preparation that should be recognized in the form of the degree awarded. With adoption of new standards for library schools, completion of an undergraduate degree before admission became, for the first time, not simply the customary background but essentially the universal requirement for ALA-approved schools. During the postwar years, the proportion of men rose above one-fourth of the total, a proportion that became the norm for total library school enrollments. As had been true in earlier years, there was a tendency for the schools with the larger proportions of men to be those—such as Columbia, Chicago, Illinois, and Berkeley—that had national constituencies. Even so, men became increasingly evident in the student bodies of schools that primarily served their own states and regions. Another group that increased appreciably during the postwar years was the part-time students who took more than one year to complete their degrees. Among these part-time students two major contingents were (1) the veterans and other men who, being already
married, had to work to help to support themselves and their families, and (2) the women who found librarianship an appealing avenue of return to the labor force as their children reached school age.

When the graduates went to work full-time, about one-third began their careers in public libraries. Almost as large a proportion went to academic libraries. After 1950 about one in five went to work in school libraries and about one in six went to work in special libraries.

During these first postwar years, changes came only gradually. A particularly important influence was the involvement of the federal government in ways that increased the demand for librarians and made money available to library schools. Beginning in 1965, the federal programs accelerated into a massive commitment to educational programs at all levels. The impact upon libraries and library schools was far-reaching. The numbers of schools increased and the number of students enrolled in each grew similarly.

The most pervasive effect of the new federal programs was a substantial increase in demand for librarians, giving the schools a ready market for their graduates. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act encouraged the establishment of school libraries with full-time librarians. The Library Services and Construction Act provided support for a multitude of new public library programs that demanded new staff members to carry them out. And the Higher Education Act brought new funds to academic libraries, which then required more staff members to procure the materials. Other federal programs, such as the National Defense Education Act and very substantial scientific research grants, had similar effects on the demand for librarians.

Some of these new federal funds went directly to library schools. Scholarships for master's-degree students helped them as individuals and encouraged the growth of existing schools and the establishment of new ones. The quantitative differences, however, were only part of the story.

For the first time on any large scale, library schools were able to compete for support for new advanced programs. Among these programs were those that were designed to educate disadvantaged and minority individuals, and that brought new cohorts of such students—both for master's-degree programs and for newly established or newly invigorated advanced and doctoral programs. In addition, financial support became available for research to be pursued by library school faculty members and students. Astute and aggressive library school directors put together proposals for federal support that enabled them to expand their schools both in size and in variety and complexity of
program. All of these developments changed considerably the atmosphere and the substance of library schools.

Diversification—1950s-1980s

The inauguration of doctoral programs in library schools represented a very considerable change. Until almost 1950, virtually the only active doctoral program was that established in the 1920s at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago. Measured by the record of completed doctoral dissertations, only a hundred doctorates in librarianship had been awarded up to the end of the 1940s, almost all from Chicago.

During the 1950s another hundred doctorates were earned, with Chicago still in the lead—though Illinois, Michigan, Columbia, and a sprinkling of other schools were represented as well. Substantial changes occurred during the 1960s, largely as a consequence of the newly available federal funding. The number of doctorates awarded more than doubled those that had been awarded before that decade. New schools joined those conferring substantial numbers of doctoral degrees, including Indiana, Rutgers, Florida State University, Pittsburgh, California—Berkeley, and Case-Western Reserve.

In the 1970s the number of doctoral degrees rose dramatically to top 1000 for the decade, produced by increasing numbers in the existing schools and by the entrance of institutions such as Maryland, Wisconsin, Drexel, Syracuse, Texas, Toronto, and others. For most library schools the number of advanced students was not sufficient to make them the dominant element in the student body; yet their presence made important differences in the general atmosphere of the schools where they were to be found. Often assignment as a teaching assistant or lecturer was a principal means of financial support for doctoral students, with a consequent change for the master's-degree students in giving them teachers who were different from the regular, full-time faculty members.

The students of the 1980s seem to be very much like their predecessors. In 1983 the men were only about one in five, a ratio only slightly lower than the one in four that seemed to establish itself in the postwar years. The median age rose above thirty, and library schools generally abandoned their policies of discouraging applicants above that age.

Many candidates for advanced certificates and degrees, of course, were even older. Even among the first-year students, however, substantial numbers of married or divorced women entered to prepare themselves for the work force when their children attained school age. Still
others—men and women—were preparing for a new career in place of a previous one. Many students, however, continued to be drawn from among recent college graduates. Students' undergraduate degrees were distributed as follows. English and history degrees represented well over 40 percent; the other social sciences and humanities combined brought the total a bit above 90 percent; leaving about 7 percent for mathematics and the sciences. The students tended to come from the region in which the school was located, with the home state accounting for more than half of all the students and, together with adjoining states, proportions ranging upward to seven out of ten students. The great preponderance of home-state students held true even for schools generally thought to have national constituencies such as Columbia in the East and Berkeley in the West.

Even though many students have stayed close to home, a number have always traveled to faraway places for their education, both from within the United States and from abroad. From the very beginning foreign students have enrolled in American library schools. Tracking them down and assessing their impact on their home countries is a formidable task not to be undertaken here. Danton's exemplary study of the impact on Norwegian librarianship is a model of a sort of investigation that should be carried out in relation to many countries. He demonstrates conclusively the very considerable influence exerted by the returning librarians, not all of whom of course had studied in library schools.

Whatever the details and variations, it is clear that American library education has been one of the factors that has made American practice a pervasive part of librarianship throughout the world. Danton's Norwegians were only one group. Another was composed of substantial numbers of Chinese librarians who, prior to World War II, were one of the large contingents. In contrast to many of the postwar Taiwan Chinese who have often remained in the United States, these earlier Chinese went home to create a substantial network of library education that is only now resurfacing on the international scene.

A multitude of instances could be cited of individual librarians who, after studying at an American library school, went home to establish American library practices in many different countries of the world. Typically such librarians became prominent leaders in their own countries, though it is important to realize that these successes have often been at least as much a consequence of the outstanding qualifications students brought to their studies as of the library school instruction. An especially notable case is the group of New Zealand librarians who came
to America in the 1930s under Carnegie sponsorship to study at Michigan. As Maxine Rochester has shown, they returned to reform New Zealand librarianship in important ways. In a different fashion, American graduates serving as consultants abroad have carried with them to a multitude of countries the ideas and practices of American librarianship. A very early instance was the work of Asa Don Dickinson (New York State, 1904) in the Punjab, but the large numbers date from the postwar period under many U.S. assistance projects sponsored by the federal government and by foundations such as those associated with the names of Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller. Some American library school graduates have gone abroad with the Peace Corps, though it appears that a greater number of Peace Corps workers have found an interest that led them to attend library school after returning home. Perhaps the largest contingent of all has been composed of American librarians who have served abroad with U.S. armed forces' libraries and USIS (U.S. Information Service) agencies.

In a multitude of ways, American library schools have affected the course of librarianship throughout the world. The most pervasive carrier of this influence has been the student who became the practicing librarian, whether at home or abroad.

Summary

The library school that Melvil Dewey founded in 1887 began a process through which almost 200,000 librarians were prepared for their profession. The growth in the ranks of graduates was slow (see table 1). For the whole period up to 1920, the average number of graduates per year was only 141. Only in 1928 did the total yearly graduates of the eighteen schools top 1000. The rate of increase, however, accelerated during the decade of the Williamson report; during the 1920s, about 5500 new graduates more than doubled the 4664 who had graduated up to that time. Again in the 1930s, the numbers more than doubled, rising to 14,000 for those years. This number remained fairly constant during the following war decade and rose only slightly to 16,000 in the 1950s but again more than doubled to 33,000 in the 1960s and almost did so again in the 1970s to 68,000. In the current decade, the annual number of those graduating has receded somewhat to about two-thirds of the fast pace of the 1970s.

Although impressive in total, the numbers of graduates annually stayed at a moderate level for most of the years of the century. About half of the graduates of accredited library schools have completed their studies during the years since 1970. Indeed, nine out of ten of all
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graduates come from the years since 1935; some of that group are still serving the profession.

As the number of students rose, the number of schools to prepare them increased as well. The fifteen to eighteen schools of the 1920s rose above thirty by 1939 but then remained in that range for some years. Only in 1970 did a surge in new schools carry their number above fifty and then on to the high of sixty-nine. Ironically the time required to bring new schools into being resulted in their starting their work just as the demand for librarians and the federal funds at its base were receding. Very recent years, of course, have seen the closing or consolidation of a number of schools, some of them with long traditions.

The multiplication of schools kept so close a pace with the demands that library school classes remained small, particularly as compared with the size of other professional schools. Even in the peak year of 1974, the average number of graduates per school was only about 120. Throughout the century, a few schools have attracted considerably larger proportions of the total students than the average, with the result that the typical library school student has been a member of a small group. The character of the experience, for the most part, has been of membership in a cohesive student body, most of whom knew each other at least casually and usually were well known by their teachers.

It is important to realize, of course, that even the whole body of graduates has never constituted all of those serving libraries and librarianship. Library school graduation certainly was not a prerequisite to appointment in the early years, and it has never become a universal requirement. Always, some individuals have risen in libraries on the basis of experience alone. And instruction besides that in ALA-accredited programs has abounded. Even the membership of the American Library Association itself has welcomed as its leaders many individuals who had no library school background.

Only in 1910 was the first graduate of a library school elected president of the association. He was James Ingersoll Wyer, the director of the Albany school. Three years later a second library-school product was elected in the person of Edwin Hatfield Anderson, Wyer's predecessor as director of the school and, by then, director of the New York Public Library which had its own library school. After an intervening year, the head of that school, Mary Wright Plummer, was elected, the second woman to hold the presidential post. Four years later, Chalmers Hadley, a New York State graduate, was elected. He was succeeded by Alice S. Tyler, director of the library school at Western Reserve University. Two more years intervened before Judson T. Jennings was elected in 1923 and Herman H.B. Meyer in 1924. Five more non-library-school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>4664</td>
<td>5893</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>6122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>6622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7231</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>7743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>8829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>9165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>10158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>11258</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>13132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>15007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>15762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>16950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>18911</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>19969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>21759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>22183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>23831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>25992</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>27557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>28573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>29492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>30316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>31928</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>33283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>34572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>36152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>37733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>39431</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>41129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>42985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>44495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>46226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>47543</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>48840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>50223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1

Library School Graduates 1921-1983
Annual and Cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>51700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>53414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>55193</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>57119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>59213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>61713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2827</td>
<td>64540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3337</td>
<td>67877</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>71774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4378</td>
<td>76152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4941</td>
<td>81093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5506</td>
<td>86599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>92670</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6877</td>
<td>99547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7112</td>
<td>106659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>7494</td>
<td>114153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7282</td>
<td>121435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7070</td>
<td>128595</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6856</td>
<td>135361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6008</td>
<td>141369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>145459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3899</td>
<td>149358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>153351</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4228</td>
<td>157579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3945</td>
<td>161524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

graduates served before Adam Strohm was elected in 1930 and Josephine A. Rathbone in 1931. In 1934, Charles H. Compton took office and in 1936 Malcolm Wyer.

With the election of Milton J. Ferguson in 1938, library-school graduates took continuous place in the presidency of the association, interrupted only by the terms of Milton E. Lord in 1949, Frederick H. Wagman in 1963, and William S. Dix in 1969. All three were of the older tradition of scholarly preparation for a library position but all three had become active members of the profession in positions of leadership both in their own libraries and in the association. It took a full fifty years before library school background for the leadership of the professional association became the norm. It is indeed noticeable that heads of library schools were elected to that post perhaps more often than their numbers would have predicted. As early as 1892 at the Lakewood Conference, it was noted that Dewey’s clique of library-school students and graduates enabled him to exert considerable power, and some have observed even to the present that library school connections seem to give a special advantage to candidates for office in the association. Throughout a century of growing and changing librarianship, library schools have powerfully influenced the profession, primarily through the students whom they prepared to do the work and to exert the leadership.
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Curriculum and Teaching Styles: Evolution of Pedagogical Patterns

LAUREL A. GROTZINGER

In 1969, NOT QUITE TWO decades ago, a small volume was published by Unesco that had the simple title, Methods of Teaching Librarianship. In light of the fact that this essay is to address that same topic, but in the framework of a century of formal library education in the United States, it is worthwhile to consider one paragraph in the preface of the relatively recent Unesco work since it summarizes the problems faced throughout the ten decades of American library education history.

The schools in question...are beginning to give serious thought to the quality of their teaching and are working to improve their teaching facilities (libraries, laboratories, audio-visual materials, etc.), their curricular policy and content, and the efficiency of their teaching staff; they are also trying to make the instruction they impart conform to the norms obtaining in other schools in the same country or region.1

The following pages will attempt to synthesize the key concepts that have dominated library school curricula with special attention to the idea of the "core," the growing conflict between library and information science, and the actual methodology of teaching as it has been described and experienced by members of the profession.

Evolution of the Curricula

As noted by Magrill in 1975, "library school curricula have been the subject of critical comment and debate for so many years now that it is
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difficult to think that there might be anything new to say on the subject. In preparing this short commentary, it took only a quick review to discover that a section of relevant references could dominate any actual discussion. The period from the mid-1940s through the 1970s produced one major work after another that critiqued programs, outlined problems, and established some of the common perceptions found throughout this essay. With only one or two major dissenters—e.g., Houser and Schrade—there was a reasonable consensus that historical surveys of library school curricula did identify common stages in the evolution of the course of study in library schools.

One of the most concise analyses was done by Reed in a contribution to the Conference on the Design of the Curriculum of Library Schools conducted by the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science in September 1970. The pre-Drew (Dewey) years—apprenticeship and in-service library training classes...; 1887—Dewey and his rationalization leading to a common avenue of library training...; 1923—Williamson, the ALA Board of Education for Librarianship, and initial accreditation of professional library education; 1933—the clarion call to respectability sounded by the 1933 standards; 1947/48—Denver, Chicago, Columbia—all this and a master's degree too; 1951—the unveiling of the new qualitative standards calling for sound general education, introductory professional courses, and initiation into an area of library specialization; and finally 1970—a library education curriculum still with challenges for change impinging from every direction.

In her discussion, Reed also commented on the ALA Curriculum studies conducted under the auspices of W.W. Charters, University of Chicago School of Education. The studies not only provided professionally sound textbooks but illustrated the parallel developmental patterns that library science shared with other applied disciplines; the pioneering educational and research efforts found at the Chicago Graduate Library School; the emphasis on a common core found in Leigh's Public Library Inquiry of the 1940s; and the University of Chicago 1953 conference that addressed the core curriculum.

It is impossible to discuss each of these historically significant benchmarks in the evolving pedagogy of library education, but they are documented thoroughly in Vanny White, Carroll, and most recently Morehead. However, certain major concerns have been highlighted in the first century of library education.

The primary concept running through the studies indicates that library education, evolving as it did in ways similar to such other
professions as clinical psychology, public administration, education, nursing, and social work as well as the areas of medicine and law, has always focused on an integration of theory and practice. As Morehead states, "the complexity, and difficulty that inform the curricula in professional education arise from the dichotomous nature of professional work with its emphasis upon a broad theoretical foundation, and upon mastery of skills and techniques for effective practice."

The original preparatory agencies were the guild and its apprentices; the battle that Dewey fought to formalize library education was against these esteemed methods, and they had to be incorporated into the course of study in order for the school to survive although there is also evidence that the coexistence of the two elements was fundamental in his beliefs and in those of his followers. At the same time, the original need to respond to demands for actual experience quickly came into conflict with the requirements of formalized training. That uneasy wedding has continued to plague the development of effective, creditable curricula. As library school programs evolved in the first half of this century, the conflict emerged even more strongly when the assorted definitions associated with the distinction between library and/or information science came into conjunction. Because of these amorphous conceptualizations, the programs of the library schools of the 1980s contain, in many instances, an unwieldy and often unsatisfactory combination of the traditional library core, appropriate library science electives, computer sciences, mathematics, philosophy, and the assorted theories of management, psychology, communications, organizational behavior, educational development, human and machine engineering, business, sociology, and any other discipline presumably of value to the generalist graduate of the one-year library school.

As already noted, this unstable situation began with the first formal programs at Columbia (Albany), and was quickly taken up by Dewey's disciples at Pratt, Drexel, Armour (Illinois), and the schools associated with public libraries. The idea of teaching library techniques or "economies" and those subjects that were perceived as particularly important in the organization of libraries, notably cataloging and classification, was matched with an equal emphasis on practical or field experience. In 1970, Reed pointed out, the "pioneer educators left their impression not only upon professional library education, but also upon librarianship generally. They attempted to give their students sufficiently specific suggestions on each of the hundreds of questions that they faced...to enable them eventually to put the library...into perfect working order."

The requirements of these early curricula are familiar from the well-known Williamson reports and in the landmark 1936 publica-
tion on *The Curriculum in Library Schools* by Reece. Williamson's studies, of course, caught the attention of the profession because they strongly documented that the quality of instruction in library schools as well as almost everything else associated with the schools was totally nonprofessional. The curricula included some twenty-five courses, but at least half of the student's time was spent in four areas: cataloging, book selection, reference work, and classification. Even then he noted that the amount of time devoted to each of the four varied greatly, and that the differences between "professional" and "clerical" demands had not been well defined. Reece later described that essential distinction as the one that exists between training and education.

"Training" may be assumed to hold in prospect routinized, repetitive tasks, and to connote the learning of methods and processes which call for little discretion and which conceivably may be exercised with only remote reference to their meaning. "Education," on the other hand, contemplates work involving problems, necessitating adaptations, embracing the revision of techniques, and entailing the treatment of human situations; it presupposes concern with a definite body of knowledge, possession of intellectual responsibility, judgment, and initiative, and appreciation of the purposes and standards of the tasks in view; in short, it implies whatever is prerequisite to practicing a profession.

Despite the strong recommendations of Williamson and the response of the profession through the Board of Education for Librarianship and the 1933 standards, the issue of theory and practice was not resolved nor has it been to this day. The schools of the 1980s have much in common with the schools of the 1890s regardless of the years of experimentation, efforts of the accrediting agencies, and attempts to provide widely held professional parameters. As Conant reported in his 1980 survey, the majority of the schools that he examined attempted a "balance" between practice and theory. Yet, he went on to state:

The tight job market in librarianship during the 1970s made it inevitable that many graduate librarians would begin their library careers in subprofessional or paraprofessional positions, and most graduate library schools provided some instruction that anticipates this situation. Thus even the theory-oriented schools were somewhat responsive to the demands of students for practical training.

These conflicting priorities are seen throughout the accredited and unaccredited programs as we move into the second century. Although no solution to this issue is currently in sight—especially in light of today's recruitment difficulties and the limited opportunity for professional employment—some members of the profession have concluded
that the one-year program is obsolete. Only through an extended period of study will it be possible to provide any serious recognition of the principles on which the field is based and to provide the quality field experience that has been recognized by other professions as part of the requirements of the first professional degree. Morehead addresses this issue in detail in his chapter on "Theory and Practice in Library Education."

It is evident that the principle thrust over the last four decades in library education has been to construct a body of theory. The writings of Danton, Metcalf, Lancour, Berelson and others show that the primary concern has been the reduction or elimination of techniques and routines that had no place in a graduate curriculum. Like trying to square the circle, the efforts to resolve the theory-technique conundrum appeared more taxing than the presumed rewards.

At the same time, he eventually concludes that the lack of past vision in resolving this pedagogical issue is not really a justification for ignoring the value of practice along with theory. Morehead also points out that some of the best responses to these issues are found in the original writings of Williamson and Reece. He then suggests that "it is to these pioneers that library educators must once again turn for direction and inspiration. An examination of alternatives to field work, within the framework of the teaching-learning process, may yet liberate library educators to seek creative responses to the legitimate demands of an experimental component in the curriculum."  

The Core Curriculum

At the heart of any examination of the curricula of library education is the existence of a core, a standard essence required of each graduate of an accredited program. The concept of the core was reaffirmed by the Conant report of 1980. In his review of one-year programs, he included a table titled "Composite Course Listings by Categories of Subjects." Although he noted, as did Williamson in the 1920s, that none of the schools surveyed offered all of the courses [categories] that were cited, he also stated that "library schools concentrate on the basic functions of the profession: reference bibliography, technical services, and administration. The historical background of books and libraries is a standard part of the curriculum in all of the schools." Conant has been criticized for his limited sample, but his conclusions about core topics were reflected in every preceding review of the field in a manner so comparable that only an occasional title wording is noticeable.
The nature of professional education, regardless of definition, has invariably suggested that there is a common content relevant to any beginning professional. In response to Williamson's severe critique in the 1920s, in 1936 Reece outlined a “brief schedule, which is essentially functional [that] illustrates the first of these steps.” It is not difficult to identify what Shera and others have described as “The Old Quadri-vium.” His list was titled “Activities Entailed in Library Work,” and point number (1) was “fashioning a library collection.” This was followed by (2) “organizing and caring for a library collection,...” (3) “using a library collection,...” and (4) “directing a library enterprise....” The foregoing embodies the raw material of the curriculum—in outline if not in fullness and symmetry. It may be translated into instructional subjects with whatever amplification and refinement are useful or feasible in a given case.

A quarter of a century later, Reed cited the results of her survey of accredited library schools: “All of the schools studied offer courses in the areas of reference, cataloging and classification, administration, and information science; 96 percent in selection and acquisition; 86 percent in research methods; 80 percent in introduction to librarianship or library in society; and 44 percent in communications and libraries.” The significant addition found in Reed’s survey is that of information science although the citing of research methods and content that would provide a fundamental overview of the field indicates a growing concern about elective flexibility that is seen in other writings of the last two decades. Of special importance is the already growing influence of a related, but independently evolving area of study—information science.

Supporting the need to provide the fundamental concepts and skills is the major accrediting agency itself, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the ALA. Although the current (1972) Standards for Accreditation are based on the premise that each school’s goals and objectives determine the exact nature of the curriculum under review, COA also issues a guideline identifying the “Principles and Procedures Common to All Types of Libraries.” Four basic components are listed:

1. An understanding of role of the library as an educational and information agency.
2. An understanding of the theories of collecting, building and organizing library materials for use.
3. A knowledge of information sources and an ability to assist the user of library materials in locating and interpreting desired items.
4. Knowledge of the principles of administration and organization to provide information services.
These components are not identified simply as interpretation; accrediting teams examine the curriculum for the existence of the quadrivium of the past.

Despite this affirmation by the only accrediting agency dealing with first-level professional programs, members of the profession have, on many occasions, addressed the issue and proposed a variety of modifications that would reflect changing pedagogical approaches. Wilson, in 1948, suggested that there had been extensive curriculum changes at, for example, Illinois, Columbia, and Chicago. He noted the relatively new approach of placing the core at an undergraduate or prerequisite level in several schools. He commented on the development of a variety of new courses focusing on the societal response required from the professional librarian.

Garrison in 1974 and Asheim in 1975 attested to a changing order. Garrison emphasizes that “serious differences of opinion have always existed on what the core is and what it should contain” and “wonders if the concept of core has not lost its validity.” Asheim hit on several of the interrelated issues when he first described the trend toward longer programs at the master's level.

Interestingly enough, the move to increase the length of the program has been accompanied by a move to reduce the number of required courses. The “core” has undergone many changes to accommodate new content (computer technology and systems analysis, for example); to make optional some of the traditional requirements (history of books and printing, and even cataloging and classification); but most especially, the core has been reduced whenever possible, not so much to reduce the length of the program overall, as to increase the number of elective options available to the student. This recognition of the growing demand for a higher degree of concentration in a great variety of specializations is one of the key developments in library education in the past decade.

Three years later, at a workshop on the Integrated Core Curriculum held at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Asheim made a slightly different statement about the emphasis on specializations. Despite apparent reduction of required courses:

In almost all cases, there is some kind of requirement; if not a single requirement for all students, then separate requirements for all students in each specialty: a bunch of little cores. Moreover, if one looks closely at these separate cores, one usually finds two or three courses that turn up in every one of them, thus sneaking in the general core concept, sub rosa.
The workshop then addressed the idea of an integrated core in which students move through a logical sequence of study from learning the fundamental information needed by the librarian generalist to a point at which each graduate would have a total overview of common principles and procedures. However, after hearing the reports of how selected schools were approaching that objective, Garrison concluded that the examples showed inconsistencies in defining basic knowledge, emphasis on concepts and not details, and unclear relationship to the larger information world. He identified a primary concern that would eventually impact the field more than any discussion of the core, integrated or not: "We need to agree first that there is an information profession larger than library science and that there can be professional schools of information larger than present library schools."31

Whither then, the core curriculum? The resolution of this issue is far from clear after one hundred years of library education. Surveys of the current situation reveal the same patterns as existed in the original schools. Only a handful of schools have attempted to define a core that might reflect the broad foundations of all branches of "the information profession." Many more evidence that even though each library school regularly reviews and "revises" its curriculum:

Each one when it finally comes up with its (presumably unique) definition turns out to be where everyone else is: advocating the premise that anyone holding a degree from the particular school should know something about materials that carry information, the needs and interests of the users of those materials, and the means, devices, processes, and mechanisms that will bring the user and the information together. And when you shake down that general, philosophical language, you have cataloging and classification, reference and bibliography, selection of materials, and library administration.

Information Science

The interjection of information science into the arena of library science education hit its major stride in the 1960s. For a number of years prior to that decade, it had been increasingly apparent that the impact of new technologies had not been assimilated effectively into library school curricula. The relatively primitive information processing equipment of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s was rapidly giving way to the sophistication of the modern computer; the marketplace for its users was not built on the services of the public, academic, school, or even special libraries. The attention given by librarians to the organization and retrieval of discrete, formal publications had not been redirected to
the concept of the properties, behavior, and flow of information in general. Library educators could not, however, ignore the fact that an entirely separate field of study was developing in a way that threatened the foundations of library science. Independent degree programs in information science and computer science began to cut into the available pool of students and to threaten the credibility and existence of library schools.

In 1967 Rees and Riccio noted that "the past decade has witnessed impressive efforts to define, formalize, systematize and even automate both the clerical and intellectual processes involved in library practice." They described two curricula modifications that had occurred in the library schools: (1) the addition of information science courses to the schools' offerings, and (2) the development of separate degree programs. They also noted that a number of schools had established an information science track or subcurricula within the standard master's degree. It was already evident that the integration had not dealt with the basic differences in definition and that the library school courses were, in general, oriented to service and not to research. At the same time, it was commonly perceived that the future had to be built on a successful merger with redefined objectives that stressed the interdisciplinary nature of the work.

A decade later, Fosdick, in his 1978 paper on trends in library education with respect to information science, cited a number of studies that confirmed the earlier predictions and illustrated the current state-of-the-art. He also presented the results of his own survey and outlined the development of library schools' curricula. Less than a decade ago, the schools were generally providing separate courses rather than an integrated curriculum. Based on his analysis, five areas of competence or topical content could be used to classify the existing courses: (1) library automation, (2) information storage and retrieval, (3) systems analysis, (4) interactive computer systems that especially focused on online bibliographic retrieval, and (5) programming.

Although Fosdick recognized that these five categories were not mutually exclusive, he was able to "fit" each course cited in the catalogs into one of the five. He also noted that a core of information science had evolved—i.e., students were counseled or required to take library automation and an introductory course in information storage and retrieval. This latter category was a broadly based one that included such topics as abstracting, indexing, vocabularies, thesauri, searching methods, information networks and systems, and study of modern storage and retrieval theory.
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A few schools—e.g., UCLA—had tried to make a complete transformation in the early 1970s by focusing on what was considered to be a totally modern and relevant approach to library education of this generation:

—the curriculum was intended to develop persons who were competent in the functional areas of the information transfer process;
—the curriculum was intended to allow for the personalization of the process of acquiring knowledge;
—the curriculum was intended to provide a mix of technical skills (limited in terms of classroom exposure), conceptual background, and human relations skills;
—the curriculum was extended from twelve months to approximately twenty-one months (generally six quarters of residence plus a summer session).

The designers of this program were unique in their approach despite the fact that critics considered the result to be one more example of “old wine in new bottles.” The emphasis on student “personalization” meant exceptional flexibility in course selection, although, a few years later, there was a move to reestablish “required courses,” and a core came into being once again. Still the UCLA program was and is an attempt to make a major break with past pedagogical patterns. A number of other programs took similar steps to create an integrated information-oriented program of study—often in an extended time frame—that would allow for student specialization at a professional level with the routines and paraprofessional responsibilities left to support staff. However, the profession as a whole did not make such a dramatic modification but moved rather to make cosmetic changes through the addition of the word information to the titles of their teaching units. By the early 1980s, only a handful of schools had not incorporated the word or substituted it for the historical designation of library science or librarianship. The curricula, as Fosdick demonstrated, still reflected the old tradition rather than a meaningful synthesis of the complex substance of information science with the fundamental theory and philosophy of library science. As Shera noted, “information science is not souped-up librarianship or information retrieval, nor is it antithetical to either. Rather information science contributes to the theoretical and intellectual base for the librarian’s operations.”

At the present, a number of library schools are in the process of examining or changing their curricula to respond more adequately to the demands of the information society. Curricula of library schools have always responded to the needs of society, whether it was in service
to special groups, to its own constituency through continuing education, or at different levels of training such as undergraduate and advanced degree study. However, no societal impact has been as significant as the information revolution and the machines that have changed every aspect of our world of recorded information and communication.

Information science and computer science have grown faster separate from existing library education programs rather than in cooperation. Recent closings of nearly a dozen library schools suggest that their justification or priority in the university setting has not competed well with departments of computer science or information science. The growing numbers of undergraduate programs in information science and information resource management—to name only two areas—further threaten the future of library education. The integration of information science and the new technologies has been slow, and the next decade may well determine whether the past ten decades of library school curricula will survive into the twenty-first century.

### Instructional Methods

No discussion of the pedagogy of library education is complete without addressing the question of "how" as well as "why" and "what." The concern about the method of instruction is, quite rightly, as old as the first classes in library instruction taught by Dewey at Columbia. Williamson addressed the issue in his special report of 1923 with a statement that "concerted effort should be made to raise the quality of instruction in library schools by increasing salaries and making teaching positions more attractive...."37 His observations noted an "excessive dependence on the lecture method" which he attributed to the students' background, a failure of the emerging profession to provide adequate texts and materials, and the extraneous and demanding requirements placed on the instructional staff. Reece's study of the curriculum included a chapter on "Conditions for the Curriculum" that identified a need for adequate tools—i.e., resources and equipment.38 The volumes of the Journal of Education for Librarianship have regularly noted the issue of "how to" teach the core courses, along with an occasional article on specialized areas. For example, in volumes 5 and 6, numbers 4 and 1, 1965, a series of experts outlined the assorted approaches to teaching reference, cataloging, book selection, the history of books and libraries, government publications, documentation, administration, adult education, and newer media.39

The 1960s were a period of special growth in the area of instructional technology and the literature began to reflect the basic tenets of
good pedagogical planning beginning with objectives, followed by planned units of instruction taught with the use of appropriate media, and concluded by a careful evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction. A 1981 study by Kazlauskas summarized many of the activities that had been incorporated in accredited schools. He noted that computer-assisted instruction had gained acceptance especially as the computer became a basic component in library and information systems. Among other forms of instruction, he described the use of programmed instruction including audiotutorials, video, online interactive laboratories, instructional games, and directed independent study. In support of these types of effective teaching approaches, in 1970 the American Library Association adopted a statement of policy on “Library Education and Manpower” that explicitly recommended that “library schools should be encouraged to experiment with new teaching methods, new learning devices, different patterns of scheduling and sequence, and other means, both traditional and nontraditional, that may increase the effectiveness of the students’ educational experience.”

One of the best and most comprehensive discussions is Morehead’s text, Theory and Practice in Library Education, especially his chapter on “Modes of Instruction in Library Education.” He begins his review by noting that it is easier to classify modes of instruction than to discover whether one or more is superior as a method of imparting knowledge. As he simply states, “methods vary by discipline as well as by temperament of the instructor.” Nevertheless, he does develop a classification or taxonomy that is useful in examining the current state of library instructional methodology. He bases his categories on the research of Dubin and Taveggia and begins by stating that “in a broad spectrum of pedagogical situations, there are two distinct modes of teaching-learning behavior: ‘face-to-face instruction’ and ‘independent study.’”

Under the broad category of face-to-face instruction fall those areas with which many in graduate education are most familiar—notably the omnipotent lecture, the group discussion, the question-and-answer strategy that has its roots in Socrates—all methods that ultimately advocate an authoritarian role of the instructor in the classroom. The lecture or modified lecture approach is used in classrooms today as much as it has been since the first classes taught at Columbia or indeed since the Germanic tradition became the basis for the universities of this country.

Independent study, on the other hand, removes the instructor from the classroom and allows the student to choose his/her own path of
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achieving the objectives of the course of study. Here, of course, the technologies of programmed instruction, computer-assisted instruction, and all of the contemporary paraphernalia that have become increasingly important, although the first use of this approach depended only on a student and an assignment to be completed—regardless of the medium. There are variations on the involvement of an instructor in that some independent study is almost completely nonsupervised while, in other forms, the instructor interjects himself/herself at significant evaluative steps along the way. It is fair to say that library school faculty employed both methods with increasing use of nonprint media as the 1960s drew to a close.

In the last quarter century, methods developed in other disciplines have been successfully adapted to library science. The case method, initiated at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, moved a short distance and became a mainstay of Simmons College and then spread throughout a number of other library school programs and produced texts and resource material. The case-study approach, however, encompasses a variety of submethodologies, and it is impossible to discuss them in any detail. Some instructors found that the case study could be used in another approach—e.g., role playing. Here, in particular, the field experience within a laboratory setting could be controlled and evaluated. Use of audiovisual methods to record the interaction provided an additional strength through feedback and a means to evaluate the experience more effectively. Still another variation on the experiential approach was to require a practical "project" that required the student to relate the theory of the text to a real-life situation. Some projects were even more directed when they were confined to a laboratory situation within the library school itself and observed by the instructor. This was also seen as a justifiable approach to the practice requirement noted earlier in this discussion.

A number of commentators on the teaching methods used in library education devoted special attention to a concept called library-centered library education. This was probably best advocated in the landmark studies of Knapp. She perceived the university library as the center of the learning experience that would incorporate the literature of the discipline, the body of knowledge of the discipline, and the sources that provide the information required by the users. The student was a participant-learner in a seminar-laboratory that would allow him/her to react, the instructor to observe and act as a mentor, and the student to respond to the incident activity. As Morehead analyzed the situation, "the unfocused problem, at first perplexing and undefined, is trans-
formed by a process of inquiry into an ordered situation....If the model works well, the process has been student-initiated and student centered, while the role of the teacher has been non-directive, in the Rogerian sense."

Finally, the entire problem of quality of instruction that has plagued the profession in its first century must now be placed within the additional perspective of the requirements of information science and its effect on the methods of teaching. In its most simplistic framework, is the issue now one of adapting catalog material on OCLC terminals as it once was one of typing accurately spaced three-by-five cards? Is experience in online database searching a matter of applying theory, or of learning a special vocabulary and "how to" turn on the machine and guide its mechanics? Clearly the old issue of the inadequate and boring lecturer who made little use of instructional methodology is now more complex since the students of tomorrow's library schools are more familiar with the technology than many of the instructors. Morehead suggests that:

[Even] if increased options for practical work through simulations or with the new technologies do not automatically confer upon the teaching-learning process a greater quality, neither does adherence to a proven set of teaching measures appreciably demonstrate a significant difference in instructional outcomes. We are not at all sure about our ability to prove statistically the main effects of any currently used educational or instructional variable."

Once again, a century of experience has not brought an answer, but only suggested new and often more complicated questions.

Summary and Concluding Remarks

One hundred years of formalized library education have been completed. Library science, librarianship, library studies, or the current configuration of information and library science have emerged within the comparative framework of other "professions" of this century. In the 1960s, McConnell stated that "the professional school may legitimately expect the university to recognize that knowledge, understanding, and theoretical foundations are not enough for the professional practitioner, for he must also be a master of his craft." The original problem of the proper balance between theory and practice has led to the recognition that "we tread upon a superficially familiar but highly unknown terrain which is open to exploration, with a multitude of theoretical approaches which can be taken." Although the faculties of professional library education programs have seemingly placed little
priority on experiential learning, the profession itself has continued to advocate a special role for it. Shera summarized it succinctly when he stated that “every profession is a blending of theory and practice, a science and an art, wissen und können, to understand and to know how. Both of these elements are essential, both must be maintained in an harmonious and proper relationship.” As the programs evolved in these ten decades, the university setting became the accepted approach, accreditation became the measure of success, and the definition of the professional was modified with the schools in turn developing more sophisticated curricula, providing advanced courses that could lead to a doctorate, and offering lifelong-learning experiences to overcome vocational obsolescence.

One overriding issue was inextricably intertwined with the concern about the relationship between theory and practice and the definition of a professional discipline: the basic requirements known as the core. Defined by Shera, in its simplest terms, the core was “the search for a unified theory of librarianship [that] implies a professional philosophy which is expressed in the curriculum as a basic course structure required of all students.” Shera also noted that this issue produced a “continuing search for the principles of unity that would bind the educational program into a cohesive whole....” The search for principles of unity is still a fundamental guideline to accreditation of the first professional library program—the master’s-level program. Regardless, the search has not been successful, and the definition of the core has not been professionally established. Numerous experiments in many different library schools have not produced one universally accepted definition of what constitutes a core, and the problem has been exacerbated by the growing impact of information science on the traditional library science programs.

Fosdick in 1982, building on his 1977 survey, reviewed the trends in library and information science at the graduate level. He concluded that “information science is now viewed as critical to modern professional education,...” and stated that “the integration of this material across the curriculum gives such traditional courses as cataloging and reference sources a different flavor than only a few years ago.” He also noted that more and more graduates of library science programs are seeking employment in nontraditional fields. Hayes, an early pioneer in curriculum design in this area, places information science in a broad perspective that dates back nearly 140 years. Indeed, it encompasses library science rather than complementing it. To the degree that the profession does not recognize this historical depth and breadth, then to an increasing degree it will be limited in its own development and
effectiveness. McGarry, in an article that addressed the combined issues of the core and the impact of information science, concluded that “the advances in information science and technology leave us very little basis for guessing what technical skills (if any) will be needed at the end of the decade, or what will be the role and structure of these information professions that have come to the fore.”

Finally, the issue of the methods of teaching cannot be set aside in a discussion focused only on what is to be taught. The technological revolution has meant that the environment of the classroom has changed once and for all. Despite a historical affection for the lecture approach, the growing ease of media application and individual instruction means that the student of this decade and of the next century will be learning in ways quite different from that of 1887, 1937, and even 1987. As Morehead noted in 1980, “if library educators are not to evade pedagogical theory of this kind because it is too enervating or because it is easier to engage in mellifluous discourse upon the geenaws of technology, it is incumbent upon them to develop multiple working hypotheses to challenge and indeed disprove the assumptions.”

The first century is at an end and library educators are once again at a beginning. It is unfortunate that library educators too face the problem of Alice in *Through the Looking-Glass*. The Queen informed Alice that a memory should be able to go both directions. Alice responded that her memory was such that she did not recall things before they occurred, whereupon the Queen replied: “It’s a poor sort of memory that only works backwards.” Let us hope that we can reverse our role of only looking backwards and see more clearly the library curriculum of the future.
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An Overview of the History of Library Science Teaching Materials

PHILIP A. METZGER

From its beginnings, university-level library education has generated much literature on the subject of its own curriculum. This is not surprising, since that curriculum was subjected to a great deal of flux in its early years and some of the element of change has persisted throughout its development. One aspect of the literature has remained constant throughout, however, with all of the discussion of ways of teaching and what ought to be taught, the subject of the tools to be used in that work—i.e., primarily textbooks—has been nearly ignored. Even in Melvil Dewey's formative curriculum, where it is known certain works were used in the classroom to help the teacher instruct, the subject receives virtually no attention. For example, Mary Wright Plummer, in a commentary on her library school education, has a lot to say about its quality, but not a word—good, bad, or indifferent—about the books that helped her learn.¹ On a more sophisticated level, Tse-Chien Tai's 1925 proposal for a reform of the library science curriculum, in which he goes to great lengths to describe the structure that curriculum ought to take, breathes no mention of textbooks or any other classroom teaching materials.² These two examples could be multiplied many times, and they suggest that textbooks have been truly an invisible aspect of library science education. They remain largely so today.
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The Williamson Report

One very important exception is to be found—the Williamson Report. Among the points covered in the pivotal Williamson Report, two—each receiving one full chapter of attention—are of interest in the present discussion. Chapter five deals with "Methods of Instruction" and chapter six addresses the issue of the sufficiency of textbooks for teaching library science. Among the many criticisms he made of the way librarians were educated, Williamson cited "excessive dependence on the lecture" and the "acute" need for more textbooks in order to "save the students' and teachers' time and to improve the efficiency of library school teaching."

Although Williamson never defines what he means by the word textbook, he suggests by example what the term signified to him. By the time he prepared his report, many standard texts were available in the field, among which he mentions the A.L.A. Catalog Rules, Dewey's Decimal Classification, the ALA List of Subject Headings, and—perhaps that which most looks like a textbook to modern librarians—Kroeger's Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books. None of these were labeled textbooks by Williamson, however; he called these works manuals of practice and reference books.

He identified two categories of publication he sought: the textbook and the treatise. The former is an elementary explanatory work to be directed strictly at the student, and the latter is an encyclopedic compilation of practice and procedure, not presumably directed strictly to the student. However murky the distinction between textbook and treatise may be, Williamson's point about the difference between each category and the type of material he excluded from each is well taken. None of the works commonly available for library instruction made much of an effort to explain to a neophyte the procedures they codified. This was precisely the problem that disturbed Williamson.

He also noted the heavy use of mimeographed course syllabi. These were a direct result of the lack of suitable textbooks and the efforts of instructors to give students something to help them through their course work. He did not find it necessary to comment on the inadequacy of this practice, which was to continue for at least several more decades. Indeed, they are sometimes used in library school courses today, although perhaps not in the depth and detail of earlier periods. One other method Williamson noted for getting around the lack of textbooks was the use of assigned readings. He found that even in this case "on many important subjects...useful literature is not only inadequate but
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scattered and inaccessible." Oftentimes, noted Williamson, the instructor gave up on this procedure out of frustration.7

Undoubtedly Williamson was correct in his explanation for the lack of suitable textbooks: lack of sufficient demand resulting in no interest on either the part of publishers or perspective authors. One attempt to remedy the situation, the ALA Manual of Library Economy—a series of pamphlets on various subjects—he found entirely inadequate because of the brevity in the treatment of each topic. His solution was twofold: (1) to appeal to "professional interest and service" to write suitable books, and (2) the establishment of some sort of sabbatical fund to allow instructors time off to research and write.8

Williamson’s implicit definition of the textbook appears to have been narrower than that proposed by others and certainly narrower than the one to be used in this paper. Here the meaning will be extended to include all types of material used in classroom teaching, however reproduced, and of more than transitory interest. Williamson’s contention that library science lacked suitable textbooks was certainly accurate, but the field did not completely lack material to be used in classroom teaching, whether or not it might be precisely called textbooks. One must not forget that such material must be related to the style of teaching employed, and in the beginning of formal library education, textbooks (such as Williamson hoped for) would probably have been little used, if indeed knowledge in the field was sufficiently organized and developed to have allowed many to be written.

Like the rest of Williamson’s Report, this aspect of his criticisms received a mixed reception. Henry Bartlett Van Hoesen, assistant librarian at Princeton University, took exception to Williamson’s definition of a textbook and included all of the texts meant to help the practicing librarian as well as the student. He found Mudge, for example, an exemplary textbook for the teaching of reference. Van Hoesen listed a number of works useful in the instruction of students, although not necessarily intended for that purpose. Most of these, it turned out, had been published in England.9

Teaching Materials, from the Early Columbia Days Onward

Early library training—whether in library schools or in the apprentice programs that preceded (and ran concurrently with) them—emphasized learning by doing and observing and using the documents and procedure manuals of other libraries.10 Clearly not much was needed in the way of textbooks for this type of instruction other than the
procedure manuals of other libraries. The one separately published volume that did serve as a textbook was the 1876 U.S. Bureau of Education publication entitled *Public Libraries in the United States of America, edited by Samuel R. Warren and Major S.N. Clark.* The first part of this work discussed the history, condition, and management of public libraries, and part two was Charles Ammi Cutter’s *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue.* The first part appeared only this once, but Cutter’s *Rules* went through a number of editions, the second and third appearing in 1889 and 1891 respectively. Indeed, the occurrence of these two dates in the early years of Dewey’s school probably reflects the students’ increased demand for the work. After the 1876 edition, the word *printed* was dropped from the title, probably reflecting the increased interest in and use of the card catalog. Whether or not one considers Cutter’s *Rules* properly a textbook, they certainly represent one of the pioneer works used in library education.

Melvil Dewey’s attitude toward the curriculum of his library school is well known. He was interested in very practical instruction in the efficient implementation of established library routine. There was little published material that described these routines, and little need for any as long as these routines could be described to students by an experienced librarian—such as Dewey himself. One doubts very much that Dewey would have found any merit at all in Williamson’s criticisms. However, one area of the curriculum—cataloging—had developed a certain degree of complexity, perhaps beyond the level of other skills being taught. Indeed, Dewey’s system for classifying books, the *Decimal Classification and Relative Index,* was already becoming well known among librarians, and formed the basis for teaching classification at the new school at Columbia. Originally published in 1876 by the Amherst College Library where Dewey was employed, the system had been considerably revised and expanded by the time it had been republished by Dewey’s own Boston firm, the Library Bureau, in 1885. Its appearance came just in time for it to be used in Dewey’s teaching. By 1889 it had gone through six editions.

At about the same time, Dewey prepared a work more suited to being called a textbook, although it might also be looked at as something of a workbook, and corresponded to his ideas of practicality. This was his *Library School Card Catalogue Rules, with 52 Facsimilies of Sample Cards for Author and Classed Catalogs* (1889). In this work he was also assisted by Mary Salome Cutler. In 1890 this forty-eight page work was included in a larger text entitled *Library School Rules,* which included the section on the card catalog as well as rules for the accession book and the shelflist. This too was published by the Library Bureau,
and went through five editions by 1905. Unlike the *Decimal Classification*, which was simply the outline of a classifying system, the school rules contained facsimiles of properly completed shelflists and other forms, so that students could learn the correct procedure. The question of why they were done that way received little or no discussion. Used in conjunction with these texts was Charles Ammi Cutter's *Alphabetic Order Table*, first published by the Library Bureau around 1887. Very little else was available to, or used by, the Columbia Library School or its reincarnation in Albany. Of course, works like Cutter's were not intended entirely for library school students; they were also used by practicing librarians in their daily work. Indeed, without sale to librarians there is little doubt that it would have been economically impossible to publish Cutter's *Rules*.

This state of affairs existed for a number of years. In 1898 a new version of *Library School Rules* was issued by the Library Bureau. Entitled *Simplified Library School Rules*, it covered the same topics as before plus other details of library cataloging practice, including library handwriting. This and the others mentioned continued to be virtually the only works that could be called library science texts during the period before 1910. They were clearly directed to the elementary practical level which Dewey espoused in library education, and they contained none of the elements of synthesis and analysis which Williamson was later to identify with the textbook.

However, it is possible to see the beginnings of the topics to be covered in more depth in later textbooks. While at Albany, Dewey's library school issued tracts on various subjects using the pages of the *New York State Library Bulletin*. Among them were Johnston's "Selected Reference Books" (1899), Walter Biscoe's "Selected Subject Bibliographies" (1899), and others. These works, as meager as they may have been, helped bridge the gap from the entirely practical curriculum to the more theoretical programs to come.

**ALA Book-Publishing Activity**

Even though the market did not exist for the publication of many books intended strictly for the use of library school students, a number of works were published after the turn of the century which were of use both to students and to practicing librarians, especially those who were working without the benefit of formal training. The American Library Association Publishing Board was especially active in providing these materials. The first formal organization within ALA for this purpose was the Publishing Section, established in 1886. In 1900 it was reorga-
nized as the Publishing Board, and in 1902 Andrew Carnegie gave ALA $100,000 to help support the board's publishing activities. No doubt this largesse was responsible for the increase in the number of titles that followed, many of which were potentially useful in library school classrooms. Foremost among the new publications was Alice B. Kroeger's *Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books* that appeared in its first edition in 1902 under the Houghton Mifflin imprint. In spite of the work's usefulness, it may not have been rewarding for the publisher, for the next printing in 1904 was issued by the ALA Publishing Board; as were the second revised edition of 1908, and all subsequent printings. Although filling a definite place as a bibliography to reference material, it also quickly found a use as the primary text for the teaching of reference work in library schools. Kroeger's work was the direct antecedent of later editions by Mudge, Winchell, and Sheehy.

Another title that was used both in libraries and library schools at the time was the *ALA Catalog*. The first edition of this work appeared in 1904 and listed 8000 volumes "suitable for a popular library." Not only was this used as a means of selecting books, but it can be found in courses on acquisition, along with required reading in *Publishers' Weekly*. Several expanded later editions of the *ALA Catalog* continued to be used for these purposes.

The ALA Publishing Board began at this time also issuing two series of pamphlets, *Library Tracts* and *Library Handbooks*. Both were directed at librarians working in small libraries. They included such topics as "Traveling Libraries," "Essentials in Library Administration," and "Cataloging for Small Libraries"; and especially in view of their low price (five to fifteen cents apiece) and appropriate topics, they were very probably used in library schools, although course descriptions do not mention them. These pamphlet series were the forerunners of an unsuccessful ALA attempt to produce a comprehensive text by a fascicle system.

Library school catalogs occasionally mention the textbooks that were in use in their curriculum. An example is the 1917 catalog of the library school at Case Western Reserve University that mentioned "the more important texts" that were employed in its courses. These were the *ALA Catalog and Supplement*, *ALA Cataloging Rules*, the *ALA List of Subject Headings*, Bostwick's *The American Public Library*, Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*, the *Dewey Decimal Classification*, and Mudge's revision of Kroeger's *Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books*, all in the latest editions. This list was updated every year for more than a decade, but the updates included mostly changes to the newer editions.
Overview of Teaching Materials

In spite of these few works, the state of availability of library science textbooks may be sensed by a paragraph which first appeared in the 1898 Circular of Information of the library school of the University of Illinois, then newly transplanted to Urbana from Chicago. In the 1910-1911 circular the statement was expanded to become more explanatory and advised:

There are few text-books on library economy, and instruction is given chiefly by lectures, collateral reading, problems and discussion, supplemented by a large amount of practical work in the various departments of the University library. In their class work instructors use illustrative material from the School's collection of printed forms and library fittings...¹⁴

After the 1913-1914 issue, the statement was dropped in its entirety, whether because the new Manual of Library Economy was alleviating some of the problem, or else to retreat into the bland generalities characteristic of the modern curriculum description, is impossible to say. Certainly the frankness of this paragraph represents one of the very few times the role, or lack thereof, of the textbook in its curriculum was clearly delineated by a library school. Nor was Illinois alone in this assessment. Case Western Reserve had a similar statement in its catalog about 1910, and dropped it at the same time the University of Illinois did.¹⁵

Undoubtedly the most ambitious effort—although it was not an entirely successful effort to produce a general text for library science—was the aforementioned Manual of Library Economy published by ALA. The plan was to issue each chapter of the work as a separate pamphlet as it was prepared, ultimately offering the work as a bound volume upon completion. The effort was partially successful, in that over thirty titles (or rather, chapters) were issued, but the volume was never published as a separate entity. Nonetheless, they were of use to the profession, and because of their low cost of ten to twenty-five cents a copy they were undoubtedly appreciated by library school students as well.

The first chapters of the ALA Manual of Library Economy appeared in 1911, and included eight titles. Further titles were added until, by 1922, all but one of the projected chapters had been published. Chapter 28 remained a hole that was apparently never filled and perhaps contributed to the fact that the set was never published under one cover. Actually by the time the “last” chapter saw the light of day, several of the others had been revised and reissued—one or two under different authors—and a few had even gone out of print.
Many leading librarians contributed to the series, which contained coverage of nearly all important topics in the field, although one wonders how thorough the coverage could be, given the eight to thirty pages allotted to each. James I. Wyer was the leading contributor—writing four titles, among them one on government documents. Topics of special interest to library school students included the high school library, library administration, classification, and many others. The pamphlets comprising the *Manual of Library Economy* were a bargain, and it represented probably the first attempt in this country at a systematic codification of library knowledge and procedures.

One of the more important textbooks of the period which saw the beginning of the publication of the *Manual of Library Economy* was Arthur E. Bostwick’s *The American Public Library*. Moreover, it was one of the few to be published by a private firm—D. Appleton and Company—in 1910. Its 393 pages carried it clearly beyond the scope of a pamphlet. The *ALA Catalog* described Bostwick’s book as a comprehensive survey of the public library movement in the United States, and called it “of special value to the student.” Of course, it clearly was not intended entirely, or even primarily, for the student. The work’s importance is attested to by the fact that it went through four editions and a couple of revisions by 1929, with an increase in length each time.

The other materials that were available for use in library school curricula were reflected in the 1921 list of ALA publications. In addition to the *Manual of Library Economy* there were two editions of the *ALA Catalog*, and a third edition was forthcoming. Kroeger’s *Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books* had been reissued and revised in 1917 by Isadore G. Mudge. That same year the University of Wisconsin library school issued a syllabus for *An Apprentice Course for Small Libraries*, in effect taking the curriculum to the library school student if he or she could not come to the university. Several books and pamphlets were available on the subject of cataloging, but without a doubt the bulk of the training was still carried on by practical exercises in the library school’s cataloging laboratory. Other than these ALA publications, little was available except one other set of pamphlets edited by John Cotton Dana entitled *Modern American Library Economy*, and published by the Elm Tree Press. This series described the methods used at the Newark Public Library and covered many of the standard subjects of the library school curriculum. This series did not have a long life, but its potential utility in library schools is apparent.

In the main then, Williamson’s criticism of the availability of teaching texts in library science seems to have been reasonably accurate. Indeed, only one or two of the titles mentioned, Kroeger and Bostwick in
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particular, appear to have made any sort of lasting impression on the curriculum in library schools. Van Hoesen was probably accurate in his view that most of these works were written for the high-school-educated but the students entering library school showed increasing sophistication and nearly all possessed the bachelor's degree by this time. "But," Van Hoesen remarked, "almost all our textbooks that would survive elimination on the criterion of suitability for students of college graduate education would fall by the criterion of comprehensiveness and relative values or proportional treatment of topics." "And," he added, "most of the few remaining would fall short of being interesting, of course." Van Hoesen identified several works which he felt could be used as textbooks in library science. Some of them were foreign works, written from a viewpoint not always useful for American librarianship, and many more treated rather narrow topics.

The American Library Association had for a long time encouraged the preparation of basic books that might be used as texts for library schools. In 1924 ALA's Editorial Committee announced that, in cooperation with its accreditation agency—the Temporary Library Training Board—it had prepared a plan for producing textbooks on various aspects of library service. Only one of these books reached publication, Public Library Administration by John Adams Lowe. Under the leadership of the Board of Education for Librarianship, the Library Curriculum Study was set up under the direction of W.W. Charters, then professor of education at the University of Chicago. The study was subsidized by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The project continued from the fall of 1925 until the fall of 1928, when Charters became director of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University. As a result of the study, and through the cooperation of the ALA Editorial Committee, seven books were published:

3. Mann, Margaret. Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books (1930).

Materials for the books were assembled through analysis of activities, problems, and traits involved in several aspects of library work, and through interviews and observation of practice in libraries of many types and of widely different geographical location. An advisory com-
mittee and experts in each special field were called upon at appropriate stages of each study to assist the author in the solution of problems met in the preparation of each book. Experimental use in library schools and revision by the author preceded final publication in each case. One of the series (Fargo) was revised by the author in 1933 and again in 1939.18

Media Enter the Curricula and Library Schools Publish Syllabi

It is in the period between 1910 and 1920 that the first inklings of the use of what is now called “media” are to be found in descriptions of library school curricula. Like textbooks, media are an area on which the literature is largely silent, but some hints may be found. The 1910/1911 circular of the University of Illinois, in the same place as the remark about the lack of textbooks, stated that “one of the rooms [in the school] is equipped for the use of the stereopticon.”19 It did not say anything about the subjects of the slides, but probably they portrayed library buildings and rooms, the most logical subject for the stereopticon. Seven years later the information brochure from the library school at Saint Louis Public Library showed an instructor using slides to present an illustrated lecture to the class.20 Thereafter, and in the 1930s and 1940s increasingly so, it was not too unusual to find a picture of a class being shown a film. Not until the 1960s, however, was it common for the library school curriculum to include instruction in media.

In the 1930s and 1940s, it gets more and more difficult to determine exactly what textbooks were in use, primarily because even the occasional mention of these in library school catalogs went out of fashion. Thus it is especially helpful that occasionally an observer of library education happened to say a word or two about textbooks. One such person mentioned in 1939 what the most popular textbooks in library school happened to be. First and foremost among them was, of course, Mudge’s Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Works. Hosteter also cited the series from the University of Chicago as “useful.” Clearly these had found their place in library schools. Then came a heterogeneous list which provided a clue to which of the increasing number of works on library science topics—not necessarily intended as textbooks—were finding a place. These included W.S. Gray’s What Makes a Book Readable (1935); Carleton B. Joeckel’s The Government of the American Public Library (1935); W.M. Randall’s Principles of College Library Administration (1936); Douglas Waples’s The Library, National Libraries and Foreign Scholarship (1936) and What People Want to
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Read About (1931); and finally Louis Round Wilson's seminal The Geography of Reading (1938).²¹

In spite of the apparent progress since the Williamson report, Keyes D. Metcalf—writing along with two others in 1943—found the state of overall textbook availability much the same as it had been twenty years before. Even the “Library Curriculum Series,” he found, failed for the most part to satisfy the need for better texts. Margaret Mann’s Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books was the sole exception. The others had a number of defects. These included the author’s lack of freedom to follow his own plan, the lack of awareness of some authors of the needs of library schools, excessive verbiage, too little graphic material, and a style that was neither scholarly nor popular. This was a rather severe indictment of these textbooks, although one wonders if those authors who did not understand library school needs would have been any better off if they had had more control over their work. A further criticism of the series was the lack of a work on library administration. The only other text that Metcalf found worthwhile was not a part of that series: Helen Haines’s Living with Books, which he said “stands out as the kind of textbook a library school instructor can produce if left free from editorial and other restraints.”²²

Metcalf also provided a helpful assessment of the position of visual methods (perhaps sometimes a better term than media) in the library school curriculum. This, according to Metcalf, was one of the “weakest phases” of the curriculum. (As we have seen, there were indications of the use of film and slides in the curriculum, but apparently that use was not very prevalent.) He suggested that films would be especially useful in teaching administration. Although bulletin boards with pictorial and other materials were frequently used in library schools, Metcalf found this insufficient. He called for the production of more films just as he called for the writing of more, and better, textbooks.²³

One of the most important ways (as Williamson noted) in which library schools got around the inadequacy of textbooks was by using published syllabi. There seems to be no way of getting an accurate view of how many schools published these documents, or in what numbers, but Library Literature—the H.W. Wilson index—included some of them. It is possible to suggest the range of subject matters considered by these syllabi. Columbia University seems to have been the most prolific in the late 1930s. Columbia’s syllabi covered such subjects as bibliographical method, reference, book selection, and cataloging and classification. Some of these went through a number of editions; most often they were mimeographed assemblages of typescript. Some of the topics were not covered by available texts, but it would seem that others were.
Other schools too published their course syllabi. The University of Chicago published some syllabi, as did Wisconsin, Denver, and other important library schools. One finds them listed in Library Literature as late as the mid-1970s, but at the end of the 1940s their numbers decreased. No doubt the increasing availability of a wide variety of textbooks, along with the rapidly changing nature of the curriculum, made the effort which went into the production of syllabi unnecessary. They are still used in a small way in some schools, but syllabi are not nearly as important as they were a few decades ago.

The period after World War II until the beginning of the 1960s seems to have been a rather quiet time in the development of library science texts. Very little new material was introduced, but many of the old classics were reprinted or appeared in new editions. The major developments occurred at the latter end of this period and consisted of the use of the introduction of media into the curriculum and the appearance of information science as a subject matter for library schools to teach.

Commercial Publishing of Textbooks

A great change in library science textbook production took place in the late 1960s and early 1970s. This change may be directly related to the increase in library school enrollment brought about by the influx of federal money that was appropriated by Congress in an effort to alleviate the shortage of librarians. The change also involved the wholesale entry of commercial textbook publishers into the library science market. Indeed, there had always been a few trade publishers in library science, but by and large the great majority of library science textbooks had been issued by professional or academic presses, such as the American Library Association and University of Chicago Press. The commercial market for library science textbooks scarcely existed, because, before 1960, the number of students in accredited library schools never exceeded 1800.

With the influx of federal funds and students, circumstances changed radically. The number of library school students shot up from a little less than 1800 in 1960 to over 5500 by 1970. In addition, the number of library schools with accredited programs increased in the same period from thirty-two to fifty-two. All of this increase, while probably miniscule in relation to many other academic programs, proved to be attractive to many major textbook houses, and they began to enter the market. Along with the increase in governmental funds for education of all kinds—and probably as a result of it—textbook firms
were seen as attractive takeover prospects by larger firms. The resultant influx of capital may have helped publishers to make the most of the educational market.

One of the first firms to enter the library science market was also among the largest publishing houses: McGraw-Hill. Its contribution was a series of widely used textbooks, "McGraw-Hill Series in Library Education," under the editorship of Jean Key Gates. She was also the first contributor to the series; her *Introduction to Librarianship* appeared in 1968, and appeared in a second edition in 1976. As the title implied, this was a general overview of the field of librarianship. Other examples in the series focused on more specific areas of library practice at the time. John Boll's *Introduction to Cataloging*, in two volumes, had first been published by the University of Wisconsin—Madison in 1966, and shortly thereafter was included in the new McGraw-Hill series. The second important area of librarianship, reference work, was covered by what turned out to be probably the most widely used work in the series, William A. Katz's *Introduction to Reference Work*, in two volumes. It first appeared in 1969 as well, with subsequent editions in 1973, 1978, and 1982. Other titles included the 1971 book by Edward Heiliger and Paul Henderson entitled *Library Automation; Experience, Methodology, and Technology of the Library as an Information System*. This was issued at a time when the subject of computers and automation was just beginning to enter the library school curriculum. If this work looked to the future, Sidney L. Jackson's *Brief History of Libraries and Librarianship in the West* (1974), looked to the past. The McGraw-Hill series was being added to as late as 1981, with Richard K. Gardner's *Library Collections, Their Origin, Selection and Development*.

The McGraw-Hill series contained relatively few titles, all them clearly focused on major areas of library education. Another series of texts, published by Libraries Unlimited, competed to a certain extent with the McGraw-Hill series, but was much broader and more varied in scope. Its origin was in a text on cataloging written by Bohdan S. Wynar. His *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification* first appeared in 1964 and predates the series in which it was later to be issued. By 1980 it had reached its fifth edition. Other important works in the series included Jesse H. Shera's *Introduction to Library Science: Basic Elements of Library Service* (1976), H. Robert Malinowsky's *Science and Engineering Reference Sources: A Guide for Students and Librarians* (1967), Joe Morehead's *Introduction to United States Public Documents* (1975), and A. Robert Rogers's *The Humanities, a Selective Guide to Information Sources* (1974). In addition to these titles, a
number of others contributed to more restricted areas of library education, such as map librarianship, micrographics, and Dewey decimal classification. The series also had at least two titles for use in library technician training programs. But, as can be clearly seen, this series attempted to respond to the same basic needs for textual materials as the McGraw-Hill series.

Two other series of textbooks, neither perhaps as important as the ones previously discussed, deserve mention, at the very least because of their innovative and individual approaches to the material they dealt with. NCR Microcard Editions took advantage of modern photo-offset procedures to produce volumes of articles assembled from other publications. Rather than have the student laboriously search the literature for items of interest, the topics were presented to him or her in one package. These "Readers in..." covered a fairly wide range of topics, including library administration, research methods, academic libraries, American library history, cataloging, and others. All of these were published during the period 1969 to 1974—the great expansion period of library education. None seems to have been published in more than one edition, however.

The second series took the case-study approach, presenting actual—or at least realistic—problems in library service. These could then be discussed by students, and appropriate solutions proposed and analyzed. This series was R.R. Bowker's entry into the library science text sweepstakes, and it was entitled "Problem-Centered Approaches to Librarianship." The series consisted of four titles—all by prominent library educators—on reference service, school media management, science and technology, and organizing library collections. All of the volumes in this series appeared in 1971 and 1972, and it is difficult to tell how successful they were. The fact that the series stops at this point suggests they were not particularly well received.

Other publishers also aimed individual titles at the library market. It is not possible to mention all of these. Many of them were responding to the general upturn in library buying, as a result of the influx of federal money. The most prominent of these was Scarecrow which had developed techniques for printing small editions profitably. Most of what they published was directed to academic library collections, but some was intended as textual material in library science. One may mention Elmer D. Johnson's *History of Libraries in the Western World*, 1965 (second edition by Michael Harris and Johnson in 1976) as an example. Other publishers—such as Greenwood Press—directed much of their list at the library market, without quite adopting Scarecrow Press' bargain basement methods.
Information science courses first began to appear in library science catalogs in the late 1960s, and by the early 1970s at least one textbook series had come into being to serve that growing need. John Wiley & Sons had been a scientific and technical publisher for a century or more. Its subsidiary, Becker & Hayes, began the "Information Science Series" in 1970, with Gerald Jahoda's *Information Storage and Retrieval Systems for Individual Researchers*. There followed in 1971 Allen Kent's *Information Analysis and Retrieval*. Other titles included discussions of information handling, automated language processing, information retrieval systems, and further topics of concern in information science. The series occasionally ranged a bit more widely, including Jesse Shera's classic 1972 work (inexcusably out of print) *The Foundations of Education for Librarianship*.

At the present time, the use of the computer and media seems to have become ubiquitous in library education. In a recent study, sixty-three responding library schools indicated they maintained a combined total of ninety-three different laboratories devoted either to media or computers, or else both in one facility. However, their introduction into the curriculum has been so recent that they may almost be said not to have a history, although that would of course not be quite the truth. Nonetheless, in the last ten years the computer has grown dramatically in importance, as the use of computerized reference databases and cataloging systems has increased.

Media have been present in the library school curriculum somewhat but involve probably more instruction in their use rather than their use in instruction. In this regard, the same study also found that, as of 1984, the mean number of years of existence for media laboratories was about eleven. The media laboratory at the University of Illinois library school has been around a good deal longer but still may serve as an example and may also mark the earliest that this type of instruction has been offered in library education. The first course in the subject was offered in 1943; five or six years later the teaching of "audiovisual" materials was spread throughout the curriculum. The media laboratory has grown and developed in many directions and is a far cry from stereopticon slides of an earlier day. Although other schools may not be able to boast of the antiquity of such a program, it is difficult to imagine a curriculum without this aspect, whether film, videotape, slide production, or other nonprint media.

More difficult to characterize is the use of computers in library school instruction. The introduction of information science into the curriculum no doubt had a great influence, but probably more to the point was the need to teach online cataloging and database retrieval. In
1984, the mean number of years that library schools had had cataloging laboratories was a little over five. The recent widespread availability of inexpensive microcomputers and commercial software will make changes that are probably not fully reflected in the library school curriculum or its needs for teaching material yet.

**Periodicals in Library Science**

It is difficult to summarize the development of library science publications during the last one hundred years. As an introduction, some statistics will help. H.G.T. Cannons's *Bibliography of Library Economy*—the first index in this country devoted solely to library science material—was published in 1927. It covered journals published between 1884 and 1920, and indexed sixty-eight titles. Its successor, the H.W. Wilson index, *Library Literature*, first appeared in 1934. The initial volume covered years 1921 to 1932 and indexed seventy-eight periodicals, about one-fifth of which were foreign. The next volume—covering 1933 to 1936—including eighty-six titles, about one-third of which were foreign. From that point on, the proportion of foreign titles indexed has remained rather steady at about one-third. In the 1941 to 1951 volume, 120 titles were indexed and in 1970 to 1971, 164 titles were indexed. Finally, in the 1983 volume, access to 218 titles was provided. This is truly a prodigious increase in the literature of the field and parallels developments in other areas of learning.

Yet the large number of publications directed at the librarian of today belies the relative simplicity of the early days. Before the turn of the century—although librarians probably read those foreign journals that their language skills permitted—very little of any importance was published in the United States. One of the first which the newly emerging field of librarianship made use of was *Publishers' Weekly*. Established in 1872, it was intended primarily as an organ for publishers and booksellers. However, the information it published was of very great import to librarians too and a perusal of its pages will make it clear that the editors were conscious of that audience as well.

In the centennial year of 1876, *Library Journal* appeared—the first periodical specifically directed to librarians in the United States. As in many other areas of librarianship, Melvil Dewey had a hand as principal founder as well as being editor for a number of years. The connection with *Publishers' Weekly* is strong. Frederick Leypoldt, its founder, was *Library Journal*'s publisher as well. *Library Journal* served as the
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American Library Association's official organ until that body established a periodical of its own a number of years later. In fact, the next major library publication to appear was the Bulletin of the American Library Association, which first appeared in 1907 as a bimonthly of about twelve pages. Its aim was to "communicate at frequent stated periods with members...." Early issues were rather dry, being full of committee reports and bare of any illustration. In 1926, the publication frequency changed to monthly and began to feature articles of more general interest as well as pictures. It gradually evolved into the American Libraries and was received, if not read, by all members of the American Library Association.

The next major development in the area of library science publications did not take place until 1931. The foundation of the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago had many profound influences on the course of library education. None was more important than its establishment of Library Quarterly, whose first issue came out in January 1931 under the editorship of W.M. Randall. Much more so than any other American library periodical, it followed the format of the scholarly quarterly both in appearance and content. Its focus was on research in library science—a point made clear in the opening essay, which stressed the importance of that area. Indeed, given the thrust of the curriculum at Chicago, the appearance of such a journal may be considered more or less inevitable. Others of its ilk were to follow, but none have retained quite the prestige of Library Quarterly.

The communal interests of library education itself have been served since 1915 by the American Association of Library Schools. This body had published for some time several smaller publications which included a collection of meeting reports, a newsletter, and a directory. However, with the growing ferment in library education after World War II, apparently the need was felt for a journal to deal solely with the issues of library education. In this manner the quarterly, Journal of Education for Librarianship, first made its appearance in the summer of 1960. Recently renamed the Journal of Education for Library and Information Science to reflect the importance of information science and library science education, it has remained the primary publication in this area.

A departure in format was Library Trends, which first appeared at the University of Illinois under the general editorship of Robert B. Downs. The great departure for this journal was the fact that each quarterly issue was devoted to one theme under the editorship of a specialist in that particular area. Since the first issue in July 1952, just
about every problem in librarianship has been covered at least once, from copyright to computerization.

These are a few of the most important journals in library science; ones that have contributed to the education of the student and practitioner alike. Obviously many others could be mentioned. Today the list of library science periodicals includes not only scholarly journals but also a plethora of state and regional library association periodicals, all having a similar purpose to that of the *Bulletin*—i.e., communication with members. In addition, there has been an increasing number of journals—often published commercially—that are directed to specific areas of practice and are intended to help the practitioner in those areas. The *Journal of Academic Librarianship* is one such journal. However, the Haworth Press of Binghamton, New York, is the most prolific producer of these periodicals. During the last ten years or so it has seemingly tried to cover every possible area of library practice with such titles as *Public Library Quarterly, Special Collections, Journal of Library Administration, Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian, Reference Librarian*, and many others. In 1952, when Robert B. Downs introduced *Library Trends*, he apologized for adding another publication when librarians were already "surfeited" and "inundated" by library periodicals. The surfeit and inundation are even more pronounced today, yet the flow of new publications does not seem to abate.

**Conclusion**

This paper has been an introduction to, and an overview of, a subject which richly deserves further, much more detailed, examination. Textbooks are among the codifiers and standardizers of knowledge in a field, and in that role they may reveal a great deal about attitudes and approaches of a discipline at a particular time. Much can be learned from studying them. It might be rewarding, for example, to examine early texts on reference service to try to determine what attitudes and practices they were inculcating into beginning librarians. Similarly, approaches to the organization of material and the expectations made of catalogers have changed a great deal, in ways that deserve further exploration. The whole question of introduction of the teaching of media and automation has only received that most cursory attention here. These subjects and many more are all worthy of the attention of doctoral students and other researchers. It is indeed time that the transparency that textual materials have had in the literature of our profession be reduced or perhaps even eliminated entirely.
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The Growth of Continuing Education

ELIZABETH W. STONE

At the first World Conference on Continuing Education for the Library and Information Science Professions held in August 1985, continuing library education (CLE) was advocated as an essential element of a librarian's lifetime education. Yet fifteen years ago even the discussion of the term continuing education (CE) was thought unimportant by many leaders in the field. And the idea of having a World CLE Conference would have been scoffed at and considered impossible—impossible because it would have been considered a topic of so little significance that very few, if any, would have attended.

Actually holding such a conference (and securing financial support for it) is in itself a sign of the "growth" in importance of the concept of continuing education in the profession. But the growth has not come easily and the road has been—and still is—full of a series of starts, retreats, and hesitancies, of conflicts and compromises. Total acceptance of the belief that CLE is an activity that must occur throughout a professional's career is still some ways off. Highlighting some of the concepts and developments over the past one hundred years that have led us slowly toward this stance should help develop some guidelines to help in charting the future.

Continuing library education, as used in this article, consists of all learning activities and efforts, formal and informal, by which individuals seek to upgrade their knowledge, attitudes, competencies, and

Elizabeth W. Stone is Professor Emeritus and former Dean, School of Library and Information Science, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
understanding in their special field of work (or role) in order to: (1) deliver quality performance in the work setting, and (2) enrich their library careers.

Consider also the definition developed by six library/information leaders who founded the National Council on Quality Continuing Education for Library/Information/Media Personnel:

Continuing education is a learning process which builds on and updates previously acquired knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the individual. Continuing education comes after the preparatory education necessary for involvement in or with information, library media services. It is usually self-initiated learning in which individuals assume responsibility for their own development and for fulfilling their need to learn. It is broader than staff development which is usually initiated by an organization for the growth of its own human resources.

This more specific definition is helpful, as it makes clear that continuing education is a generic term which includes staff development as one element. It also indicates that CE is considered the basic responsibility of each professional.

In reviewing the development of CLE it is important to recognize realistically its limitations as well as its strengths so that thinking about CLE is not plagued by conflicting and unrealistic objectives. One concept that particularly has created conflicting and unrealistic expectations is the one that teaching guarantees learning which in turn assures quality performance. CLE is a support system, not an absolute determinant of quality performance. To achieve the goal of quality performance requires commitment and action by the profession as a whole (as well as by the individual professional) in the development of essential criteria for quality, methods of measuring performance, and constant evaluation. Quality performance depends also on the profession’s will to use the criteria developed, to assess minimum performance, to continuously evaluate, and finally, to take corrective actions where necessary.

The Beginnings of Continuing Library Education

In summarizing the growth of CLE it is necessary to realize, as stated by John Lorenz in 1964, that until recently little attention was given to its structure either with respect to society’s needs or the individual practitioner’s. Only recently has CLE graduated from something “nice but peripheral” to something “urgent and central.”
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Although the American Library Association (ALA) took no official initiatives in urging CLE efforts, a few early leaders saw its importance and made statements or recommendations about it. For example, at the 1898 annual meeting of ALA, Melvil Dewey planned the program to feature two topics: professional training and home education (distance learning). During the discussions, Dewey spoke of the advantages of library institutes held at a regional level so practitioners would not have to travel more than two or three hours and could be exposed to competent leaders for a few days. He also spoke of the feasibility and value of correspondence study.

William Howard Brett, librarian of the Cleveland Public Library, suggested that the status of librarians would be raised if a certification process were required after formal professional training, and Dewey made a motion which was passed by the assembly, “that the executive board be requested to formulate a plan looking to a system of library examinations and credentials.” Accordingly, the Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials was appointed and asked to report the next year. It made no report in 1899, but asked to be continued.

Many of Dewey’s earlier recommendations were echoed by Charles C. Williamson in his landmark Carnegie Foundation survey of 1923 on library education. Williamson stated that there were no standards for library practice and declared a system for certification should be developed to be administered by a national accreditation board. Two other areas in the Williamson report had also been addressed by Dewey: (1) the continuing education of professional librarians; and (2) correspondence instruction. Although Williamson devoted a chapter to each, they were given little attention by educators until the mid-1960s and beyond.

Compared with other professions, librarianship has been slow to recognize the value of CE. For example, as early as 1906 the American Medical Association (AMA) was so concerned about the need for CE efforts that it commissioned J.C. McCormack to visit various states to stimulate interest in CE by practicing physicians. In 1932, a report of the Association of American Medical Colleges proposed that provisions should be made so that physicians could continue their education after graduation from medical school. In 1962, a joint study committee of the AMA and seven other medical associations that was chaired by Bernard V. Dryer produced the classic report entitled Lifetime Learning for Physicians: Principles, Practices, Proposals based on the assumption that “the continuing education of physicians is one of the most important problems facing medical education today.”
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For the number of practitioners reached regularly each year by CE, banking has an enviable record. Under the direction of the American Institute of Banking (AIB), an active CE program has been in existence for over eighty-five years. Currently it involves some 250,000 bankers nationwide; and AIB prides itself that every community in the land, regardless of size or density, has some AIB study group.12 A review of major developments in CE in other professions can be found in the 1974 study, *Continuing Library Education Viewed in Relation to Other Continuing Education Movements*, which included suggestions for the development of a profession-wide program for librarianship.13

By contrast, Ralph Munn, director of the Pittsburgh Public Library and one of the acknowledged leaders in the library profession of his day, stated as late as 1936 that “except for the director and about six department heads and specialists, I believe the Pittsburgh staff does not need more bibliographical or technical training than is now given in one-year library schools.”14 Commenting on this statement, Jesse Shera15 wrote in 1972:

> Obviously Munn did not see the accelerated rate of change that, even at the time he wrote, was beginning to be manifest, nor did he envisage the role that the librarian of a large and important metropolitan public library might play in the communication system in society.... The obvious fact remains that, except for a very few people...the need for anything beyond the first professional degree was not widely recognized until very recent years, and even today this need has been poorly articulated.

> The profession’s responsibility for continuing education was brought sharply into focus in 1965 by Samuel Rothstein in his *Library Journal* article “Nobody’s Baby: A Brief Sermon on Continuing Professional Education,” in which he made a plea for the baby’s adoption. He nominated ALA for the office of parent and urged it, in keeping with the functions of other professional organizations, to “move to establish offices for continuing professional education with paid secretariat and field workers.”16 He envisioned this office serving as a coordinating agent and resource and development center. ALA did not accept the invitation then, nor has it yet, in spite of the efforts of scores of dedicated practitioners who support this objective and official directives to this effect passed by the ALA Council.

> Awakening to the realization that librarians’ roles as professionals were insufficiently sustained by preservice education, plus an occasional trip to an annual meeting or a regional conference, plus scanning the journals, ALA invited the renowned adult educator Cyril Houle of the University of Chicago to address its 1967 midwinter meeting. Houle
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emphasized the central role that the professional association should assume in CE:\textsuperscript{17}

The professional association crowns all other efforts at continuing education and bears the chief collective responsibility for it. A manifest function of every professional association is the continuing education of its membership; indeed scarcely any other function has a longer tradition than this one. It is, moreover, undertaken not merely by a few people working at a separate task but by the whole body of people engaged in the affairs of the association.

In explaining how an association fosters a learning community, Houle listed four areas where practitioners need the professional association's support: (1) to keep up with the new knowledge related to the profession; (2) to establish mastery of the new conception of their profession; (3) to continue study of the basic disciplines which support the profession; and (4) to grow as persons as well as professionals.\textsuperscript{18}

In 1968, \textit{A Study of Factors Related to the Professional Development of Librarians} analyzed the relation of motivation to professional growth. The results indicated that the reasons for librarians engaging in CE activities are different from and not merely opposite to the reasons for their nonparticipation. Most important motivation factors were CE opportunities that were directly related to the librarian's job responsibilities. Attending CE courses that were directly related to job content tended to give participants a feeling of growth in job competence. The major motivators for participation were (1) quality of professional improvement activity, (2) chance to be exposed to new and creative ideas, and (3) the opportunity to use new knowledge on the job.\textsuperscript{19} Deterring forces were primarily associated with extrinsic conditions—chiefly inconvenience of location and lack of time.\textsuperscript{20} Respondents in the 1968 motivation study listed 879 suggestions for CLE directed to seven relevant groups. The consensus was that CE should be a shared responsibility in the profession.\textsuperscript{21} The overwhelming number of suggestions for action implied a strong concern in favor of strengthening CLE.

Library School Initiatives in the 1960s

Realizing that the profession insisted that graduate library schools had responsibilities for both currently enrolled students and for their alumni—for keeping up with the exponential growth of information as well as applying new technologies to librarianship and preparing specialists in a wide array of fields—library school educators sought ways to confront the dilemma. Some educators favored reducing emphasis on fundamentals at the master's level and offering more specialty-oriented
information science courses: some schools chose this route, others recommended instituting formalized programs beyond the master's degree—something between the master's and the Ph.D. degree.

In 1965, Raynard Swank proposed a sixth-year post-master's certificate program as one way to meet the demand for specialization:

With all the new content and roles of librarianship that confound us in these times, we need to pay more attention than ever to the nature, scope, and purpose of the general curriculum, wherein lies the unity of the profession. At the same time, we must intensify our specialized curricula, wherein lies the diversity of the profession. We cannot win by slighting either and we cannot succeed at both within the fifth year. Therefore, let us get on with both the reorganization of the general curriculum in the fifth year and the extension of specialized curricula into the sixth year.

In 1967/68, Floyd N. Fryden studied eleven of the twelve accredited schools then offering the post-master's programs and found that they served three purposes: (1) to help practicing librarians improve their performance, (2) to help practicing librarians advance their careers, and (3) to prepare persons to teach, chiefly at the undergraduate levels. In March 1985, thirty-nine of the fifty-nine ALA-accredited U.S. schools (66 percent) offered a post-master's certificate program.

In 1968, J. Periam Danton carried out a study to supplement Fryden's. Danton found great differences in the programs and said that the programs were tailored to students' individual needs. One pattern Danton observed, however, was that more than one-third of the programs emphasized information science and automation.

In 1969, a study conducted at The Catholic University of America concluded that a need exists for a post-master's program to upgrade the performance of professional librarians. It was recommended that such a program should (1) be interdisciplinary in nature, (2) use a systems approach in planning and implementation, (3) be based in a library school, (4) be related to identified on-the-job needs, (5) use multimedia instructional techniques, (6) take into account motivational factors, and (7) be offered on a part-time basis if large numbers of participants were to be attracted to this type of CE delivery system. The highest priorities respondents identified for courses were (1) library management, (2) library automation, and (3) specialized library services.

The Development of Continuing Library Education: 1970 Onward

Lester Asheim gave strong support to CE for the profession. The last three of thirty-three policy statements in the document refer to CE:

31. Continuing education is essential for all library personnel, professional and supportive, whether they remain within a position category or are preparing to move into a higher one. Continuing education opportunities include both formal and informal learning situations, and need not be limited to library subjects or the offerings of library schools.

32. The "continuing education" which leads to eligibility for Senior Librarian or Specialist positions may take any of the forms suggested directly above so long as the additional education and experience are relevant to the responsibilities of the assignment.

33. Library administrators must accept responsibility for providing support and opportunities (in the form of leaves, sabbaticals, and released time) for the continuing education of their staffs.

These statements represent a major breakthrough for the cause of CE in the profession, but they are still goals toward which the profession can strive.

Also in 1970, a CE position statement was made by ALA's Activities Committee on New Directions. This document stated that "commitment to the continuing education of the profession must be made by the individual librarian, by the managers of libraries, and by the professional association—especially the ALA." The document called for centralization of CLE activities at ALA and enumerated ways ALA could contribute to the professional growth of its members, especially in the area of management training.

Important contributions in management training and CE were made by the Staff Development Committee, Personnel Administration Section, Library Administration Division (LAD; now LAMA) of ALA. For the first time an all-day workshop on CLE was held at the 1970 ALA annual conference, and the workshop papers were published. In July 1971, the ALA Staff Development Committee produced an issue of Library Trends on "Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries."

Concurrently, Allie Beth Martin and library leaders in the Southwest identified CE as the highest priority in a list of eleven nationwide needs. Continuing Education for Library Staffs (CELS) in the Southwest was developed and funded initially by the Council of Library Resources (CLR) as part of the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor (SLICE). In her landmark study of 1972, A Strategy for Public Library Change, Allie Beth Martin cited CE as one of the highest priorities for action:
There is an urgent need for concentration on training and retraining of the practitioners—those presently performing and those who will follow—to enable them to know how to establish goals for individual libraries, how to develop libraries which will continually change with society and perform efficiently in the community.

In this study, Martin eloquently presented the view that opportunities have never been more promising for libraries—that a renascence in libraries is on the threshold. Martin believed that CE was a major force favoring such a renascence. Continuing education for whom? She felt that "broadest possible inclusion should be the goal....Continuing education should be available to all at whatever level of employment. Formal recognition in the form of certificates or other awards would be desirable."33

The Contribution of AALS to the Growth of CLE

During the early 1970s, the Association of American Library Schools (AALS, now the Association for Library and Information Science Education—ALISE) took a number of initiatives in CLE. In 1971, AALS President Margaret Monroe stated her belief that library schools had a unique contribution to make to CLE for three reasons: (1) the schools emphasized theory, which enabled better understanding of problems and the probability of arriving at better solutions to them than experience alone might permit; (2) the schools had sustained attention on problems of practice long enough to view them from all angles; and (3) the schools afforded deeper insights from concepts of other disciplines and professions.34

Accordingly, Monroe appointed an ad hoc study committee to investigate the role of AALS in CLE.35 The committee presented its report at the AALS Annual meeting in Chicago in January 1972. The AALS board's adoption of the report was based on four key assumptions: (1) that CLE was one of the most important problems in library education, (2) that there was a need for coordination and expanded programming, (3) that library schools have a CE obligation to their graduates, and (4) that there was a necessity for coordinated nationwide planning for CE among relevant groups.36

As adopted, the report outlined specific recommendations for implementation "inside" AALS and "outside" AALS. It remained as the association's policy on CLE until June 1981, when the organization approved a revised statement. The 1981 document is designed as a guide to interpreting ALISE's role to provide leadership that encourages
library, media, information programs to offer basic professional education and active CE programs in their fields.

Pleased with the accomplishments of its ad hoc CE committee, the AALS board in 1972 converted it into a standing committee on CLE. The standing committee carried out a wide range of activities including: (1) development of a CLE network of representatives appointed from the AALS schools, other professional associations, and state library agencies; (2) holding a workshop describing the CE programs of five other professions (architecture, banking, education, engineering, and the ministry); (3) conducting two CLE surveys (one of library associations and one of library schools); (4) trying, albeit unsuccessfully, to get a profession-wide position paper on CE adopted; and (5) initiating a successful proposal in answer to an RFP (Request for Proposal) from the National Commission on Library and Information Science (NCLIS) for a nationwide survey of CLE. Regional hearings NCLIS conducted in 1972 found a severe lack of availability of CE opportunities for the development and maintenance of competencies needed to deliver quality library services to the nation.

The Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange

The NCLIS-sponsored survey, carried out at The Catholic University of America by Elizabeth W. Stone, Ruth J. Patrick, and Barbara Conroy, found that no central mechanism existed for providing information on CE programs; that CE programs at state and regional levels were uncoordinated; that no assessment of CE needs had been made with a resulting coordinated plan of action for meeting these needs; and that planners and trainers themselves frequently needed additional training.

A new organization, the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE) was the basic recommendation of the nine-month NCLIS study on CLE. The final report suggested starting points in the ongoing process of developing a highly diversified nationwide program of CE for library and information science personnel at all levels of sophistication and need. CLENE was officially founded during ALA’s 1975 annual meeting.

Based on a philosophy of lifelong, self-directed learning, the basic missions of CLENE were:

1. To provide equal access to continuing education opportunities, available in sufficient quantity and quality over a substantial period of time to ensure library and information science personnel...
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and organizations the competency to deliver quality library and information services to all.

2. To create an awareness and a sense of need for continuing education of library personnel on the part of employers and individuals as a means of responding to societal and technological change.

CLENE's activities focused in four major program areas: (1) needs assessment, (2) information acquisition, (3) product development, and (4) communications and delivery. CLENE's programs were those that had been identified as priorities in the 1974 NCLIS study. They included: periodic directories of CLE opportunities, periodic directories of human resources available in the field of CLE, the CLENEx-change, a quarterly newsletter on CE activities both inside and outside the profession; publication of concept papers and annotated bibliographies dealing with major issues in CE; monthly updates of current programs published as the Continuing Education Communicator; semiannual assemblies of the membership followed in the first years by publication of their proceedings, and development of funding proposals for carrying out programs and research relative to priority CE needs in the profession.

CLENE's fund raising activities produced U.S. Office of Education Title II-B grants in 1976, 1978, and 1979 for three one-year institutes to train state library agency personnel in implementing and strengthening statewide systems of CE for library/information/media personnel. Grants were also received for the development of a model recognition system for CLE, for the development of a home-study course, guidelines for home-study course development, and for the Criteria for Quality for CLE programs.

After nine years as an independent national organization, CLENE was transformed—on petition by vote of the ALA Council at its 1984 Midwinter meeting—to the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange Round Table (CLENE RT). It was hoped that the staff services provided by ALA would lead to increased membership. (Top membership of CLENE as a separate entity was 653.) To others, the move was important because it indicated that ALA was taking a more vital interest in CLE as a major association goal than they had perceived in the past.

The objectives of CLENE RT, as stated in the ALA Handbook of Organization 1985/1986, are:

1. To provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and concerns among library and information personnel responsible for continuing library education, training, and staff development.
2. To provide learning activities and material to maintain the
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competencies of those who provide continuing library education.

3. To provide a force for initiating and supporting programs to increase the availability of quality continuing library education.

4. To create an awareness of, and sense of need for, continuing library education on the part of employees and employers.

Role of State Library Agencies

The 1970 Standards for Library Functions at the State Level state that "the state library agency should promote and provide a program of continuing education for library personnel at all levels, as well as for trustees." These standards suggest that CE goals may be attained through cooperation with library schools and professional associations, and by sponsoring meetings and workshops.

In the early 1970s there were a number of regional organizations supporting CLE. Examples include the Continuing Education for Library Staffs in the Southwest Project of the Southwestern Library Association; the Western Council on CE for Library Personnel under the umbrella of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE); the New England Library Association, with its “Outreach Network” approach; the Pacific Northwest Library Association, which recognized CE as its central responsibility; and the six Midwestern states that formed a committee on CE to identify resources and research needed for CLE programs.

The NCLIS-sponsored CE survey cited eight reasons why states are a major factor in building a strong nationwide continuing CLE system. Affirming the key role of the states in providing library and information services to all Americans, NCLIS requested the U.S. Office of Education to strengthen state library agencies by providing them with leadership training. Accepting this challenge, the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources of the U.S. Department of Education granted Title II-B funding for three institutes—each of them one year in length—to be carried out by CLENE. Each had a common goal—to facilitate work of state library agencies in implementing statewide systems for CLE, including coordinating existing CE resources. A common objective of these three institutes was to develop a written plan for a statewide system of CLE.

As a result of these three institutes—in which forty-one states and Guam participated—there is evidence that state library agencies have played an increasingly central role in the development of CLE. In his “Introduction” to the Library Trends issue entitled “State Library Development Agencies,” editor John A. McCrossan states.
Many state library agencies are now calling library leaders together to plan coordinated, statewide continuing education programs for all types of librarians. This work is the direct result of planning for statewide continuing education programs which was sponsored by the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE). Writing on “The Role of State Library Agencies in Continuing Education” in this Library Trends issue, Nettie B. Taylor, chief officer of the Maryland State Library Agency, noted that CLENE activity had been instrumental in providing “the impetus for renewed continuing education at the state level.” The total impact and influence of the three institutes reinforced the original hypothesis on which CLENE planned the first institute, namely that the leadership of state library agencies is a crucial factor in the improvement of CLE for the profession.

In 1985 a promising cooperative venture between states that developed was the Intermountain Community Learning and Information Services (ICLIS). It was being planned by land-grant universities, state librarians, and rural community libraries. Its comprehensive plan uses the existing network of rural community libraries as delivery sites for improved informational, educational, and learning services combined with using modern telecommunications for multistate networking of services to rural residents. When implemented, the network will provide access to educational programs, courses, and independent learning materials not currently available to rural Americans. In 1986 the Kellogg Foundation funded ICLIS for over $4 million. The network includes states—Colorado, Utah, Montana, and Wyoming.

Role of the Federal Government

The federal government has played a significant role in advancing CLE. A number of acts of Congress have provided formal and informal CLE programs. The first major support came in the form of the Library Services Act of 1956 (LSA, now Library Services and Construction Act, LSCA) which—although chiefly designed for the improvement of rural library services—made provision in its Title I for scholarship aid for public librarians. With the extension and expansion of this act, the states have been able to use Title I funds for a variety of CLE efforts. By 1985 the types of CLE courses funded by LSCA included seminars/workshops/short courses offered by multitype library systems or by library systems. Course emphases included technology for libraries, training personnel who are serving American natives, training personnel in rural areas with a high concentration of disadvantaged,
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and courses on services to the disabled. At the state level and in some metropolitan libraries some LSCA funds are being used to improve planning and evaluation of library programs.

Title II-B of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 has been the primary vehicle for federal support for CLE. The library training institute program of Title II-B of HEA—first enacted and implemented in 1968—provided both short- and long-term training and retraining opportunities. Over 16,000 librarians were trained or retrained under the program through 426 institutes between 1968 and 1980 when appropriations ended. CLE constituted the bulk of institute activities, with over 15,000 librarians being re-educated on skills and techniques of library and information service.

During the first five years of the program (1968-1972), two-thirds of the institutes (258 serving 9000 trainees) dealt with the improvement of school library media services, with the balance in public and academic areas. The last five years of the program (1976-1980), with funding drastically reduced, focused on retraining all types of librarians in service to minority groups and the economically and/or educationally disadvantaged. About 3500 librarians were retrained during this period through 107 institutes.

The basic distinction between the first five years and the last five years is that the first five years concentrated on the improvement of management and supervisory skills as well as specialty areas (e.g., children's services, young adult services, map librarianship), and the last five years concentrated on services to minority groups and providing programs in educational problem areas (e.g., literacy, the institutionalized, handicapped, social interaction) with recruitment priorities to minorities themselves.

An overview of the first four years of the HEA Title II-B Fellowship Program was published by Engin Holmstrom and Elaine El-Khawas in 1971. It was concluded that: "The Title II-B program seems to have contributed to an improvement in the quality of students recruited into library programs....The Title II-B program also seems to have had the effect of strengthening institutional programs of instruction and improving the quality of library education." A historical review of the HEA Title II-B fellowships from the inception of the program in 1965 until 1982 was written by Mildred Lowe for the Department of Education in 1985. Since the inception of the HEA Title II-B funding program, 232 post-master's fellowships have been awarded for CLE.

Other pieces of legislation which have financed CE include: the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) that provided institutes for training school librarians through its Title II funds; the Ele
mentary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) that expanded NDEA funding initiatives with Title II ESEA funds; the Vocational Education Act, 1963; the Economic Opportunity Act, 1965; the Education Professions Development Act, 1967; and the Medical Library and Assistance Act, 1966.

These programs illustrate a few of the ways that the federal government has helped the profession to improve CE and, in turn, these programs helped upgrade library service quality. Recent fund cutbacks for library-related programming have caused concern throughout the profession.

Role of the Professional Associations

One of the basic obligations for a professional association is to provide growth opportunities for membership, including CE. Starting in the mid-1960s, there was a tremendous increase in CE activities sponsored by professional associations. A survey of major CE programs up to 1978 is presented in volume 8 of Advances in Librarianship. Only a few examples of CE programs will be given here to indicate CLE’s growth and importance.

American Library Association. Although many ALA units are involved in CE, it has never been considered or recognized as the “crowning jewel” of the association or a top priority. Rather, a lack of coordination and lack of focus have existed. A number of attempts to increase the stature of CE in ALA have been made, however, starting in the late 1970s. In June 1979, the ALA Council adopted a policy statement on CE which declares that ALA accepts responsibility for the promotion of CE.

The aim of the Association in this area is to develop a planned program for ensuring that the knowledge, skills and attitudes of persons involved with library service are adequate to meet the challenges of social change, provide leadership for the constant improvement of library theory and practice, and to fulfill individual aspirations for growth.

With this directive as an impetus, ALA sponsored a first of its kind Policy Development Forum on CLE in December 1979. Two of the major outcomes of this forum attended by approximately sixty individuals were: (1) the development of twelve objectives of CE to be presented to the various administrative bodies of the association for approval; and (2) a resolution to be presented to ALA council for approval of a national long-range plan for CE, including a request for a full-time
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professional position dedicated to CE, and appropriate support facilities at ALA headquarters.66

Another encouraging development was ALA Council's adoption of a resolution at the 1980 Midwinter meeting which read in part: "That ALA begin immediately to design, develop, communicate, implement, and continuously evaluate a national comprehensive long-range plan for continuing education to improve the quality of library service....."67 In response to this directive, ALA staff wrote a three-year development plan for a Continuing Education Center.68 By mid-1985, however, no steps had been taken toward implementation. Even so, the fact that these resolutions were set forth in detail and approved represented an advance in raising the value of CE in the perception of ALA Council members.

A recent development of particular interest is the section of the strategic plan of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) that includes these CE objectives: "(1) develop and coordinate CE offerings into an integrated 'curriculum' of presentations at progressive grade levels; (2) seek out and relate ACRL CE programs to useful parallel offerings by other agencies; (3) develop CE packages for multiple modes of delivery (e.g., mail, televised, individual or group use, CAI, etc.)."69

Association of Research Libraries (ARL). An association that has been particularly concerned with CLE is ARL. Its Office of Management Studies (OMS), directed since its founding in 1970 by Duane Webster, has recognized that library staff members require frequent retraining because of changing client demands, budget trends, and the multiplication of automated systems that have increased the threat of obsolescence of formal training. Consequently, OMS designed and implemented an array of management skills institutes, special focus workshops, and a management training film program. Its management skills institutes have provided more than 1200 persons across the nation with training to improve their performance as academic librarians.70

Webster believes that the role of OMS is to help research library managers prepare for a vague and highly demanding future. Accordingly, during its first fifteen years, the OMS has designed a series of self-study techniques aimed at analyzing and strengthening library programs in management, collections, preservation, and services. These techniques are change strategies aimed at involving the affected community in problem-solving efforts and planning that will shape the future of research libraries.

American Society for Information Science. The American Society for Information Science (ASIS) Special Interest Group on Education
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(SIG/ED) has provided leadership in CE through surveys, preconference workshops, newsletters, and CE-related publications. For example, the survey conducted by SIG/ED Chair Rowena Swanson in 1975 investigated the CE needs of ASIS members. Respondents cited preferences for tutorials, institutes, and workshops. The most frequently mentioned needs were: management, technologies (including computers), information systems, and information retrieval. In 1975, Gerald J. Sophar, chair of the ASIS Committee on Long-Range Planning, identified continuing education as one of the seven priorities with which the society should be concerned.

Medical Library Association. The Medical Library Association (MLA) initiated its CE efforts in 1957 with national seminars. The first committee on CE was appointed in 1962 and by the mid-1970s MLA had a national program directed by full-time Director of Medical Library Education, Julie Virgo. MLA took the lead in advocating certification for librarians and developed a certification system, including publication of an "Examination Booklet" in December 1977.

CE activity in the mid-1980s is concentrated on generating new concepts of the role of libraries in the management of information science and describing alternatives for the development of professional competency through its current strategic planning effort. The ad hoc Committee on Professional Development has taken the lead in preparing guidelines for professional development, recognition, and materials designed for use in the approval of non-MLA-sponsored CE activities. The aim of this committee is to build a new curriculum which will combine academic and intellectual vigor with the authenticity of life experience and professional needs. A proposed three-part series will include: (1) foundations, designed as a support system for those preparing to qualify for the MLA Certificate Examination; (2) dimensions of current practice; and (3) new perspectives, designed to keep members abreast of technological trends and explore future roles of librarians. In 1984, MLA announced plans for a winter institute on continuing professional education, combining seminars with evening plenary sessions in an intensive three-day program, including sessions on marketing strategies, executive communications, decision analysis, library planning, and human resource management.

Special Libraries Association. During the 8th Annual Special Libraries Association (SLA) Conference in 1968, a CE general planning session was sponsored by Margaret Sloane, chair of the Education Committee. Since that time the SLA Education Committee has sponsored CE courses during its annual conferences. The SLA meeting in June 1984 identified CE as the number-one priority of SLA. The SLA
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Professional Development Committee was directed to prepare a policy statement on CE.

Evidence of the increasing importance of CE to special librarians was the fact that 1200 registered for twenty-seven CE courses at the annual 1984 meeting—a record enrollment for its professional development opportunities. Also at that meeting, the first graduates of the Middle Management Institute (MMI) series completed their courses and were given certificates. MMI was founded in 1982 to provide formal management training to special librarians and information specialists moving to supervisory and management positions.

The preceding paragraphs indicate what a few of the larger of the two dozen or more library and information science professional associations have done or are doing in CE activities and programming. It needs to be remembered that participation in association activities is in itself a CE learning experience for members by giving them opportunities to work on committees, to solve problems, and to be instructed through publications and meetings, and by providing a democratic structure in which potential leadership qualities can be developed in a way not often possible in work settings. Today a major need is for national specialized associations to develop and disseminate appropriate performance criteria related to their specialties and to prepare educationally effective learning materials and evaluation methods.

Role of Academic Institutions

Because academic institutions are specialists in preparing practitioners for the profession, they are the gatekeepers for those entering, and these institutions set the standards for the quality and dimensions of student performance. Academic institutions must therefore occupy a central place in CE. During the 1970s there was increased interest among graduate library educators in the development of CE. In October 1978, 56 percent of the fifty-seven ALA-accredited library schools in the United States offered post-master's specialist or certificate programs; this compared with 66 percent in 1985. Only one library school (Columbia University) offered such a program in 1961.

In the Association of American Library Schools Library Education Statistical Report: 1982 (State College, Pa.: AALS), Timothy W. Sineath reported that during 1980/81, 100 percent the then sixty-nine library schools holding institutional membership in AALS offered a total of 624 activities. These figures for 1980/81 represented a 19.5 percent increase in the offerings available between 1979/80; an increase of 21 percent in the number of hours of instruction, and an increase of 10
percent in total enrollment. He found that schools used the workshop format most often—27 percent of the total offerings. Data also indicated that most schools use their campus facilities for CE instruction though three schools indicated they used other modes of delivery including educational telephone networks (Wisconsin-Madison), videotape (Arizona), and home study (Catholic).  

But to make an impact on the quality of performance on a continuing basis, more is needed from the professional schools than just increased numbers of courses, workshops, institutes, and certificate programs. If a library school were to choose the single most important role for it to play in CE, a strong case could be made for stimulating an excitement and commitment to lifelong learning. Additional considerations that merit attention are:

1. Undertake serious efforts to decrease the historic low priority for CLE compared to other library school missions.
2. Now that the King study has identified the competencies needed for quality service, it is necessary to provide the training for them and develop performance assessment experiences for these competencies.
3. Change academic values and reward systems so that teaching in CLE programs will have value in advancing faculty careers.
4. Make a routine part of the education process the importance of the criteria for quality CE, self-assessment, peer review of performance, and correction of deficiencies.
5. Keep in close touch with alumni and their changing needs in the work environment through computerized records and develop opportunities for alumni who wish to develop new career patterns.
6. Take advice from the scores of surveys that have been made and apply experience and advice from their findings. For example, in CLE programs, incorporate active learning opportunities, use new media and technologies; perfect alternate delivery systems; use the knowledge about the ways adults learn in developing programs, such as distance learning, teleconferencing, tutorials; develop programs based on the needs of those who wish to learn—not on what the institution may want to teach.

In summary, the library school, its dean, and faculty should constantly keep in mind the philosophy stated by William McGloughlin: "The [professional] school must judge itself and be judged on its influence over the full careers of its graduates. Nothing less than endless growth can be considered success."
research community seem to agree with Altman's admonition suggests to me that it has deliberately committed a collective act of intellectual impoverishment.\textsuperscript{15}

**Paradigm Lost: Social Scientists and the Rejection of Positivism**

The timing of the emergent intellectual isolation was particularly unfortunate, for it was in the sixties that social scientists began to revise their conception of the nature and role of research. At this point, a brief discussion of the intellectual trajectory that led to the widespread rejection of positivism by social scientists would appear to be in order. Richard Bernstein notes that in the early 1960s, just at the moment "when there was a widely shared self-confidence among mainstream social scientists that their disciplines had finally been placed upon the firm empirical foundation where we could expect the steady progressive growth of scientific knowledge of society—troubling issues broke out.\textsuperscript{16} These issues led to a prolonged controversy that still rages through the social sciences.

Particularly troubling to social scientists, especially in light of the publication of T.S. Kuhn's highly influential *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962, rev. ed. 1970), was the evidence suggesting that the social sciences had been incapable of generating a "paradigm" which could govern research such as that found in the sciences. While many social scientists misread Kuhn and attempted to use his concept of the paradigm to prove that their respective social sciences were indeed sciences (or near sciences), it became all too clear that no single paradigm in the social sciences could boast the allegiance of even a minority of the social scientists at work in the country.\textsuperscript{17} Equally distressing was the awareness that the only paradigm candidate to even come close—structural functionalism—was generally deemed flawed beyond repair.\textsuperscript{18}

How could the social sciences qualify as sciences if they could not generate paradigms that would govern "normal science" similar to that in the natural sciences? And how long could social scientists, after the expenditure of countless hours, continue to insist that the problem lay in the relative immaturity of the social sciences? Ever larger numbers of scholars began to insist that the problem was much more serious than the "relative immaturity" thesis would suggest.

Equally disconcerting was the vigorous and ultimately successful attack on the idea that the social sciences could emulate the *weltfrei* methods of investigation that prevailed in the sciences generally. This attack converged on positivism from a number of directions. First there
funding that the Department of Education gave for CE projects and programs in the 1970s; in the number and quality of statewide plans for CE; in the number of leaders who have made the special focus of their careers CLE and who have served as role models for others; in the number of books, articles, and concept papers on CLE that have been produced and used; in research in such areas as motivation for CE, needs assessment, staff development, and identification of competencies; in the development of "Criteria for Quality" for the evaluation of CLE and the establishment of the National Council on Quality CLE to monitor the approval of CE providers; and in sharing CE concepts with colleagues around the world—as demonstrated by the August 1985 World Conference on CLE. The conference had participants from thirty-one nations and thirty-one states and a total attendance of 150.

For an optimal future for CLE, however, something more is needed—e.g., a conceptual blueprint and action plan in the form of specific objectives and working policies for the future, such as the following:

1. The most visible and universal characteristic in all professions is change. Therefore, it is not possible to think of professional education as being terminated at any time during one's career.
2. CE should be considered as part of an entire process of learning that continues throughout the lifespan.
3. The primary responsibility for learning should rest on the individual.
4. The profession should support its members by: (a) fostering a zest for growing in a "learning community"; (b) helping members learn how to learn through formal training, personal examples, and provision of many alternative systems of CE designed at a time, place, and pace to meet different learning styles.
5. The quality of CLE can be strengthened through leadership, understanding the profession, and the use of criteria of achievable best practice in the areas of: desirable outcomes, education process, and program administration.
6. Appropriate applications of learning theory and adult learning principles should be used to enhance the quality of CE.
7. The methods of CE should be planned and conducted using three modes of education: inquiry, instruction, and performance.
8. Recognized management concepts should be used to strengthen CE quality.
9. Professions should collaborate on the planning and provision of CE.
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10. CE should be perceived as not an end in itself, but as a means to an end—i.e., quality service to the public.

Whose responsibility is it to move forward toward the optimal future for CE in the profession? Houle answers in this manner:

The facilitators, the innovators, and the pacesetters will need to take the initiative, but the ultimate answer to the question is: All people who are concerned with the maintenance and improvement of professions and professionalization, in whatever the setting in which they work....Some people will do a great deal to advance such learning, and others will do little or nothing. But everybody has an opportunity to help, even if it is only to set a personal example.
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The Dialectic of Defeat: Antimonies in Research in Library and Information Science

MICHAEL H. HARRIS

Introduction

SOMETHING APPEARS TO BE dramatically wrong with research in library science. Some would argue that there is simply too little of it. Others, like Herbert Goldhor, would insist that what little research is done is methodically primitive; all that is needed is more sophistication. Yet others, like Lloyd Houser, would claim that what is needed is a quantum leap to some sort of paradigm science that would focus or accelerate research in the field. Still others complain that what is needed is better coordination of research via institutes and centers. Then there are those who point the finger of blame at a research community that appears to be unable to communicate its findings effectively to practicing librarians. Finally, there is the evidence that suggests that practicing librarians, always relentlessly pragmatic, don't pay any attention to the quality research that is available.¹

While I feel that each of these variables contributes some to the general malaise of research in library and information science, taken separately or in any number of permutations, they not only fail to explain the problem but actually tend to mask its real nature. In short, the conclusion from the beginning is that none of the earlier analysts of research in library and information science have gotten it right.²

In the pages that follow it is hoped that these claims are substantiated by tracing the emergence and development of research in library
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Science. It will be argued that the prevailing ideology posits the desirability of the adoption of a positivist epistemology for research in the field. Then, using recent work in the social sciences, it shall be argued that such a positivist science is neither possible nor desirable. Finally, drawing on work in critical theory and hermeneutics, it shall be proposed that there be a rethinking of the epistemological foundations of research in library and information science.

The Emergence of Research in Library Science

As early as 1853, when some few librarians began to think about the nature of their new "profession," there was a growing concern centering on the nature of training for work in libraries. Throughout the nineteenth century there was a consensus that librarians would best be trained in a sort of apprentice system. Melvil Dewey began to change all of that by the end of the century, but the conception of librarianship as a mechanical art best assimilated through precept and practice has retained its appeal to this very day. This practical (critics called it "empirical"), intuitive, and experiential approach to education began to draw some fire by the first decade of the twentieth century. By the twenties, strong voices were calling for the creation of a new awareness of science as the key to unlocking the mysteries of library management and—it must be added—as a necessary prerequisite to the improvement of the status of the librarian.

These critics, always a minority of the profession, decried the librarians' mindless attention to technical detail. Pierce Butler stated his view in searing prose:

Unlike his colleagues in other fields of social activity the librarian is strangely uninterested in the theoretical aspects of his profession. He seems to possess a unique immunity to that curiosity which elsewhere drives modern man to attempt, somehow, an orientation of his particular labors with the main stream of human life. The librarian apparently stands alone in the simplicity of his pragmatism.

What was needed—Butler and others would insist—was attention to the role of the scientific method in the investigation of library problems, and especially that method as evidenced in the social sciences.

One can only conjecture whether the views of the "new breed" would have had any significant impact on librarianship had it not been for the decision of the Carnegie Corporation to establish an entirely new type of library school—the Graduate Library School (GLS)—at the University of Chicago. This new program was to be a true graduate
school "in the sense that its primary objective was the extension of the boundaries of knowledge relating to libraries and librarianship." The new school, endowed by $1 million gift, opened its doors with four faculty members and a small group of students in 1928.4

From the outset the school and its project were controversial. Librarians, and even outsiders like Abraham Flexner, heaped criticism and ridicule on the effort. The battle lines were quickly drawn with defenders of the new approach being ably represented by Douglas Waples and Butler, with the opposition view being most fiercely championed by Seymour Thompson who asked, "Do we want a library science?" and then, at great length, answered with a monumental "NO!"5

While some have argued that the pressure from the forces of darkness eventually won the day and led to the abandonment of the initial thrust of the program, it is this author's contention that the GLS not only succeeded in its mission to establish a "psychosociological" research program for the school, but it further succeeded in forming the conception of research in library science for several generations of scholars.6 The justification for this conclusion will emerge, but first it is necessary to examine in some depth what it was that faculty at Chicago were attempting.

Louis Round Wilson, the school's most influential dean, put it succinctly when he wrote that "its early faculty, drawn largely from fields other than librarianship, and experienced in graduate study and research, introduced new ideas from nonlibrary fields, and related librarianship to other enriching disciplines."7 The most enriching of disciplines proved to be sociology, and while all of the early faculty insisted that the "school's sociological point of view rested on a humanistic base" it was soon clear that the faculty and students were losing their sense of balance.8

Indeed, as early as 1936, Wilhelm Munthe, a prominent European librarian, was charging that the school was "too heavily weighted on the psychological and sociological side."9 This early warning was conclusively confirmed when Butler, among the first faculty of the school and author of its manifesto, called foul and argued in a 1951 essay that librarians had apparently succumbed to a "scientistic delusion." "This is," Butler noted, "a mistaken assumption that librarianship is a profession only in so far as it is a science." Butler was quick to point out that this problem was not "peculiar to librarians but is characteristic of our period."10 In the later remark Butler saw what many recent commentators on research in library science have generally overlooked. Librarians and especially the research community in library science, had fallen
prey to the siren called "positivism," the prevailing orthodoxy in the
social sciences from the thirties through the sixties.¹¹

Before proceeding further, it is essential to define the community of
scholars that is under discussion. It must be made clear that the segment
of the profession that adopted this new positivism from the thirties
onward represented a highly select elite. Made up of the graduates of the
GLS and the dozen doctoral programs in library science that were
cloned off of the GLS model, this group has never numbered much over
a thousand. Nevertheless, they have proven of great significance due to
the fact that they staff most of the graduate library schools in the country
today, and that they are the producers of most of the research being
conducted in the field. In the main, members of this group are holders of
the doctorate in library and information science.¹²

**Positivism and Paradigms in Library Research**

What are the characteristics of the positivism that has become so
prevalent among this group? It is my contention that this approach can
be characterized as follows:

1. Library science is a genuine, albeit young, natural science. It follows
then that the methodological procedures of natural science are appli-
cable to library science; that quantitative measurement and numera-
tion are intrinsic to the scientific method; that epistemological issues
are best treated with respect to specific research questions; and that
complex phenomena can best be understood by reducing them to
their essential elements and examining the ways in which they
interact.

2. The library (broadly defined) must be viewed as a complex of facts
governed by general laws. The discovery of these laws and theories is
the principal objective of research.

3. The relation of these laws and theories to practice is essentially
instrumental. That is, once the laws and theories are in place, we will
be able to explain, predict, and control—i.e., produce a desired state
of affairs by simply applying theoretical knowledge.

4. The library scientist can and should maintain a strict "value-
neutrality" in his or her work.

This positivist perspective now governs the thinking of most
serious researchers in library science (and probably all who refer to
themselves as "information scientists").¹³ How did it come to pass that
such a foreign perspective could hold such sway in the profession once
characterized by its intuitive, almost mystical, approach to its work? A
detailed analysis of this development would require an extensive essay in itself, but my conclusions are briefly outlined here.

When the original faculty of the GLS was organized in the late twenties and early thirties, the emphasis was on individuals "drawn largely from fields other than librarianship." Thus the first faculty came to Chicago with varied and recent exposure to new developments in the social sciences and research in general. The same could be said of many of the students. It is clear that faculty and students were generally committed to the interdisciplinary approach to research being proposed on the Midway. Given the time and place, this meant that the faculty and students would be aware of recent developments in the social sciences, especially sociology, and that they should be drawn to the positivism then emerging as the dominant model for research in the social sciences.14

There is little to criticize about these earliest attempts at Chicago. However, before long the plan began to unravel. First, the original faculty departed and was replaced by graduates of the GLS. The idea of a faculty, "drawn largely from fields other than librarianship" was abandoned. Concomitantly, other graduates of the GLS joined the faculties of library schools throughout the country and soon came to dominate them—especially the doctoral programs. Soon the GLS vision of research in library science gained hegemony in the field.

Second—mainly as a result of the drive to define library science as a distinct discipline—the schools, including the GLS, became increasingly jealous of their right to offer a complete graduate program in what was an ever more proscribed subject matter. The result was that contact with the enriching disciplines stopped for all practical purposes in the mid-1940s. By 1956 this situation had advanced to the point where as distant an observer as Arthur Bestor could explicitly accuse librarians of "substituting clock-hours of pseudo-vocational credit for sound learning." Library schools found ways of "expanding their courses in the mere techniques of librarianship and thus prevented the 'leakage' of potential students to genuine graduate departments." This rigid isolation meant that the research community (all library school students for that matter) would be educated in near complete ignorance of new trends and breakthroughs in the social sciences. It has even become commonplace to find this insular trajectory endorsed by leaders in the library and information science field. For instance, in 1979 Ellen Altman forcefully hailed our myopia when she wrote, "let's leave history to historians, sociology to sociologists, psychology to psychologists and concentrate our research efforts on topics central to librarianship." The fact that so many members of the library and information science
research community seem to agree with Altman's admonition suggests to me that it has deliberately committed a collective act of intellectual impoverishment.  

Paradigm Lost: Social Scientists and the Rejection of Positivism

The timing of the emergent intellectual isolation was particularly unfortunate, for it was in the sixties that social scientists began to revise their conception of the nature and role of research. At this point, a brief discussion of the intellectual trajectory that led to the widespread rejection of positivism by social scientists would appear to be in order. Richard Bernstein notes that in the early 1960s, just at the moment "when there was a widely shared self-confidence among mainstream social scientists that their disciplines had finally been placed upon the firm empirical foundation where we could expect the steady progressive growth of scientific knowledge of society—troubling issues broke out." These issues led to a prolonged controversy that still rages through the social sciences.

Particularly troubling to social scientists, especially in light of the publication of T.S. Kuhn's highly influential The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962, rev. ed. 1970), was the evidence suggesting that the social sciences had been incapable of generating a "paradigm" which could govern research such as that found in the sciences. While many social scientists misread Kuhn and attempted to use his concept of the paradigm to prove that their respective social sciences were indeed sciences (or near sciences), it became all too clear that no single paradigm in the social sciences could boast the allegiance of even a minority of the social scientists at work in the country. Equally distressing was the awareness that the only paradigm candidate to even come close—structural functionalism—was generally deemed flawed beyond repair.

How could the social sciences qualify as sciences if they could not generate paradigms that would govern "normal science" similar to that in the natural sciences? And how long could social scientists, after the expenditure of countless hours, continue to insist that the problem lay in the relative immaturity of the social sciences? Ever larger numbers of scholars began to insist that the problem was much more serious than the "relative immaturity" thesis would suggest.

Equally disconcerting was the vigorous and ultimately successful attack on the idea that the social sciences could emulate the wertfrei methods of investigation that prevailed in the sciences generally. This attack converged on positivism from a number of directions. First there
was the startling proof that the natural sciences themselves were considerably less than value-free endeavors. A whole range of historians of science, following Kuhn's lead, were demonstrating that the scientific community was more a political arena where "authority is imposed, and novelty and deviance suppressed" than a forum for the encouragement of an "impartial interest in the quest for truth." 19

In the light of this work, social scientists began to examine their own houses only to find widespread evidence of bias and prejudgment in social scientific research. Indeed, by the late 1970s most social scientists seemed amazed at the degree to which they had subscribed to the value-free proposition in the first place. Most now agreed that while objectivity should always remain a topic of concern, it was not possible to continue to assume that scholars in the social sciences could hope to exclude subjective preunderstandings from their pursuit of knowledge. Many even came to insist that such an attempt was both impossible and undesirable. 20

In a related controversy, social scientists debated the subject/object dichotomy so central to positivism. Comte had insisted that people and society's institutions must be viewed as neutral objects which could be investigated in essentially the same way that one would investigate a thing. But, by 1960, it was becoming all too clear than an essential difference between the sciences and the social (or human) sciences was that in the latter it was impossible to separate the subject (the researcher) from the object (those being studied). Quite simply, the inability to define a closed system within which to study the human objects means that they cannot be studied independent of the influence of the subject conducting the study.

These varied attacks on positivism in the social sciences led to a growing chorus of eulogies. Typical of the new view is the following assessment:

Now the time seems ripe, even overdue, to announce that there is not going to be an age of paradigm in the social sciences. We contend that the failure to achieve paradigm takeoff is not merely the result of methodological immaturity, but reflects something fundamental about the human world. 21

Another example is Anthony Gidden's insistence that "social science must surely be reckoned a failure" in its effort to bring into being a "science of society." He points out that many still yearn for the "arrival of a social-scientific Newton" but is quick to note that they "are not only waiting for a train that won't arrive, they're in the wrong station altogether." 22
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It now seems clear that the social physics is not about to begin, and further that a positivist approach has proven of little value as a means of producing knowledge of social reality. It seems equally clear that the library physics is not about to begin, and yet many students of library and information science continue to dream of a science of librarianship, a fact that suggests that the crisis has not been deeply enough registered or is being actively evaded.

**Toward a Reorientation of Research in Library and Information Science**

It would now appear to be the time to open a debate on both epistemological and normative issues surrounding the research endeavor in library science. It is tempting at this point to turn to a discussion of the large, essentially unfinished, research agenda for library and information science. And indeed this author intends such an attempt in a forthcoming volume of *Advances in Librarianship.* But since the emphasis here has been on epistemological issues, the intention is to adhere to that focus and to conclude with a discussion of what are in the main methodological questions. I would insist at the outset that what we don’t need is a surrender and return to the old subjectivism that prevailed in this field prior to the advent of the GLS. What is needed is an attempt to transcend the dialectic of defeat and move beyond positivism and subjectivism.

In addressing this matter I am encouraged by recently published essays by Elfreda Chatman, Jack Glazier, Mary Niles Maack, Joseph P. Natoli, and Amusi Odi, all of which demonstrate an awareness of methodological advances in the social sciences and argue for a reorientation of our own work in accord with these new developments. I would like to add my voice to theirs in the general project of building a new conception of what good research might look like while at the same time encouraging us all to look beyond positivism for heroes. It seems to me that we might make a beginning by attending to three critical methodological imperatives.

First, research should be holistic. Carl Shorske notes that the serious student of human society must seek the intersection of two imaginary lines: “One line is vertical, or diachronic,” and here the scholar is concerned with the relation of the institution in question to previous expressions of institutional ideas and goals; the other is “horizontal, or synchronic,” and here the scholar is concerned with the institution’s interrelationship with contemporaneous referents situated in other “fields of the social totality” (e.g., socioeconomic, political). He
thus stands against the unproductive attempt to formulate laws of human society that are intended to apply to collectivities independent of their historical and cultural location. Instead, we must attempt an understanding of human society that integrates fact and theory from history and social science and resists the dissipation of central problems through an even finer fragmentation around which professional experts cluster with their vested interests.27

Research in library science stands doubly in need of such a corrective perspective. Increasingly, research in this field is ahistorical and deterministic; an attempt to develop general laws intended to apply to objects independent of their historical or cultural location. Such an approach is clearly bankrupt. What is needed is historically informed scholarship that focuses attention on libraries in terms of their “foundation in specific historical developments and in a particular historical situation.”28 At the same time, any attempt to view the library in isolation from other contemporaneous social activity is inherently distorting and ultimately fruitless.

A holistic approach would also force the recognition that “library science” is not a separate discipline, but rather a mediating profession concerned with knowledge derived from all other disciplines, and researchers in this profession must be alert to, and prepared to draw upon, developments in the social sciences generally which promise to contribute to the solution of problems specific to libraries.29 “The skilled problem-solver,” Barry Barnes points out, “sees the themes of solved problems in those he seeks to solve.” Research in library science would be enhanced if scholars would broaden their knowledge of the social sciences so that they might proceed analogically from concrete problem solutions in the social sciences to unsolved problems in library science. This can only be done if the community of scholars in library science cultivates an awareness of what Barnes refers to as the “repertoire of paradigms” in the social sciences.30

Second, our research should be reflexive and empirical. This view is aligned against the positivist conception of science as a suprahistoric, neutral enterprise. As Josef Bleicher points out, students of the human sciences have been forced to realize that the “subject shares the world with his objects, and has a pre-understanding of them which guides his subsequent methodological enquiry,” and that “however much we objectify our object, as socio-historically situated observers we cannot but approach it with some pre-understanding.”31

The sociocultural embeddedness of the scholar must be recognized, for only this awareness will allow us to rise above the mystifying confusion of an invisible predilection. Alvin Gouldner argues that two
insights are necessary to grasp this concept productively. First, the scholar "must recognize that what is at issue here is not only what is in the world but also what is in himself; he must have a capacity to hear his own voice, not simply those of others." Second, Gouldner argues that the scholar must have the "courage of his convictions, or at least courage enough to acknowledge his beliefs as his"; he must struggle to bring his domain assumptions from the "dim realm of subsidiary awareness into the clearer realm of focal awareness." Such self-reflection is, of course, the first step. Once initiated the scholar must struggle to constantly test his consciousness against the best evidence available, and make the necessary adjustments in his world view when it is contradicted by the evidence.

This point leads naturally into a brief consideration of the empirical nature of critical scholarship. This approach emerged in opposition to the positivist attempt to "reconstruct social reality as consisting of brute data alone." The intent is not to replace empiricism with reflection but rather it is to bring the two approaches under one roof; to find some sort of higher synthesis in which both have a place.

The implications of the reflexive/empirical approach for research in library and information science are self-evident. It would suggest that the all too common denial of preunderstanding in our research is misleading and ultimately dishonest and cowardly. It suggests that the reluctance on the part of the library research community to examine its own domain assumptions is both deliberate and unconscious. For instance, it is apparent that much of the research in library science is defined by, and conducted for, elites determined to gain instrumental control over libraries. It is hard to believe that the researcher's partnership with those in authority is not self-consciously made, and that these same researchers are indifferent to what is to be controlled for what purpose.

It would also appear true, however, that large numbers of researchers in this field have been able to effectively repress any awareness of their own values and genuinely believe in the value-neutrality of their approach. It is all too common for scholars in this field to affect a sort of willful methodological naïveté. This profession seems persuaded that it possesses a neutrality that gives the work an almost autonomous and self-authenticating stature. I now believe that one of the most essential tasks is to expose the "historically conditioned character" of our work, to preside, if you will, over the unmasking of our claim to autonomy founded on a nonexistent neutrality.
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Mary Hesse recently summed up the matter when she noted:

The fact that the view of the social sciences presented here is more often associated with the particular choice of value goals of the revolutionary left does not in the least invalidate the general argument, nor reduce—rather it increases—the need for the moderate centre and right to look to its own value choices. Neither liberal denial that there are such value choices nor cynical right-wing suppression of them from consciousness will meet the case.

Finally, I feel that our work should be dialectical. An emphasis on the dialectic should replace our positivist tendencies to highlight surface appearances. Drawing on Marx, I would argue that there is an essential difference between the "level of appearances" and the underlying social conditions which generate these appearances. As Erik Olin Wright points out, "the central claim is that the vast array of empirical phenomena immediately observable in social life can only be explained if we analyze the social reality hidden behind those appearances." The positivist tendency to remain on the surface of appearances allows them to describe these phenomena, but not to explain them.

Explanation requires a "theory of the underlying structures of social relations, of the contradictions embedded in those structures, of the ways in which those underlying structures generate the appearances people encounter in everyday life." As a result the dialectical mode of analysis stresses change, conflict, and tension as the foundations of reality rather than stability and consensus. This dialectical emphasis on contradiction, it is suggested, enables "the analyst to be far more sensitive to social potentialities than the more conventional" positivist approaches that dominated the social sciences in the postwar era.

Sadly, nearly all of our research is policy-oriented, designed for immediate professional consumption, and this only reinforces the desire to find reductionist answers of "relevance." All too frequently the emphasis is on professionally palatable findings. Most of this work is quite expert, but it is also unwilling to challenge conventional wisdom. We need to place this complacently descriptive approach to research in question and begin to explore the contradictions inherent in the delivery of "free library service" in a capitalist society.

Conclusion

I have covered rather an extensive terrain, and I fear I have not explored any of it in enough detail to completely satisfy my readers.
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have contended that the basic shortcomings of research in library and information science can be traced to our belated, but nearly complete, conversion to the positivist definition of epistemological rectitude. And that this epistemological self-righteousness has led library and information science researchers to make a fetish of certain methodological approaches to their work and has blinded researchers to the right questions. I have maintained that our research, and ultimately the practice of librarianship itself, requires a radical reorientation if we are to gain any significant understanding of the social reality within which librarians pursue their goals in modern America. To do so it will be necessary to relinquish the rigid commitment to positivism as the only legitimate path to knowledge and to question the concomitant allegiance to "instrumental reason" as the surest guide to professional praxis.

Editor's Note: This paper was presented in preliminary form at a joint meeting of the American Library Association's Library History Round Table and Library Research Round Table in Chicago on 6 July 1985.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>N. 3</td>
<td>History of Library and Information Science Education</td>
<td>Marilyn Lary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A complete list of back issues is available from Library Trends, Publications Office, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL 61820.† Also available in clothbound editions.*
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Procedures for Proposing & Guest Editing an Issue of Library Trends

Scope

Library Trends focuses on library and information science topics of interest primarily to practicing librarians and information scientists and secondarily to educators and students. The style and tone of this quarterly are formal rather than journalistic or popular. Library Trends issues review the literature, summarize current practice and thinking, and evaluate the directions practice is taking. Papers must represent original work, published for the first time in Library Trends. Extensive updates of previously published studies are acceptable, but revisions or adaptations of published work are not sought.

Processes of Proposing and Publishing

An issue editor proposes the theme and scope of a new issue, draws up a list of prospective authors and articles, and provides short annotations of the articles' scope or else gives a statement of the philosophy guiding the issue's development. The issue prospectus is examined by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science (GSLIS) Publications Committee and requests for clarification or modification may be made before the prospectus is approved.

Once the prospectus is approved by the GSLIS Publications Committee, the issue will be scheduled for publication and the issue editor begins by inviting authors to write for the issue. The Publications Office will alert the authors to issue deadlines and will send them “Instructions for Library Trends Authors.” The issue editor also will be sent a copy of the instructions along with “Suggestions for Library Trends Issue Editors.” The suggestions are culled from our experience in editing and dealing with questions raised by issue editors and authors. Included are the typical stages an issue passes through; responsibilities of the issue editor; the responsibilities of the Publications Office editorial staff; and the typical timing of the writing, editing and production stages. Generally, it takes 1-2 years from proposal to publication.

Soliciting Readers' Ideas

We publish Library Trends using theme suggestions of GSLIS Publications Committee members and our readers. We welcome ideas for issues and for writers that our readers would like to hear from. We also encourage readers to volunteer to be issue editors or to suggest others who may be willing. Please write us with your ideas or inquiries: GSLIS Publications Office, University of Illinois, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, IL 61820 or call: James Dowling (Managing Editor) at 217/333-1359 or F.W. Lancaster (Editor) at 217/333-3280.
Library Trends

Forthcoming numbers are as follows:

Spring 1986, *Current and Future Trends in Library and Information Science Education*. Editor: George S. Bobinski, Dean, School of Information and Library Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Summer 1986, *Privacy, Secrecy, and National Information Policy*. Editor: Robert Burger, Associate Professor, Library General Services, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
