

## 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)<sup>1</sup> 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

---

Mary Niles Maack is Associate Professor, on leave from the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, and she resides in Oak Park, Illinois.

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."<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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."<sup>4</sup> 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

## *Women in Library Education*

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.<sup>5</sup> 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."<sup>6</sup> 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."<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> 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."<sup>9</sup>

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."<sup>10</sup> 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."<sup>11</sup> 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

### *Women in Library Education*

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."<sup>12</sup>

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."<sup>13</sup>

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."<sup>14</sup>

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

Robbins, 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]."<sup>15</sup>

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 protégées, 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

*Women in Library Education*

TABLE 1  
LIBRARY SCHOOL FOUNDERS 1887-1919

<i>School</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Founder</i>	<i>Library Training</i>
Columbia/New York State Library School (NYSL)	1887	Melvil Dewey (1851-1931)	none
Pratt Institute	1890	Mary Wright Plummer (1856-1916)	NYSL 1887
Drexel Institute	1891	Alice B. Kroeger (1864-1909)	NYSL 1891
Armour Institute/ University of Illinois	1893	Katharine Sharp (1865-1914)	NYSL 1892
Pittsburgh	1901	Frances Jenkins Olcott (1872-1963)	NYSL 1896
Simmons	1902	Mary E. Robbins (1865-1939)	NYSL 1892
Western Reserve	1904	William Brett (1846-1918) Electra Doren (1861-1927)	none NYSL 1895
Carnegie Library Atlanta/Emory	1905	Anne Wallace Howland	none
University of Wisconsin	1906	Mary E. Hazeltine (1868-1949)	none
Syracuse	1906	Dr. Mary J. Sibley	none Ph.D. 1892
New York Public Library	1911	Mary Wright Plummer (1856-1916)	NYSL 1887
University of Washington	1911	William E. Henry	none
Los Angeles Public Library/ USC	1914	Everett Robbins Perry	---
Saint Louis Public University of California-Berkeley	1914	Harriet E. Sawyer	Pratt 1904
	1919	Sydney Mitchell (1878-1951)	NYSL 1904

Sources: The list of schools with dates of foundation is taken from Davis, Donald. *The Association of American Library Schools, 1915-1968*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974, p. 360. Supplementary information on founders is taken from Vann, Sarah K. *Training for Librarianship before 1923*. Chicago: ALA, 1961; and from the *Dictionary of American Library Biography*, edited by Bohdan S. Wynar. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1978.

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].”<sup>16</sup>

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.”<sup>17</sup>

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,”<sup>18</sup> 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.”<sup>19</sup> 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 “recommenda-

## *Women in Library Education*

tions...for a one year graduate library school, but the subject matter and method of presentation...were necessarily adapted to European conditions."<sup>20</sup>

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."<sup>21</sup>

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."<sup>22</sup> 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."<sup>23</sup> 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."<sup>24</sup> 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."<sup>25</sup> He also observed that "the tendency has existed from the beginning for library schools to be more or less dominated by a single personality."<sup>26</sup> 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."<sup>27</sup>

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].<sup>28</sup>

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-

## *Women in Library Education*

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.<sup>29</sup>

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.<sup>30</sup> 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.”<sup>31</sup>

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].”<sup>32</sup> 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.”<sup>33</sup>

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.<sup>34</sup> 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....”<sup>35</sup>

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.”<sup>36</sup> 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.

## *Women in Library Education*

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.<sup>37</sup> 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."<sup>38</sup>

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.<sup>39</sup> 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

Years	Master's Degrees Earned by Women GLS-CHICAGO		Doctoral Degrees Earned by Women GLS-CHICAGO		Library Quarterly Articles by Women	
	(N)	Percentage	(N)	Percentage	(N)	Percentage
1980-1985	9	69.2	5	33.3	15	11.0
1986-1940	13	56.5	4	40.0	23	23.2
1941-1945	40	74.0	7	29.1	29	19.5
1946-1950	31	68.8	7	36.8	13	13.8
Total	93	68.8	23	33.8	80	18.3

Sources: The number of degrees earned at the University of Chicago GLS is taken from Richardson, John. *The Spirit of Inquiry, The Graduate Library School at Chicago*. (ACRL Publications No. 42). Chicago: ALA, 1982, p. 112. Information on *Library Quarterly* is based on tabulations of all substantive articles—i.e., editorials, letters, book reviews, or obituaries were excluded.

## *Women in Library Education*

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."<sup>40</sup>

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].*"<sup>41</sup>

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<sup>42</sup> 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.”<sup>43</sup> 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.”<sup>44</sup> 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.

### *Women in Library Education*

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."<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup>

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

Years	Columbia/NYSL*		Pratt Institute		Drexel Institute		Illinois-Urbana*	
	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women
1903-1905	10	7 (70)	12	8 (66.6)	6	4 (66.6)	5	5 (100)
1924	11	7 (63)	6	4 (66.6)	CLOSED		6	5 (83)
1948	13	6 (46)	6	4 (66.6)	6	6 (100)	12	8 (66.6)
	California/Berkeley*		University of Chicago*		University of Michigan*			
	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women	Total No. Faculty	(Percent) Women		
	7	2 (28)	11	4 (33.3)	6	1 (16.6)		

\*Indicates those schools designated Type I after 1983

Sources: Library school catalogs

## *Women in Library Education*

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."<sup>47</sup> Howe, who is credited with designing the core curriculum concept in the 1930s, 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.<sup>48</sup>

### **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."<sup>49</sup> In addition, the new standards stated that the library school "shall be an integral part of the parent institution."<sup>50</sup> 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.<sup>51</sup> 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.)<sup>52</sup>

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:<sup>53</sup>

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

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:<sup>54</sup>

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

## Women in Library Education

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

Year	Number of Schools	Number & Percentage Headed by Women	
1900	4	3	75.0
1921	15	7	50.0
1937	26	14	53.0
1948	36	15	44.0
1960	32	10	31.2
1970	52	10	19.0
1980	67	14	20.9
1985	65	21	32.3

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.*<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup>

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:<sup>57</sup>

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.<sup>58</sup> 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<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> In 1979 a survey showed that the proportion of women in library doctoral programs had risen to 51.6 percent.<sup>62</sup>

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.<sup>63</sup> 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

## Women in Library Education

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."<sup>64</sup>

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

<i>Journal Title Years/Volumes Analyzed</i>	<i>Percentage of Women as Authors</i>
1. <i>College &amp; Research Libraries</i> 1968-1977/vols. 29-38	12.5
2. <i>Library Journal</i> Oct. 1969-March 1977/vols. 93-102	32.3
3. <i>Library Quarterly</i> 1968-1977/vols. 38-47	19.2
4. <i>Library Trends</i> 1967-1977/vols. 16-25	29.2
5. <i>RQ</i> 1967-1977/vols. 7-16	33.9
6. <i>Social Science Citation Index</i> Most-cited library science faculty--1965-1980	20.0
7. <i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i> 1960-1984/vols. 1-24	33.3*

\* 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.

Sources: Information relating to journals 1 through 5 is drawn from: Olsgaard, John N., and Olsgaard, Jane K. "Authorship in Five Library Periodicals." *College & Research Libraries* 41(Jan. 1980):51. For journal 6 information is taken from: Hayes, Robert M. "Citation Statistics as a Measure of Faculty Research Productivity." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 23(Winter 1983):161. For journal 7: Schrader, Alvin M. "A Bibliometric Study of *JEL*, 1960-1984." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science Education* 25(Spring 1985):292.

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.<sup>65</sup>

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."<sup>66</sup> 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.

## *Women in Library Education*

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.<sup>87</sup> 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 child 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'."<sup>88</sup>

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 6  
WOMEN PRESIDENTS OF AALS/ALISE

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

Sources: Information for the period from 1915-1968 was drawn from: Davis, Donald. *The Association of American Library Schools 1915-1968*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974. For the period since 1968 information was taken from the *Journal of Education for Librarianship/Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*.

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."<sup>69</sup>

## *Women in Library Education*

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 naïve, 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.

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

## *Women in Library Education*

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).<sup>70</sup>

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.<sup>71</sup> 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.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Professor Nancy J. Rohde of the University of Minnesota for her insights and assistance, and Robert S. Martin of Louisiana State University for sharing his collection of early library school catalogs.

## References

1. Carroll, C. Edward. *The Professionalization of Education for Librarianship, with Special Reference to the Years 1940-1960*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1970; Churchwell, Charles D. *The Shaping of American Library Education* (ACRL Publications in Librarianship No. 36). Chicago: ALA, 1975; Davis, Donald G., Jr. *The Association of American Library Schools, 1915-1968: An Analytical History*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974; Houser, Lloyd, and Schrader, Alvin. *The Search for a Scientific Profession: Library Science Education in the U.S. and Canada*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1978; Vann, Sarah K. *Training for Librarianship Before 1923*. Chicago: ALA, 1961; and White, Carl. *A Historical Introduction to Library Education: Problems and Progress to 1951*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1976.
2. Kelly-Gadol, Joan. "The Social Relation of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History." *Signs* 1(Summer 1976):810.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 810-11.
4. Houser, and Schrader, *Search for a Scientific Profession*, p. 9.
5. Brand, Barbara. "The Influence of Higher Education on Sex Typing in Three Professions, 1870-1920: Librarianship, Social Work and Public Health." Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1978, p. 98. Brand also offers an excellent discussion of Dewey's influence and describes the role of mentoring.
6. Martha Tyler Buckham. Letter. Quoted in: Rider, Fremont. *Melvil Dewey*. Chicago: ALA, 1944, p. 78.
7. Vann, *Training for Librarianship*, p. 39.
8. Rider, *Melvil Dewey*, p. 53; and a letter from Katharine Sharp quoted in Brand, "The Influence of Higher Education," p. 126.
9. Grotzinger, Laurel. "Dewey's 'Splendid Women' and their Impact on Library Education." In *Milestones to the Present*, edited by Harold Goldstein, p. 137. Syracuse, N.Y.: Gaylord Professional Publications, 1978.
10. Plummer, Mary Wright. "Training for Librarianship." *Library Journal* 26(June 1901):319.
11. Karlowich, Robert A., and Sharify, Masser. "Plummer, Mary Wright (1856-1916)." In *Dictionary of American Library Biography*, edited by Bohdan S. Wynar, p. 400. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1978.
12. Plummer, "Training for Librarianship," p. 323.
13. Melvil Dewey. Letter. Quoted in Brand, "The Influence of Highr Education," p. 111.
14. Howe, Harriett, "Katharine Lucinda Sharp 1865-1914." In *Pioneering Leaders in Librarianship*, edited by Emily Miller Danton, p. 171. Chicago: ALA, 1953.
15. "Library Work: Library Schools." *Library Journal* 43(Nov. 1918):851-52.
16. Grotzinger, Laurel. "Margaret Mann: The Preparatory Years." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 10(Spring 1970):313. As taken from Mann, Margaret: A History of the Armour Institute Library School, 1893-1897." In *Fifty Years of Education for Librarianship* (Illinois Contributions to Librarianship, no. 1). Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943, p. 12.
17. Dawe, Grosvenor. *Dewey, Melvil: Seer: Inspirer: Doer-1851-1931*. Quoted in Grotzinger, "Dewey's 'Splendid Women,'" p. 149.
18. Bishop, William W. Quoted in: Rinehart, Constance, "Mann, Margaret (1873-1960)." In *ALA World Encyclopedia of Library and Information Services*, edited by Robert Wedgeworth, p. 344. Chicago: ALA, 1980.
19. Yvonne Oddon to Carl H. Milam, personal communication, 9 March 1922. Urbana, Ill.: ALA Archives, Paris Library School File, Box 4.
20. "Paris Library School." *ALA Bulletin* 21(Dec. 1927):766.
21. Williamson, Charles C. *Training for Library Service*. (A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York). Boston: Merrymount Press, p. 107.

## Women in Library Education

22. \_\_\_\_\_. *The Williamson Reports of 1921 and 1923*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, pp. 230-31.
23. \_\_\_\_\_. *Training for Library Service*, p. 77.
24. Vann, Sarah K. *The Williamson Reports: A Study*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, p. 124.
25. Williamson, *Training for Library Service*, p. 107.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
27. "The Williamson Report: Comment from the Library Schools." *Library Journal* 48(1 Nov. 1923):899, 903, 907.
28. Williamson, *Training for Library Service*, p. 142.
29. Graham, Patricia A. "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education." *Signs* 3(Summer 1978):761.
30. Rossiter, Margaret. *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982, p. 164.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
32. R.M. Lightfoot to *Library Journal*, personal communication. Reprinted in *The Role of Women in Librarianship 1876-1976: The Entry, Advancement, and Struggle for Equalization in One Profession*, edited by Kathleen Weibel and Kathleen Heim, p. 105. Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx, 1979.
33. Alvarez, Robert S. "Women's Place in Librarianship." Reprinted in *The Role of Women in Librarianship*, p. 109.
34. Tommie Dora Barker to *Library Journal*, personal communication. Reprinted in *The Role of Women in Librarianship*, pp. 99-101.
35. Florence R. Curtis to *Library Journal*, personal communication. Reprinted in *The Role of Women in Librarianship*, p. 101.
36. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America*, p. 215.
37. Richardson, John. *The Spirit of Inquiry, the Graduate Library School at Chicago* (ACRL Publications in Librarianship No. 42). Chicago: ALA, 1982, p. 56.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
41. Hornig, Lilli S. "Untenured and Tenuous: The Status of Women Faculty." *Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Sciences* 448(March 1980):117.
42. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America*, p. xv.
43. Mead, Margaret. "Sex and Achievement." *Forum* 44(Nov. 1935):301-03. As quoted in Chafe, William. *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Roles, 1920-1970*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 100.
44. Groggin to Lundy, interview, 15 June 1978. In Lundy, Kathryn Renfro. *Women View Librarianship: Nine Perspectives* (ACRL Publications in Librarianship No. 41). Chicago: ALA, 1980, p. 90.
45. Biggs, Mary. "Who/What/Why Should a Library Educator Be?" *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 25(Spring 1985):263. As quoted from Phelps, R.B. "Who's Got the Action?" In *Reminiscences: Seventy-five Years of a Library School*, edited by B.O. Slanker, pp. 70-71. Urbana: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1969.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Carroll, *Professionalization of Education for Librarianship*, p. 154.
48. Biggs, "Who/What/Why?" p. 272.
49. Davis, Donald, G., Jr. "Education for Librarianship." *Library Trends* 25(July 1976):125.
50. Carroll, *Professionalization of Education for Librarianship*, p. 299.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 308.
52. Williamson, *Training for Library Service*, pp. 148-51.
53. Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion," p. 768. (Graham also noted that as late as 1976 the proportion of women was only 5 percent at both Chicago and Columbia and just 5.6 percent at Berkeley.)

MARY MAACK

54. Riesman, David. "Introduction." In Bernard, Jessie. *Academic Women*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964, p. xvii.
55. Kilpela, Raymond. "A Profile of Library School Deans, 1960-1981." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 23(Winter 1983):176.
56. Danton, J. Periam. "Notes on the Evaluation of Library Schools." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 24(Fall 1983):114.
57. Kilpela, "Profile of Library School Deans," p. 191.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
59. Schlachter, Gail A., and Thomison, Dennis. *Library Science Dissertations, 1925-1975*. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1974, p. 258. (The authors note that, on the average, 31.15 percent of the dissertations were completed by women in any given year.)
60. Kilpela, Raymond. "Library School Faculty Doctorates: A Statistical Review." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 22(Spring 1982):241, 243.
61. *Ibid.*
62. Heim, Kathleen. "The Demographic and Economic Status of Librarians in the 1970s, with Special Reference to Women." In *Advances in Librarianship*, vol. 12, edited by Wesley Simonton, p. 39. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
63. Kilpela, "Library School Faculty Doctorates," p. 244.
64. Dale, Doris C. *Career Patterns of Women Librarians with Doctorates* (Occasional Papers No. 147). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1980, pp. 13-15.
65. Wilson, Pauline. "Barriers to Research in Library Science: A Framework for Analysis." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 17(Summer 1976):7-11.
66. ———. "Factors Affecting Research Productivity." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 20(Summer 1979):6.
67. Carroll, Leontine. "Teachers in A.L.A. Accredited Graduate Library Schools." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 5(Winter 1965):148.
68. Harris, Roma, et al. "The Gender Gap in Library Education." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 25(Winter 1985):170, 174.
69. Kilpela, "Library School Faculty Doctorates," p. 253.
70. Purcell, Gary R. "Faculty." In *Library and Information Science Education: Statistical Report, 1985*. State College, Pa.: Association for Library and Information Science Education, 1985, pp. F6-F7.
71. Heim, Kathleen. "Summary and Comparative Analysis." In *Library and Information Science Education*, p. SCA-2.