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Introduction

"To Seek the Truth and Disseminate It"

Faculty are the critical component in all educational endeavors. Their worklife and styles of teaching determine the quality of their students' experience, the prestige of their institutions, and the advancement of their academic disciplines. Excellent faculty, working together, through research, curricular development, teaching and mentoring provide the basis for excellent education. In order to determine whether the future of library and information science education will be characterized by improvement and innovation it is necessary to determine the prognosis for the professorate in the field.

In 1986 faculty in schools of library and information science have three major responsibilities: research, public policy development, and teaching. During the century since the first formal educational program in the discipline was established the three responsibilities have had different degrees of primacy. This analysis of the role of faculty in schools of library and information science education will assay the historical record in order to demonstrate the changing faculty mandate.

Research should be the central activity of university faculty. Fifty years ago Robert Maynard Hutchins observed that "a university may be a university without doing any teaching. It cannot be one without doing any research." By virtue of doctoral level study faculty have consciously
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prepared to conduct rational inquiry. Research advances knowledge and the active researcher naturally imparts new truths about the subject at hand. From a consistent commitment to a research agenda faculty members fulfill their responsibilities to students and public policy.

Effective public policy is the result of research applied. Medical discoveries that prevented small pox or polio became the basis for public health rules and regulations; urban planning research identified the optimal social context for community involvement in Model Cities programs. The faculty member who develops theories on the economics of information, for instance, should, through published findings, scholarly presentations, and service on professional committees see that these findings influence policy development. Often faculty confuse the role of professional service with public policy development. It is not the role of faculty to sit passively on committees that set guidelines or standards for professional service, rather it is the faculty role to translate research to those committees to ensure that new policies are implemented in light of new facts and evaluated in terms of social impact. Bowen has observed that “the ideals of the academy are mostly radical ideals. Insofar as they are practiced, they are disturbing to superstition, prejudice, provincialism, ignorance, and discrimination—the enemies of change.” Activating policy based on research requires that faculty confront the status quo and vigorously work to change it when the facts so mandate.

Teaching is the ongoing responsibility that provides the opportunity to pass on new knowledge, foster critical thinking, and instill a spirit of intellectual curiosity. Facts, attitudes, and a professional ethos are transmitted best by faculty active both in research and public policy development. However, professional school faculty are beset on one side by demands of students who want neatly packaged lectures and, on the other, by practitioners from the field who want “job-ready” graduates. Historically, the tendency has been for library and information science faculty to place teaching ahead of research and public policy responsibilities.

Today, as library and information science faculty move toward the normative university model, lack of research productivity is the sharpest criticism leveled. Ironically, at the outset of the institutionalization of education for librarianship, it was a tendency to be too theoretical that caused faculty to be criticized.
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The Apprenticeship Period to Williamson

"Trained Librarians Animated by the Modern Library Spirit"4

The apprenticeship was the prevailing mode of training for most professions during the early nineteenth century. University-affiliated programs of education for law and medicine, for example, were developed as parallels to proprietary education for physicians and clerkships for lawyers; social welfare did not offer formal training as an alternative to the apprenticeship until 1898.5 For each of these professions a combination of educational philosophies and societal needs moved the period of training from the apprenticeship model to formalization through guided study. So too was the case for library education.

Social and educational forces identified by White that laid the groundwork for formal development of education for librarianship include: (1) the growth of “public” libraries of all types during the nineteenth century (49 with 8000 volumes in 1800; 694 with 2,202,632 volumes in 1850; and 3682 with 12,276,964 volumes in 1876); (2) burden on the apprenticeship method due to increased need for skilled librarians to organize and maintain these growing collections; (3) identification of librarianship as a specialized occupation; and (4) the growing national need for education to support technical and scientific development that required diversely stocked libraries.6

In her assessment of the training of librarians prior to the establishment of formal programs, Mary Wright Plummer identified trial and error, short visits to well-run libraries, and tuition paid experience under the tutelage of experienced librarians as typical patterns.7 Sarah K. Vann sums these methods up as “learning by intuition, by imitation, and by tuition,” but observes that seeking guidance through inquiry which often led to an apprenticeship was likely the most common method.8

From the time of the formation of the American Library Association (ALA) in 1876 to the establishment of the School of Library Economy in 1887 a body of literature was developed that, according to Vann, formed the nucleus of the reading program of formal training for librarianship.9 This literature included publications from the U.S. Bureau of Education (notably Public Libraries in the United States, which discussed administrative and technical aspects of library work); periodical literature in such publications as Library Journal, Library Notes, and the Library Chronicle (although earlier periodicals such as Norton’s Literary and Education Register, the American Journal of Education, and Publishers’ Weekly had, from time to time, published
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articles on library work); individual library publications such as catalogs and rules; and private publications such as Guild's *The Librarian's Manual* or Edwards's *Memoirs of Libraries*.

This body of writing by active librarians coupled with informal apprenticeship opportunities they provided new entrants to the field set the standard for the composition of the faculties of the first library schools. Dewey's School of Library Economy as described in its circular of 1886-87 was modeled after practical experience and limited in scope to practical applications. It was designed to use systematic methods to produce the same competencies as an apprenticeship. Outside experts supplemented the practical training provided by library staff with lectures. The first faculties were a combination of working library staff and exemplary experts such as Hewins, Cutter, Poole, and Bowker who initially focused on best practice. However, Biggs has observed that Dewey intended to move from the narrow local orientation of the apprenticeship system to a broader, more progressive perspective.

The deliberations of American Library Association committees charged to monitor the new school reveal that at the outset of the formal library education movement there were diverse opinions on the direction this education should take. The ALA Committee on the School of Library Economy reported at the 1887 conference. Its chair, Samuel S. Green, warned that the school would need to avoid provincialism, exaggeration of the importance of instrumentalities, and the danger of educating graduates who might not recognize that the knowledge they gained in classes must be supplemented by experience. Critical comments by E.C. Richardson at the 1890 ALA conference focused on the school's attention to detail and suggested a broadening from library economy to library science.

At the 1892 conference the committee gave attention to general criticisms "from outsiders" that the school had been engaged in "theoretical teaching rather than practical work." One committee member approved of this approach noting that to an extent "theoretical teaching is the aim of the school, the idea being that, given a right theory, the proper accommodation to circumstances can easily be made." While Dewey asserted a practical approach the school was exhorted by some to take a more theoretical approach and by others to guard against it. From the beginning library school faculty have received strong signals from opposite camps as to the right approach.

Variant programs were established soon after Dewey's school proved successful. These included Pratt Institute (1890), the Los Angeles Public Library Training Classes (1891), Drexel Institute (1892),
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Armour Institute (1893), Syracuse University (1893), Denver Public Library (1893), Maine State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts (1894), the University of Chicago (1897), Cleveland Public Library (1898), and summer schools at Amherst and Madison Public Library. These programs were monitored by ALA committees and a central concern of the association's 1898 annual conference at Chautauqua was the education of librarians. Representatives from many of the programs presented reports and membership concerns were expressed.

At the 1900 conference the ALA Committee on Library Schools observed that the instructors were minimally educated. Only two-thirds of the Illinois faculty and 45.5 percent of the Albany faculty were college graduates. Neither Drexel nor Pratt had any graduates as full-time faculty.

In 1903 the ALA Committee on Library Training reported results of questionnaires sent to library education programs. Programs were categorized as "winter schools," "summer schools," "apprentice classes," and "correspondence courses." The "winter schools" were those programs which employed regular faculty and their data provide some basis for describing the faculty of the time. Of the faculty teaching in schools offering "winter courses" most were judged qualified on the basis of their own education in library schools. Schools were criticized that did not employ faculty with formal library training.

The 1905 report of the Committee on Library Training suggested standards for training that included suggestions about faculty. For "winter schools" it was recommended that one-third of the faculty be trained in a recognized library school while the other two-thirds have practical experience or wide academic training; that one-third have experience in libraries other than that connected with the school; that one-half or one-third give their entire time to the school; and that instructors keep in close touch with actual library work, possibly through regular library duties.

In 1906 the Committee on Library Training firmed up standards by a majority vote and accepted five criteria for instructors: (1) one-third to have been trained and graduated from a recognized library school; (2) one-third to have experience in libraries other than those connected with the school; (3) some to have library duties; (4) one instructor to every ten students in laboratory work; and (5) one-sixth of students' time to be practical library work under supervision.

In 1907 library school faculty first met together at the ALA Asheville conference. This and following meetings resulted in establishment of a "Section on Professional Training for Librarianship" within ALA.
in June 1909. Early records indicate that discussions were on matters relating to school-related topics such as the scope of the curriculum, textbooks, or apprenticeship training rather than on qualifications of faculty.

By 1915 library educators decided that a more permanent and separate organization was required. The new Association of American Library Schools (AALS) held its first meeting in June 1915. Membership was limited to schools requiring high-school graduation for admission, offering a full academic year of general work, employing two full-time instructors, and with at least two faculty members who had at least one year of training in a similar library school. Davis sees the provisions for faculty preparation as indicating a stronger position than the 1906 ALA Committee on Library Training had advocated. However, since adherence to these standards would have meant that charter members formerly represented in the ALA group could not belong, the constitution was amended to allow a more liberal interpretation.

Strong criticism of the schools from the profession emerged after the formation of the AALS engendered, in part, perhaps by the organization of the schools into a separate association. Faculty were cited by library leaders for lack of subject knowledge, lack of interest, lack of organizational skills, and failure to inspire. They were also criticized for poor teaching skills and lack of contact with the field. As the schools began to forge an identity separate from the ALA other forces were at work that would affect faculty role and composition.

Professional education of all types was under examination by the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching during 1910 through 1920. Both medical and legal education were carefully scrutinized by designated investigators. In the same spirit library education was targeted by the corporation for scrutiny.

The impetus for the Carnegie-funded study of library education came from Alvin S. Johnson’s *A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York on the Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries* (1916) in which he observed the poor quality of staffs of libraries funded by Carnegie monies. Two years later the Carnegie Corporation Secretary, James Bertram, appointed Special Libraries Association President, C.C. Williamson, to meet with librarians and to draft suggestions for library training.

After attending the 1918 ALA conference at Saratoga Springs, Williamson reported on the need for improvements in library education in *Library Journal*. During 1920 to 1921 he gathered information and
made site visits to fifteen schools. The result of his analysis was a comprehensive confidential report to the Carnegie Corporation in 1921. A later version, which edited out all recommendations solely for the Carnegie Corporation, was published in 1923. The two reports did not differ substantially vis-à-vis comments on "The Teaching Staff."

**Williamson to Wilson**

"A Quite Definite Lack of Fitness"  

In his report, *Training for Library Service*, Williamson observed that an analysis of the staffs of library schools indicated a "'quite definite lack of fitness of a large proportion of them for giving instruction of high professional character to students with college or university education.'" Only slightly more than half of the schools' instructors had degrees. Williamson noted that the bachelor's degree was the minimum essential for teaching above the elementary-school level and that no high school would be considered acceptable if half the teachers were without college degrees.

Williamson reported that 81 percent of the instructors had had library school training but that 42 percent of these were teaching at the school at which they were trained. Such a pattern, in Williamson's eyes, made for "'inbreeding and a certain imperviousness to new ideas or methods.'"

The Williamson report provided a plan for change in library education. It advocated placement in universities; establishment of a national certification board; and improvement of faculty, curriculum, and instruction.

Another report prepared for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching by William S. Learned, *The American Public Library and the Diffusion of Knowledge*, also focused on the need for the education of librarians to be "'associated with comparable professional curricula in the universities.'" Both the Williamson and Learned reports provided information for the Carnegie Corporation to extend its library commitment to the education of librarians.

In 1925 Frederick P. Keppel, president of the Carnegie Corporation, wrote the ALA Secretary, Carl Milam, of the corporation's intent to support scholarships and a "'graduate school of librarianship to be an integral part of an American university.'" Carnegie funds supported the ALA's Temporary Library Training Board to assist in its development of a response to the Williamson report. The response provided for the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) which would accredit schools of library education.
In 1925 the BEL devised minimum standards for four types of schools: junior undergraduate, senior undergraduate, graduate, and advanced graduate. The next year the Carnegie Corporation adopted a "Ten-Year Program in Library Service" with funds allocated to support existing schools, establish a new type of graduate school, and support the ALA.31

It was Carnegie support of the "new type of graduate school" that had the most far-reaching implications for a changing role for faculty. Discussions and plans on the need for a graduate school were generated by such diverse groups as the Chicago Library Club; Washington, D.C.-area librarians; and the New England Librarians' Committee on Graduate Training of College Library Assistants.32

The decision to locate the new-type school at the University of Chicago was not simple, as Richardson has pointed out in his dissertation, "The Spirit of Inquiry in Library Science: The Graduate Library School at Chicago, 1921-1951." When Ernest DeWitt Burton, librarian at the University of Chicago, was appointed acting president of the university in 1923, his assignation of responsibility for designing a graduate library school fell to Edward Henry. Henry, according to Richardson, was the first to address a university model of education for librarianship.33

The first dean of the new Graduate Library School (GLS) at the University of Chicago was George Alan Works whose definition of objectives clearly moved education for librarianship away from the practical mode. He defined the primary purpose of the GLS to be, "to organize and conduct investigations of problems confronting society in general or in particular fields of scholarship when such problems fall within the field of librarianship."34 He also noted in an address to the College and Reference Section of ALA in 1927 that a primary objective of library education should be research.35 As to faculty responsibilities in the new school Works was quite clear, "staff members will have the necessary freedom for research...they will also face the fact that they will be expected to be productive."36 Works's intention was to bring together a group of scholars prepared by interest, experience, and methodological skill to investigate actively in research areas such as adult education, habits of reading, principles of cataloging and classification, or municipal administration.37

However, the faculty of scholars, strong interdisciplinary program, and objective of extending the boundaries of knowledge in the field of librarianship did not sit well with ALA. Carl Milam and Sarah Bogle characterized the new school to the Chairman of the BEL as a "failure."38 Works's defense of the graduate school, as intended to extend the
boundaries of knowledge through research, contrasted sharply with the BEL’s conception of the graduate school as a mechanism for passing on useful principles of library practice.  

Richardson concluded that Works felt the pioneering effort at the GLS was not appreciated by the profession and the ALA headquarters staff wanted immediate practical results. Works’s resignation in July 1929 was partly the result of the conflict between his idea of a research school and ALA’s desire for a high-level training school.

In response to a letter from Mary E. Ahern, editor of Libraries, Works warned of the danger of associations dictating GLS policies and asserted: “The School can stand only for truth...it had been placed at the University of Chicago and that institution should be free to develop it in accord with its ideals of research.”

After Works’s resignation four individuals served as acting dean at the GLS but Works’s goals were upheld. In the first issue of Library Quarterly GLS faculty member Douglas Waples enumerated these as (1) establishing librarianship as a legitimate field for graduate research; (2) clarifying the distinction between valid evidence and conventional assumptions regarding values and methods of library administration to the library profession; (3) training experienced librarians to direct studies in public library administration; (4) increasing the competence of instructors in library schools who are qualified to increase the professional content of the training courses as opposed to present content which is largely clerical; (5) organizing source material pertinent to library problems; and (6) to produce, select, and publish significant investigations.

The profession’s attitude toward these goals was made clear at a meeting of the American Library Institute in July 1931. To the question, Do we want a library science? speaker C. Seymour Thompson stated: “No, we do not want librarianship to be a science. Let it be an art; a Fine Art, untouched by science.” Thompson’s statement was met with thunderous applause by the audience, although Louis R. Wilson, Pierce Butler, and Charles C. Williamson spoke in rebuttal. In a counter-argument that appeared in Library Journal, Waples defended the different roles of the researcher and practitioner and stated that the topic was “perhaps the most significant issue confronting the profession today.”

The nature of the fight to gain acceptance of research as the proper concern of graduate library education is an indicator of the slow development of library science faculty along the university model. The Williamson report had asserted the need for library science faculty to be college graduates. Less than a decade later the argument for true
KATHLEEN HEIM

research was forwarded on the basis that faculty desiring to function along the lines of a university model must perform in accordance with the norms of university careers.

Apart from the debate that flourished around the GLS, the BEL was continuing its work in helping to reorganize personnel development for American libraries. However, in his assessment of the board's first five years, White has observed with surprise that the BEL "showed no interest nor inclination toward developing library schools as centers of research." Instead the focus was on curriculum issues and standards.

Revised standards for library education programs issued in 1933 focused on a full year of professional study as the attainable minimum. They allowed more discretionary local initiative for the administrators of programs. The inequities of the 1925 standards were corrected, the basis of classification of schools was changed, and a single standard was used for rating purposes. White sees the period following the 1933 standards as a time when library schools came to terms with research and recognized that the problem was not that there weren't questions to be answered but that there was a lack of training in how to conduct research projects.

Ernest J. Reece's 1936 study, The Curriculum in Library Schools, made the distinction between the caretaker/purveyor and the true librarian. The distinction was cut along lines of the ability to use and apply research or not. Reece elaborated on this distinction in his chapter, "Variations, Extensions and Abridgments of the Curriculum." By "extensions" Reece meant studies "analogous in a measure to the after-graduation study of the medical specializations." His list of matters appropriate as extensions to the basic curriculum included techniques applicable in investigating objectively the reading practices of a clientele, the value and effectiveness of books, the number and location of service points, and analysis of routine operations.

Reece noted that faculties of library schools were originally practitioners and that familiarity with library processes was their outstanding characteristic but that other qualities now demanded consideration. However, his emphasis was on good teaching rather than good research. Nevertheless, Reece's identification of research skills as a requisite for librarians who would be more than caretakers and his argument for a better quality of instruction emphasize the general change of attitude toward library education and the role of faculty that was taking place at the half-century mark of formal library education.
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Wilson to the 1951 Standards

"Further Advance is Necessary"52

In 1937 the editors of the Library Quarterly formally recognized the fiftieth anniversary of education for librarianship with a special issue. Louis R. Wilson, dean at the GLS, reviewed changes that had taken place since 1887 and appraised the status of library schools at the half-century mark.

By 1936 all of the schools (twenty-six) accredited by the BEL were connected to teaching institutions. A survey sent to 169 faculty which yielded 140 usable returns found that 92 percent held at least the bachelor's degree—a sharp contrast to Williamson's report fifteen years before when only 52 percent of the faculty were college graduates.53

In his remarks on advanced study and research Wilson noted that three developments had made this possible: (1) closer integration with study in other university departments, (2) the growing conviction that experimentation and investigation are essential to the cultivation of understanding in the library field, and (3) publications by the schools or through the supporting institutions on the same terms as other faculties. Wilson stated that such publications marked the beginning of sustained, full-length critical examinations of library situations.54

Wilson's concluding observation on faculty was that in spite of gains since the Williamson report, "further advance is necessary."55 The beginning that had been made in graduate study, investigation, and publication required support for those aspects of advanced study relating to the library's governmental and financial relations, its function as an educational force, and its significance as a social institution.56

Leon Carnovsky explored the rationale for graduate study in librarianship with examples of utilitarian aspects of library study.57 Carnovsky went on to argue for an approach to library problems that opened the way to stimulating investigation. He concluded his essay:

Librarianship as a field of research is still a relatively untried discipline. The opportunity for implementing it with significant investigations looms large before those who would be pioneers, provided they are willing to cast off too conventional modes of thought and have the courage to break new ground.58

In his analysis, The Shaping of American Library Education, which covered events to 1939, Churchwell described tensions between those who felt enrichment of the first-year book-centered curriculum was endangered by the trend of graduate study to focus on research.59 In light of this tension the insistence on research by the University of Chicago
KATHLEEN HEIM

faculty was critical. Carroll has asserted that the GLS contributed more to the professionalization of the librarian's education than any other single factor.  

The focus so far has been on the struggle to create research as a goal of library education. Actual data on faculty have simply quantified educational preparation and found it lacking vis-à-vis the preparation of faculties in other university departments. It does seem safe to assert that at the fifty-year mark little had been done—outside of the University of Chicago—to ensure that faculty had research capability in addition to practical experience.

In 1940 a special meeting of the AALS and BEL was held at the University of Chicago in connection with the university's fiftieth anniversary celebration. At that meeting Charles H. Compton of the BEL noted that among the contributions of the GLS were application of the techniques and methods of research to the special problems of librarianship; and development in members of the library profession of the ability to analyze problems, evaluate findings objectively, and arrive at solutions. Compton also pointed out the value of these contributions to other library schools insofar as GLS-educated faculty had joined their staffs. He concluded with the observation of the change of the profession's attitude to the GLS from initial skepticism and indifference to respect and admiration.  

At the same meeting Dean Wilson listed one of GLS's objectives to be the training of a number of students to teach and carry on investigations in light of guiding principles and a theory of library science. That this was so was corroborated by Harriet Howe who reported that by 1942 over half of the (then thirty) accredited library schools had faculty who had studied or graduated from the University of Chicago.

Dean Wilson also listed "the development within its students of a critical and experimental attitude toward librarianship" as an objective the GLS would continue to emphasize insistently. Clearly the intention that students of the GLS would become familiar with procedures of investigation and experimentation meant that at the GLS (or any school with similar aspirations) the faculty would be required to exhibit strong skills in these areas as well.

Three years later Keyes D. Metcalf, John Dale Russell, and Andrew D. Osborn published The Program of Instruction in Library Schools. The report noted that few instructors in library schools had prior experience in teaching and if they did it was at the secondary level. Good teaching was seen as lacking. However, the comment that "too often in the selection of instructors the emphasis is placed chiefly on academic preparation and ability to do research," seems ironic in the
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face of the GLS imperative to further the field along investigative lines. Schools were also criticized by Metcalf for excessive inbreeding.

The Metcalf report also stated that if second-year library work was to be successful, faculty had to be engaged in research work. Students at this level had to have the opportunity to work with faculty who were advancing knowledge in their field by research and investigation. No teacher should be assigned to a second-year course who is not actively doing research in the field in which the course lies.68

According to the Metcalf report the measure of the faculty should be determined by their scholarly contributions to their field of research and teaching. A high rate of scholarly productivity was associated with "intellectual alertness, leadership in the subject field, and awareness of current trends."

The report compared productivity of public North Central Association faculties of four of the best library schools. Over a five-year period the former produced .87 books and 5.1 articles; the latter only .23 books and 3.4 articles. The low productivity of library school faculties was of concern to the writer of the report who laid the blame on hiring policies that emphasized practical experience over scholarly outlook.70

A 1946 report by Joseph L. Wheeler funded by the Carnegie Corporation stated that a general improvement had taken place in teaching. Wheeler noted that thirty-eight faculty, including nineteen holding the Ph.D., had trained at Chicago.71 He commented that "the Chicago school has been instrumental in improving teaching standards through the fresh, more critical and scholarly viewpoints its graduates have carried into other library schools."72

Later that year J. Periam Danton issued a short paper, "Education for Librarianship: Criticisms, Dilemmas, and Proposals," in which he counted among the chief criticisms of library education the fact that faculties (with a few exceptions), by virtue of academic and professional training, were incapable of "envisioning, directing, and carrying out" a program of education that emphasized the professional and intellectual aspects of librarianship.73 Information Danton developed from catalogs showed that fewer than one-fifth of the faculties had earned the Ph.D. in 1945-46. Danton noted that the improvement over the last fifteen years did not invalidate criticism made in the BEL Annual Report of 1929-30 that faculties were not competent to teach research work to students.74 Even harsher was his observation that faculties had not kept pace with the standards of preparation required generally for college and university faculties.

The conference, "Education for Librarianship," held at the University of Chicago in August 1948 marked the twentieth anniversary of
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the GLS and was described by Bernard Berelson as an occasion to review the objectives, methods, and problems of education for librarianship during a period of reorientation.75

In his discussion of the role of the library educator Louis Wilson noted that the profession had reached the point where it needed the theoretician who had not been repressed by the defeatism of the field worker.76 Harriet E. Howe continued the discussion of faculty with an analysis of those teaching at the eight schools then offering a master's as a fifth-year degree.77 Thirty-two percent of the faculties of the schools she examined held the Ph.D.—a sharp contrast with Danton's 1946 survey of all schools that found only 18.2 percent of the faculty with the doctorate.78 The effect of the move toward the master's degree as the standard was clearly affecting faculty preparation. Nearly twice as many faculty at the schools offering the master's had earned the Ph.D.

In his summary remarks at the conference, Danton observed that insufficient attention had been paid to library school faculties. He assessed the tenor of the discussion as implying that higher degrees were not of great importance when compared to inspirational teaching. He went on to assert that this was dangerous, sophistic self-deception. Danton contended that schools that appointed individuals with a bachelor's degree only should be censured and that one of the reasons library schools have not achieved everything hoped for them, including academic acceptance, stemmed from the fact of the inadequate educational preparation of faculties. A great university, in Danton's estimation, above all was made by "the presence of men and women who are at once outstanding teachers, productive scholars, and great personalities."80 He concluded that the accomplishments of American libraries would be precisely as great as the quality of students educated at American library schools and the quality of the faculty that taught those students.81

Thus, at the beginning of the 1950s, the most thoughtful proponents of quality education for librarianship had successfully established research and experimentation as the hallmark of faculty at the best schools. This perception meshed well with the BEL's concurrent development of new minimum standards for library schools that took place in 1950-51. It was fitting, given his strong views on the need to improve the faculty, that J. Periam Danton presided over the first open meeting on new standards development at the 1950 Cleveland conference.

The following year at the 1951 Chicago conference new standards plus a "Statement of Interpretation" were adopted. Under these standards the BEL was authorized as the accrediting body for schools of
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librarianship. Carroll sees the 1951 standards as bringing library education to maturity and placing it on parity with other professional fields. With these standards the master’s degree was firmly established as a full year of largely theoretical studies which attempted to generalize and professionalize the traditional techniques.\textsuperscript{82}

However, in spite of the agreed-upon theoretical direction of library education, the standards were vague on faculty requirements. A bachelor’s degree and “professional education beyond the basic curriculum offered by an accredited library school” or “equivalent academic and professional preparation and experience” were the only descriptions of faculty preparation included in the standards.\textsuperscript{83}

Insofar as the role of research by faculty was addressed in the standards, the statement included was:

Research capacity as evidenced in active research or contributions meriting professional recognition and participation in professional projects of more than local importance. At least part of the faculty should be so engaged at all times.\textsuperscript{84}

The standards also required that only faculty capable of producing research or contributions meriting professional recognition should direct student research. These statements permitted schools to equate professional service with research. They also equivocated on research capacity as a requirement for all faculty.

However, the fact that the standards alluded to research activity as desirable for faculty indicates a great advance over the early conceptualizations of faculty role. At the point of the 1951 standards, the desired norm was the university model, though the standards hedged on this to some degree in deference to the status quo.

Library and Information Science Faculty at the Graduate Level

“Faculty Will Inevitably be More Active in Research”\textsuperscript{85}

Twenty some years after the 1951 standards had squarely placed education for librarianship at the graduate level, Herbert Goldhor in 1973 optimistically stated: “It is confidently predicted that library school faculty will inevitably be more active in research than they are now.”\textsuperscript{86} From the 1951 standards to 1972, library education had twenty years to function within the university context. A decade after these standards were in place the ALA’s Commission on a National Plan for Library Education generated interest in the need to reassess the spectrum of personnel concerns for the field. A $75,000 H.W. Wilson grant to support an enlarged ALA program in library education was awarded
the association in 1965 and the Office for Library Education (OLE) was established.

Among the achievements of the OLE were a refinement of accreditation procedures and revision of the 1951 standards. These standards, adopted in 1972, reaffirmed the principles of the 1951 standards but required each school to have goals and objectives against which it could be measured. They were also more qualitative in order to foster imaginative, individual, and flexible programming.87

The 1972 standards stated that faculty should be academically qualified for appointment to the graduate faculty within the institution. Required as a group were diversity; substantial and pertinent library experience; advanced degrees from a variety of institutions; specialized knowledge covering subjects in the school’s curriculum; a record of sustained productive scholarship; aptitude for educational planning, administration, and evaluation; and close liaison with the field. Individuals were expected to have an aptitude for research.88

Although the 1951 standards took the same approach to faculty requirements as the 1972 standards, Goldhor’s statement—made after the 1972 standards were adopted—indicated that progress toward the goal of research productivity had not been satisfactory.89 In his assessment of the twenty-year period from the 1951 to the 1972 standards, William Summers predicted that the expansion of doctoral programs was the most significant event of the period.90

In their analysis of the state of the faculty as it stood in 1974, Houser and Schrader used the low percentage of Ph.D.s in the field as proof that the profession preferred experience to a research orientation among its faculties.91 On this dimension, however, the faculty has steadily improved. At the time of the 1972 standards under half of the faculties had the Ph.D. degree; by 1985 over three-fourths did so (see table 1).

The steady improvement in the percentage of Ph.D.s in schools of library and information science does not prove, in and of itself, that faculty—in the aggregate—have taken on a research orientation, but it does indicate that the majority have prepared to do research through doctoral study.

In the 1970s several assessments of various dimensions of library and information science faculties were conducted. A dissertation by Ruth Margaret Katz, “Library Education and Research: An Analysis of Institutional and Organizational Context,” examined two subsystems of librarianship—library education and library research—at their point of intersection in the university setting in order to determine the extent to which library educators were integrated into the university environment and to assess the effect of library education on the development of
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TABLE 1
EDUCATION OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE FACULTY
1920-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Total Faculty Surveyed</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bachelor's 52 (n = 52)</td>
<td>Charles C. Williamson, <em>Training for Library Service</em>, 1923, p. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>No degree 1.4 (n = 2)</td>
<td>J. Periam Danton, <em>Education for Librarianship</em>, BLS-1946, p. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Ph.D. 33.2 (n = 108)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>Ph.D. 46.7 (n = 298)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>Ph.D. 65.9 (n = 454)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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library research. Katz surveyed faculty at accredited schools in 1972 and social and political science faculty at the same parent institutions in order to measure goal congruence or at least shared criteria among the members of the disciplines. She discovered that library and information science faculty spent far less time in research-related activities than did their colleagues in the social and political sciences. For instance, while 78 percent of the social and political faculties had engaged in nondissertation-related research as a primary activity over the six-month period prior to receiving the questionnaire, only 41 percent of the library and information science faculties with doctoral programs and only 20 percent at those without doctoral programs had done so. While 96 percent of the social and political science faculties were engaged in research at the time of the questionnaire receipt, only 72 percent of library and information science faculty at doctoral granting institutions and 65 percent at nondoctoral-granting institutions had done so. Of the social and political science faculties, 68 percent had applied for a research grant but only 51 percent of the library and information science faculties at doctoral-granting schools and 27 percent at nondoctoral schools had done so.

Katz’s survey took place about the time of the 1972 standards. Her speculations that library and information science faculties could institutionalize their research effort through joint programs, greater concentration on information science, and development of a research agenda (as opposed to episodic and unrelated research) seem to be more likely today than at the time of her study. While a true measure would require replication of Katz’s work another piece of evidence—the “Curriculum” reports in the annual statistics gathered by the Association for Library and Information Science—indicates that the joint program aspect she advocated is developing. In 1984, fifty-eight schools offered joint-degree programs in diverse areas such as computer science, history, law, business, biology, chemistry, agriculture, pharmacology, and pharmacy. Presumably, faculty interaction required to establish these cooperative programs points to growing involvement with other academic disciplines.

Joseph Z. Nitecki analyzed subject interests of faculty based on the 1974 Directory of the Association of American Library Schools. He found that the top faculty subject interests at accredited schools included “library organization and administration” (11.2 percent), “special literature and materials” (8.8 percent), “reference” (6.7 percent), and “bibliography” (6.5 percent). Based on the high ranking of “information science” and “research methods” (both 5.1 percent),
Nitecki concluded that the accredited schools were more theoretical and technical in orientation than the associate member schools at which fewer than 4 percent of the faculties claimed these specialties.\textsuperscript{95} A similar analysis conducted using the 1984 Directory of the Association for Library and Information Science Education shows a great increase in the number of faculty teaching in these “theoretical” areas. In 1984, 22 percent of the faculties listed “information science” as an area of interest and 22.4 percent listed “research methods.”\textsuperscript{96} While there is no hard evidence that proves that faculties as a whole are more theoretical in outlook in 1984 than in 1974, the trend to list these areas as specialties is up sharply.

For instance, according to curricula data gathered in 1984-85, new courses in information technology continued to lead all other new areas. The implication is, of course, that it is in these areas that new faculty specializations are occurring.\textsuperscript{97}

It seems to be safe to predict that this trend will continue. A survey of deans and directors of schools of library and information science conducted in 1985 requested information on subject specialties in which the administration would seek to hire with one, two, and three additional positions. The results do not take into consideration the subject interests of current faculties but demonstrate in what areas administrators would expand their faculty subject strengths. Table 2 lists subject specialties in ranked order as indicated by deans and directors at forty responding schools. Three points were given specialties that ranked highest, two to those ranked second, and one to those ranked third (six points total per respondent). Several schools indicated only one choice for additional faculty so the scores do not add up to 240. Responses are provided for doctoral and nondoctoral programs. Although approximately one-third of the accredited schools did not respond to the survey, the results are still good indicators of the deans’ and directors’ perceptions of the directions needed for faculty subject concentrations.

Overall, “information science” scored highest followed by “information resources management,” “children’s services,” and “public libraries.” When the rankings are separated by doctoral and nondoctoral programs (as in table 3) the results indicate a different set of priorities among those schools that grant the Ph.D. While the doctoral-granting institutions’ choice of specialties seems to be more inclined toward the theoretical aspects of the library and information science disciplines, too much ought not to be made of the divergence. Many of the nondoctoral schools have much smaller faculties than the doctoral-granting institutions and it may be conjectured that a cadre of faculty to
TABLE 2

FACULTY SUBJECT SPECIALIZATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS AS IDENTIFIED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(weighted 3 for top choice, 2 for second, 1 for third)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Ph.D. Granting Schools (n = 27)</th>
<th>Other Accredited</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information Resources Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information/Communication Technologies/Telecommunications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Economies of Information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Special Libraries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Database Construction/Online Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Conservation and Preservation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Natural-Language Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Academic Libraries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Information System Theory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Information Analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Man-Machine Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sociology/Psychology of Information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Research Librarianship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Information-Seeking Behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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cover the basics must be in place before schools can plan for a more theoretical set of specialties.

In spite of a growing percentage of library and information science faculty with the doctorate, a greater emphasis on interdisciplinary programs, and increased faculty specialization in more theoretical rather than practical subject areas, Pauline Wilson contended in 1979 that there was yet insufficient research in library schools because library educators have not yet been fully socialized to their role as the academic segment of a profession and as a university faculty. Wilson proposed that research be undertaken to examine library and information science faculty performance through the use of self-studies and annual reports prepared for the ALA's Committee on Accreditation. Lines of inquiry suggested by Wilson included: (1) the number and kinds of doctorates held by the faculty on the assumption that a school's research environment can be deduced from the percentage of faculty holding the doctorate, (2) quantity and quality of publication, (3) the colleague environment, and (4) the level of faculty goal displacement from the substitution of association activity for publication activity. The ambitious proposal outlined by Wilson would provide baseline data for accountability among faculty in schools of library and information science education. However, while such a comprehensive report has not yet been produced, some of Wilson's proposed lines of inquiry are taking a clearer focus. It has already been shown (in table 1) that the percentage of faculty holding the doctorate is steadily increasing. Monitoring the ALISE report will provide longitudinal data for this variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARISON OF TOP FOUR RANKED DESIRED SPECIALTIES FOR DOCTORAL AND NONDOCTORAL SCHOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Data taken from Table 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Schools</th>
<th>Nondoctoral Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Information Science (16)</td>
<td>1 Information Science (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Information Resources Management (8)</td>
<td>2.5 Children's Services (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Economics of Information (8)</td>
<td>2.5 Public Libraries (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Information/Communication Technologies and Telecommunications (7)</td>
<td>4 Special Libraries (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information on publication quantity and quality are difficult to organize but through citation analysis it is possible to profile a reasonable rate and impact factor as shown by Robert M. Hayes in his article which used citation statistics from Social Sciences Citation Index to search 411 tenured library and information science faculty members' names from 1966 through 1970, 1971 through 1974, and 1976 through 1980.\footnote{99} After carefully qualifying factors that complicate the use of the data, Hayes reported an average publication rate of 7.85 for professors and 4.18 for associate professors over the fifteen years. Citation rates were 36.32 and 8.56 respectively. Hayes's study, in spite of the cautions he points out, is a valuable example of the availability of such information. It provides data that may be compared to other disciplines. However, cross-disciplinary comparison in order to gauge relative standing vis-à-vis publication rate and citations is fraught with complexity. To take just one example, Kroc analyzed fifty-one schools of education in 1981 to derive mean citation rates for one year only.\footnote{100} In his study the mean citation rate was 6.02 for his sample which included 28,000 citations for 4600 faculty while Hayes's fifteen-year sample was for 9264 citations for 411 faculty.

A different cross-disciplinary approach was taken by Wallace who compared the use of statistics in ninety-nine journals from library and information science, education, social work, and business selected for their impact factors.\footnote{101} Wallace suggests that a possible indicator of the degree to which a field has embraced the scientific method is the orientation of research methodologies represented in the literature of the future. To analyze this he classified articles in selected journals as to their use of statistics ("no statistics," "descriptive statistics only," and "inferential statistics"). Individual counts were made for articles that used correlation, regression, analysis of variance, chi-square, and t-tests. He found that in 1981 library and information science authors made the least frequent use of inferential statistics among the four fields analyzed. Education was 31 percent, business 26 percent, social work 18 percent, and library and information science 6 percent.\footnote{102}

Reasons suggested by Wallace for the small percentage of articles using inferential statistics in the library and information science journals include less emphasis on research and quantitative methods in the master's-level curricula than the other disciplines examined; substantial numbers of faculty in library and information science who are not research-oriented and do not provide research-oriented role models; lack of funding for research; or a different orientation.\footnote{103}
The Changing Faculty Mandate

Hayes and Wallace studied aspects of the research endeavor from 1966 through 1980 and 1981 respectively. During the period examined by Hayes the percentage of faculty holding the doctorate increased from 33.2 percent to 70.8 percent; at the time examined by Wallace the percentage holding the Ph.D. was 70.8 percent. Today the faculty holding the Ph.D. degree is 77.9 percent. Since few new faculty positions are being filled by nondoctoral-degree holders it seems safe to assume that the percentage of faculty with the research degree will increase. While holding the doctoral degree cannot be clearly correlated with increased research productivity (or even increased rigor as measured by Wallace) there is little doubt that in the aggregate the increase of Ph.D. faculty will positively affect the total research picture.

Since the 1972 standards were adopted there has been an increase in articles and studies of the role of research among faculties of library and information science programs. These have included raw counts of degrees, citation analyses, methodological analyses, and attitudinal surveys. Taken together these efforts to assess the quality of faculty productivity have underscored the need for library and information science faculties to function in accordance with university norms rather than in response to field-driven priorities.

It is not clear at what point we will be able to say with confidence that library and information science faculty, taken as whole, are functioning at an acceptable level as measured against all of academe. Disciplinary differences in funding patterns and availability of research support will continue to affect the overall picture. However, as library and information science education enters its second century it can be cautiously predicted that by objective measures the preparation of the professorate and the internalization of academic rather than field norms will contribute to the development of a professorate that is more consistently trying to seek and disseminate the truth than it has been inclined to do in the past.
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