# The Socialization of Library and Information Science Students: Reflections on a Century of Formal Education for Librarianship

WAYNE A. WIEGAND

## An Exemplar: Clara Mable Brooks

ON 16 OCTOBER 1913 John B. Wallbridge—lawyer, notary public, and secretary of the Hoopeston (Illinois) Public Library Board of Trustees—penned a friendly letter of thanks to Phineas L. Windsor, director of the Illinois State Library School at Urbana. "Miss Brooks has now been 'on the job' for two weeks," he wrote, "and I am pleased that she is giving excellent satisfaction." Wallbridge was speaking of Clara Mabel Brooks, a 1912 graduate hired from Windsor's school after she had been socialized by the curriculum and faculty to make the quick changes Wallbridge found so satisfactory. He noted especially how "she has instituted several very necessary changes and improvements. I wish to thank you for securing this estimable and efficient librarian for us."[1]

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

Wayne A. Wiegand is Associate Professor, College of Library and Information Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

nent quarters in a residence of "a good local family." Once this white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant had passed community muster, she began to work.[2]

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

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

The 9000-volume collection itself was cause for concern. Brooks's predecessor had neglected the children's collection, allowed fiction to soar to nearly 80 percent of circulation and made all selections from publishers' catalogs. The new librarian's response was automatic. She immediately entered subscriptions to *Publishers' Weekly* and *Booklist* magazine, both of which her training had told her provided authoritative guidance on the latest quality cultural and intellectual literature. She also began buying books through A.C. McClurg and Company of Chicago—a jobber which offered libraries substantial discounts through volume purchasing from publishers. In fact, McClurg regularly checked *Publishers' Weekly* and *Booklist* to help maintain accurate inventory control. Finally, Brooks began a subscription to the H.W. Wilson Company's *Abridged Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*— an index to twenty-two widely circulated magazines. The *Reader's Guide* itself then became a selection aid for new subscriptions. With

these reputable collection development tools to assist her with library acquisitions, she could feel reasonably sure that the Hoopeston Public Library would be providing its community with the "best" new literature on the market.

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

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

### The Literature on Professionalism

In a summary of the literature on professionalism, Andrew Abbott has found that post-World War II schools of thought generally cluster into four groups.[5] The functionalists—represented in the writings of Talcott Parsons—believe professions "function" to control the rela-

tionship between professional and client. The structuralists—exemplified by Harold Wilensky—discount functions and concentrate more heavily on the structure of professions, which they find more compelling. Monopolists—led by Magali Sarfatti Larson—argue that professions deliberately attach themselves to bureaucracies to exert dominance and authority in order to improve professional status and power. For analyzing the socialization processes which have historically taken place in formal library education, however, all of these schools of thought have obvious flaws that limit their usefulness.

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

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

### Librarianship and Cultural and Intellectual Authority

Starr's definition of cultural authority can easily be applied to librarianship. For thousands of years the librarian's primary responsibility has been to acquire, maintain, and preserve objects of cultural and intellectual authority. For the past 100 years, library science students have been told the same thing. What is seldom discussed—but which becomes apparent from reading contemporary scholarship on the professions—is that librarians have relied heavily on outside experts or on accepted literary and intellectual canons to identify these objects.[8]

Only after obtaining outside sanctions, only after applying the standards prescribed by conventional literary and intellectual canons, do librarians acquire the authority objects in order to apply their particular expertise—they catalog, classify, and circulate the authority objects to preselected publics that are then invited to benefit from exposure to them. And these publics appear willing to grant that at least on occasion a library's collections contain some authority they have determined is relevant to their lives. To paraphrase Starr, the publics attribute varying degrees of legitimacy to the collections and build up varying degrees of dependence upon them. For the past 100 years, library science students have been taught how to acquire, classify, catalog, and circulate library collections and where to look for guidance in selecting sources of cultural and intellectual authority.

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

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

## Agates, Pumpkins, and Character

To this mix, however, one more element might be added to augment the model's validity for analyzing the socialization process in the formal education system which supplies the library profession with new members. Often this element escapes attention because it stands for a set

of requirements for admission to library schools. Although these requirements have changed significantly over the decades, in this essay they shall be gathered and discussed under the general term *character.*

Paul Mattingly, in his study of nineteenth-century schoolmen, discovered that educators' professional ideology had its origins in their belief in *character*—at that time defined as a "moral potential within each person [that] was somewhat susceptible to improvement and refinement given the proper influences."[9] Mattingly's words sound very close to Melvil Dewey's oft-quoted quip about a human's inherent qualities—"You can polish an agate, but not a pumpkin." In fact, late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century library schools were very concerned with the "character" of the people they admitted to their programs. They believed only recruits possessing the right kind of character would enjoy professional success. For her time and in her place, Clara Brooks obviously passed that test. She was a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant woman who matched the social, cultural, and, in this particular case, religious profile of the community she sought to serve.

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

On 5 January 1887 Melvil Dewey opened the doors of his School of Library Economy at Columbia College. Dewey himself penned the admission requirement: "Any person of good moral character presenting a satisfactory certificate or diploma, or satisfying the director by personal examination that he has sufficient natural fitness, ability, and education to take the course creditably...may be admitted to the class."[10] People meeting Dewey's standards of character, in other words, were admitted to a program taught primarily by nonscholar generalists steeped in practical experience.

To develop a professional expertise, Dewey's students listened to lectures on cataloging methods, classification schemes, and circulation systems that were delivered by such highly regarded practitioners as Charles A. Cutter, Samuel Swett Green, William I. Fletcher, and Dewey himself. Library students then practiced the methods they had learned under the watchful eyes of several members of the Columbia College Library staff. To secure a good understanding of the institutional framework in which methods were applied, students also listened to several prominent administrators like William Frederick Poole, Jose-

phus Nelson Larned, Reuben Guild, and Justin Winsor expound on library buildings, organization, and the fundamental principles of library administration. Finally, to make sure his students became acquainted with the appropriate written products of cultural and intellectual authority, Dewey invited Columbia College faculty members (e.g., political scientist John W. Burgess) to lecture on the state of bibliography in their own separate fields.

## The Ideology of the "Library Spirit"

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

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

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

## Authority and Library School Curricula

Disagreements over the appropriate proportion of curricular atten-
tion to be given to expertise and institution were more frequent. In the
early twentieth century, administrators argued that library schools were
spending too much time acclimating students to cataloging and classifi-
cation methods, not enough time to principles of administration. In
1906 E.H. Anderson, Dewey's successor at the New York State Library
School, called for greater attention to the "phases" of library manage-
ment "which call for executive and administrative ability."[12] In 1916,
Cornelia Marvin, director of the Oregon State Library, admonished
Mary Wright Plummer, director of the New York Public Library
School, to improve student skills in the business routine of library
systems. "It has always been my experience that librarians are lacking in
business knowledge," she wrote, "and I think it would be a splendid
thing if [students] might have this emphasized a little."[13]

"I think you are a little hard on library schools," wrote Everett
Perry, director of the Los Angeles Public Library Training School,
responding to a similar criticism Marvin made three years later.[14] In
1919 the Los Angeles curriculum fit into four broad categories:
(1) technical courses, which covered cataloging, classification, and
accessions; (2) bibliographical courses, which included book selection,
reference, special subject literatures, and public documents; (3) admin-
istration courses; and (4) miscellaneous courses, including the history of
books and libraries and "current" library literature. The categories
themselves reveal an obvious push of forces. By World War I the library
as an institution had assumed a standard organizational profile which
included reference and cataloging departments, and that organization
in turn exerted an influence on technical and bibliographical courses.
Miscellaneous courses were designed to inculcate some of the "library
spirit" felt during turn-of-the-century growth years by "demonstrat-
ing" the historical—and contemporary—benefits that libraries, their
collections, and services had on the social environment in which they
coexisted.[15]

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

lesson on their students—the modern library professional was a non-scholar generalist.

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

Still the profession expressed discontent with the socialization process. Other professions, like law and medicine, seemed to be drawing better students, certainly better *male* students, which many male librarians viewed as the major obstacle preventing librarianship from assuming a more prominent position within the community of professions. Another dimension to the problem related to students' basic character. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam pointed out in 1906 that questions of character revolved around events occurring before students ever got into the schools.[16]

Enough other librarians eventually agreed that by the time Charles C. Williamson published his now classic *Training for Library Service* (1923), he actually gave voice to an accelerating momentum. He wrote: "One of the most fundamental conclusions of this report is that professional library training should be based on a college education or its full equivalent."[17] A liberal arts education, in other words, would certify the library school graduate's character level upon which librarians could build a stronger profession. Although not always openly stated, it was nevertheless generally accepted that a college graduate had a deeper understanding of the classic objects of cultural and intellectual authority than a noncollege graduate, and that the former was better able than the latter to apply prescribed standards set by contemporary literary and intellectual canons to determine which newly published works ought to become authority objects worthy of acquisition.[18] Consequently, it was assumed, college graduates could interpret library collections to readers seeking advice much better than could nongraduates.

Williamson offered a second major conclusion. "The professional library school should be organized as a department of a university along

with other professional schools, rather than in public libraries, state or municipal." By 1923 the compromise between the ideal and reality was obviously no longer acceptable. Not only could librarians expect the quality of their profession not to improve substantially unless library school graduates had a college degree, the whole process of socializing aspiring professionals with the requisite character ought to take place within a university setting. The force of the arguments Williamson made was compelling; within a decade, library training schools affiliated with public or state libraries had disappeared. The profession had welcomed the university's intervention into the socialization process of library science students as a marked improvement. For the next twenty years most criticisms of library education aimed at living up to the ideal. By the end of World War II several library schools were even insisting that applicants be in the top half of their graduating classes or show a "B" average.[19] Some librarians assumed character could be graded.

While library schools steadily pressed for a more reliable way to measure the character potential of students they admitted, the profession was not idle in its attention to improving the socialization process within the curriculum. By applying the analytical framework discussed at the beginning of this essay, it appears that the primary goal was to increase the quality of instruction designed to build expertise, yet leave relatively untouched basic assumptions about the legitimacy of the institution in which this expertise was practiced and the authority of the cultural and intellectual objects around which the expertise revolved. The 1951 "Standards for Accreditation" that the American Library Association applied to library school master's degree programs provide a convenient set of guidelines with which to test the analytical framework. Carl White has suggested that "the standards obligate the library school, in cooperation with its parent institution, to transmit the cumulated knowledge and intellectual skills required to maximize the social usefulness of libraries." His summary of the curricular reflections of this elevated sense of obligation is revealing.[20]

One area White called an innovation was the development of subject bibliography courses. Library educators acknowledged that the literature in all fields had grown exponentially since the turn of the century, and they felt students somehow ought to be exposed to these literatures as much as possible. Their belief rested on an assumption that such exposure would make students better professionals—as reference librarians, literature searchers, and collection builders—and might induce more students to undertake subject bibliography as a branch of study once they became professionals. When matched against Paul Starr's definition of objects of "cultural authority," however, it appears

that subject bibliography courses made little attempt to draw students into a debate over the validity and truth—claims of the sources that the library profession sought to control bibliographically. Determining the authority of sources covered in these courses and setting the standards with which they were to be measured continued to reside outside the profession.

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

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

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

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

## Quality and Library School Curricula

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

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

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

tial to any professional work), are now causing many to question the validity of GPA and GRE scores as adequate measures of professional potential.

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

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

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

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

In 1984 twelve library and information science educators spent three weeks in a research library institute at the University of North Carolina that was sponsored by the Association for Research Libraries and funded by the Council on Library Resources. Practitioners who spoke to the educators about curricular change identified two issues as

crucial—(1) generate in library and information science students a greater ability to work effectively in groups, and (2) increase their capacity to cope with stress and ambiguity. Practitioners considered both of these skills essential to the success of research library institutions.

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

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

## Conclusion

Library education has experienced significant changes since 5 January 1887, but the analytical framework applied here and grounded in the most recent scholarship on the professions suggests that the changes have not been fundamental in nature. Character, expertise, and institutions have shifted with the times, but apparently not the source of authority around which the other three revolve. Curricular modifica-

tions have generally followed the dynamics of a changing environment affected by outside forces like the introduction of new technology and improved methods of administration. Contemporary library and information science students are being socialized to cope with these changes so that their response to problems is appropriately conditioned when they enter the profession. A century after formal library education began, library science students can be described as college graduates learning the expertise considered necessary to maintain and improve services within an institution housing objects of cultural and intellectual authority.

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

# References

1. Wallbridge to Windsor, personal communication, 16 Oct. 1913. In Record Series 18/1/42, Alumni Files, Illinois State Library School Archives, University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Ill. Quoted in Roy, Loriene. "Organizing a Public Library, 1910" (paper for Library and Information Science 475), Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Ill., 1985, p. 50. The author is grateful to Professor Donald W. Krummel for bringing this fine seminar paper to his attention, and to its author for permission to draw from its findings.

2. Brooks, Clara, from personnel file, n.d. In Record Series 18/1/42. As quoted in Roy, "Organizing a Public Library," pp. 39-40; and Brooks to Windsor, personal communication, 8 Oct. 1913. In Record Series 18/1/42. As quoted in Roy, "Organizing a Public Library," pp. 45-46.

3. Brooks to Windsor, personal communication, 8 Oct. 1913. In Record Series 18/1/42. As quoted in Roy, "Organizing a Public Library," p. 48.

4. Simpson to Brooks, personal communication, 10 Oct. 1913. In Record Series 18/1/42. As quoted in Roy, "Organizing a Public Library," p. 49.

5. Abbott, Andrew. "Perspectives on Professionalism" (paper presented at the annual Meeting of the Organization of American Historians, April 1985, Minneapolis, Minn.), pp. 2-3.

6. Essays on this subject may be found in the following: Haskell, Thomas L., ed. *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984; Geison, Gerald L., ed. *Professions and Professional Ideologies in Amer-*

*ica.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983; and Silva, Edward T., and Slaughter, Sheila A. *Serving Power: The Making of the Academic Social Science Expert.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

7. Starr, Paul. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine.* New York: Basic Books, 1982, pp. 9-10, 13.

8. Bordieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* pt. I. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984, pt. I; pt. III, chaps. 5 and 8; and Carey, James W. "The Paradox of the Book." *Library Trends* 33(Fall 1984):103-13.

9. Mattingly, Paul H. *The Classless Profession: American Schoolmen in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: New York University Press, 1975, p. xii; Susman, Warren I. " 'Personality' and the Making of the Twentieth-Century Culture." In *New Directions in American Intellectual History,* edited by John Higham and Paul K. Conkin, pp. 212-26. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979; and Halttunen, Karen. *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830-1870.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983, pp. 28-29, 49-50.

10. Columbia College. School of Library Economy. *Circular of Information, 1886-87.* New York: Columbia College Library, 1886, p. 88.

11. See, for example: *Proceedings of the American Library Association, 1896.* New York: ALA, 1896, pp. 103, 125, 155. (The occasion was a discussion of works by authors of the naturalist school—e.g., Stephen Crane—who had not yet been accepted by critics adhering to the dominant literary canons of the day. Librarians could not agree whether or not to include such works in their collections.)

12. New York State Library. *Annual Report of the New York State Library School, 1906* (Bulletin No. 115). Albany: New York State Library, 1906. (Dewey had taken the library school with him when he transferred to the New York State Library in 1889.)

13. Marvin to Plummer, personal communication, 8 Jan. 1916, Record Group L8, Records of the State Librarian, General Files, Oregon State Archives, Salem, Oregon, Box 45.

14. Perry to Marvin, personal communication, 17 May 1919; and Record Group L8, Box 40.

15. White, Carl M. *A Historical Introduction to Library Education: Problems and Progress to 1951.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1976, pp. 110-11 (see for a summary of the Los Angeles curriculum). For background information on the turn-of-the-century library organizational structure, see: Wiegand, Wayne A. "View from the Top: The Library Administrator's Changing Perspective on Standardization Schemes and Cataloging Practices in American Libraries, 1891-1901." In *Reference Services and Technical Services: Interactions in Library Practice,* edited by Gordon Stevenson and Sally Stevenson, pp. 11-27. New York: Haworth Press, 1984.

16. *Proceedings of the American Library Association, 1906,* pp. 173-75.

17. Williamson, Charles C. *Training for Library Service: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York.* New York: Carnegie Corp., 1923, pp. 137-38; and Vann, Sarah. *Training for Librarianship: Education for Librarianship Prior to the Publication of Williamson's Report on Training for Library Service.* Chicago: ALA, 1961 (Sarah Vann correctly notes that almost all of the improvements Williamson suggested had been advocated earlier).

18. (In subsequent years these ideas found more careful definition in Haines's admonition that librarians had to "know books" to deliver quality service. The two editions of Helen Haines's *Living with Books: The Art of Book Selection* [1st ed., 1935; 2d ed., 1950—both published by Columbia University Press] echo the need to know the classic objects and to be well enough acquainted with and practiced in applying literary and intellectual canons to make sound selections. Haines's book served as a basic text in scores of library schools for more than a generation. The library institution's response to this admonition was to create the position of "reader's adviser," to be filled by a person who "could, would, and did actively channel readers along rational and productive lines by making concrete recommendations and introducing taste and discrimination into such

choices.") Also see, Bundy, Mary Lee, and Wasserman, Paul. "Professionalism Reconsi-
dered." *College & Research Libraries* 29(Jan. 1968):9.

   19. Carroll, C. Edward. *The Professionalization of Education for Librarianship,
With Special Reference to the Years 1940-1960.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1970, p. 132.

   20. White, *A Historical Introduction to Library education,* p. 227 (see pages 255-57
for his general discussion of curricular reaction to the imposition of the 1951 standards).

This Page Intentionally Left Blank