

# The Work Calls for Men: The Social Construction of Professionalism and Professional Education for Librarianship

Suzanne M. Stauffer

Louisiana State University. Email: [stauffer@lsu.edu](mailto:stauffer@lsu.edu)

The leaders of the library profession in the United States in the 19th century were white, middle-class, college-educated men. They attempted to construct librarianship in the United States as an equivalent profession to the other white, masculine professions of their day. They also created education for librarianship in the same mold. They subscribed to, and employed, the traditional white Western masculine definition of profession as one of expertise derived from education based on science. They also employed the control of knowledge and its application as exemplified by the type of professional education they promoted. Their efforts were not restricted to education but also included active discrimination against female librarians in the Library War Service during the First World War. This paper presents a new perspective on the meaning of “profession” which recognizes it as situated at the intersection of gender, race, and nationality and explores the implications for modern education for librarianship.

**Keywords:** librarianship, LIS education, professionalization, gender, race, library war service, history of librarianship

## Introduction

Those writing about the history of education for, and professionalization of, librarianship in the United States have produced primarily descriptive works that document the events and individuals involved. This critique however, does not question the traditional definitions of profession, and so offers little insight into the social and cultural forces that influenced the structure and form of education for the LIS profession that gained acceptance (Stauffer, 2015). The historical study documented in this paper will demonstrate that the early leaders of librarianship subscribed to, and employed, the traditional white Western masculine definition of profession as one of expertise derived from education based on science. They also employed the control of knowledge and its application as exemplified by the type of professional education they promoted.

It will establish that they constructed education for librarianship according to this model in order to re-create it as a masculine profession. They imposed this white middle-class construction on black librarians as well. It will also show that their efforts to masculinize the profession were not restricted to education but included active discrimination against female librarians in the Library War Service during the First World War. Because the male and female librarians of the time were all white and middle-class and because they were nearly all native-born Americans, race, class and ethnicity are held constant, thus it is possible to focus solely on the intersection between profession and gender. This does not mean that race, class and ethnicity were not factors, but rather that librarianship as a gendered profession developed within the greater context of middle-class whiteness in the United States.

Most importantly, it will apply the

most current theory of the professions as a process of identity formation. This is in contrast to it being seen as a collection of traits, or the wielding of power or expertise, to the social construction of the development of education for, and the professionalization of, librarianship. The paper will explore the implications of this theory for our understanding of librarianship as a profession today and the appropriate form or forms of education for such a profession.

### *Definitions of Profession*

It has been established that the traditional Western definitions of “profession” ultimately derive from the “successful professional projects of class-privileged male actors at a particular point in history” (Witz, 1990, p. 675), that is, of middle-class white men in the Victorian Age in the United States and Great Britain. These traditional definitions also assume that “the work of professionals, however differently understood, transcends traditional or primordial categories such as race, ethnicity or gender” (Adams, Clemens & Orloff, 2005, p. 33) rather than being embedded in and mediated through the Western white male power structure. These constructions reflect and privilege white Western middle-class cultural masculine ideals while repressing, denigrating or denying the cultural values of other races, genders, classes and ethnicities. At the core of this construction is expertise derived from formal education based on science and the control of knowledge and its application (Lo, 2005; Witz, 1990). Current theories of the professions, however, recognize that the conceptual category of profession can only be defined contextually, that the traits and structures that characterize professions at any given time are not discrete, universal or enduring, and that they exist within an extended web of institutional relationships formed by the intersection of the professions, the market and the state. They are a process of identity formation rather than a collection of traits or the

wielding of power or expertise (Stauffer, 2014).

Library historians have documented the feminization of the profession, and feminist scholars are contributing to a more inclusive library history which examines the role that women have played (Eddy, 2001; Garrison, 1979; Grotzinger, 1994; Harris, 1992; Hildenbrand, 1992, 1996, 2000; Maack, 1994, 1997; Passet, 1994; Wiegand, 1986a, 1989). However, few have explored the development of librarianship and of education for librarianship from the modern perspective of profession as the intersection of race, ethnicity, and gender (for a more detailed discussion, see Stauffer, 2014). While Honma (2005) effectively explores the foundations of the American public library and demonstrates persuasively that those “libraries have historically served the interests of a white racial project by aiding the construction and maintenance of a white American citizenry as well as the perpetuation of white privilege in the structures of the field itself” (p. 5), he fails to extend his critical analysis to an explicit consideration of the definition and form of the concept of “profession” itself. Work on the history of education for African-American librarians uncritically accepts the white, middle-class masculine definition of profession and places African-American librarianship within that framework (DuMont, 1986; Shiflett, 1994; Martin & Shiflett, 1996).

Research on the history of education for librarianship in countries other than the United States reveals a strong influence of the white Western European model of the professions in Eastern and South Africa (Dyab, 2002), Australia (Wilson, Kennan, Willard, & Boell, 2010), Britain (Grogan, 2007), Canada (Boone, 2003), Ethiopia (Gupta, 1993), Russia (Richardson, 2000), and India (Kumar, 2010; Raghavan, 2005; Thakur, 2004; Walia, 2010) where library education was established by an Englishman, John MacFarlane and two American librarians, William Alanson Borden and Asa Don Dickinson (Kumar, 2010). Mo-

niarou-Papaconstantinou, & Tsatsaroni (2008) explore the history of education for librarianship in Greece “using a sociological point of view to attempt to understand its place in the field of higher education today” (p. 85) while they unquestioningly accept the traditional white Western masculine definition of the concept of profession. Researchers writing about the history of education for librarianship in China do not address the model or definition of “profession” which provides the foundation for such education, although the emphasis on a university education suggests that it is some form of the Western European model (Zhou & Lin, 1990). Lin (1985) provides a brief glimpse into the pre-Communist Revolution model of librarianship as a career for retired officials and unemployed scholars and the impact of the radical social and cultural changes of the Revolution on librarianship and education for librarianship, but, again, the Western European model of “profession” seems to be assumed.

### **Historical Background**

It has been well established that there was conflict over how to construct the new profession of librarianship and how to educate its practitioners during the late 19th and early 20th century in the United States (Stauffer, 2015) and that library leaders themselves were ambivalent about the issue. The men who organized the American Library Association (ALA) in 1876 were “white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males born in the Northeast, from families which had been living on the continent three generations or more. Most were educated in northeastern schools and most were chief administrators of large libraries” (Wiegand, 1986b, p. 12). In other words, they were the epitome of the class-privileged male actors from whose activities the early theories of the professions derived and they attempted to construct librarianship and education for librarianship in their own image. The profession they were con-

structing resembled other professions at the time, with its professional association and declaration of professional rights and responsibilities, emphasis on specialized knowledge and skills, and the necessity of maintaining standards in order to preserve their status and prestige. After forming the ALA, their next project was to define and institute appropriate professional education to transmit that specialized knowledge and those specialized skills. The work of other historians demonstrates that the development of librarianship in the United Kingdom (Coleman, 2014; Freeman, 1992, 1997; Grogan, 2007) and Canada (Bruce 2012) followed a similar pattern, as all three countries derived their definition of “profession” from the same source. Grogan’s excellent comparative history of education for librarianship in the US and UK demonstrates that, while the two countries followed different paths historically, with the UK preferring certification of librarians to accreditation of library schools, those paths were converging by the end of the 20th century (Grogan, 2007).

Prior to the opening of Melvil Dewey’s School of Library Economy at Columbia University in 1887, training for librarianship in the United States consisted of library-based apprenticeship programs and on-the-job training (Davis, 2005; Shera, 1972; see also Vann, 1961), as was the norm for all of the professions at that time. Even after the School of Library Economy and others had opened, a majority of public library directors in this period preferred to train their own employees in-house rather than hire library school graduates (Wiegand, 1986b; see also Vann, 1961). Mary Wright Plummer, head of the Pratt Institute library school in New York City, advocated university library schools and argued against the need for training “the born librarian” (Vann, 1961, p. 128). The ALA ad-hoc Committee on Standards for Library Training reported that formal training in a library school was preferable and that experience and training on the job were perfectly adequate (Vann, 1961).

Herbert H. Putnam (ALA president in 1897 and U.S. Librarian of Congress from 1899-1939) and John Cotton Dana (president of ALA 1895/96 and director of Newark (New Jersey) Public Library) urged ALA to establish educational or certification requirements (Vann, 1961), while William Fletcher (ALA president 1891/92) and historian Ruben Gold Thwaites (president of ALA 1899/1900) opposed library school training entirely, claiming that it was beneath the dignity of "the men [known] foremost as bibliographers and scholarly librarians" (Vann, 1961, p. 87). Hiller C. Wellman, ALA president 1914/15 and librarian of the Springfield (Massachusetts) City Library, argued that students needed less technical training and more instruction in the "aims of the library, methods of advertising a library's work, and other administrative problems," while Charles H. Gould of McGill University in Canada insisted that the purpose of library schools was specifically to teach the "technique which is peculiar to library work" (Vann, 1961, p. 148). In the U.K., Henry R. Tedder, president of the Library Association in 1897 and librarian of the Atheneum Club in London, declared that "It is impossible to train librarians except in connection with a large library" (Grogan, 2007, p. 6).

The gendered and implicit racial nature of the arguments is made obvious by the frequent comparison of librarianship to the traditional masculine professions which were, at that time, dominated by white males, if not actually closed to white women and to men and women of color. William H. Brett, head of the Amherst summer library school and ALA president 1896/97, proposed that librarianship follow the example of the masculine legal profession by creating an examining board that would certify all those who claimed to be librarians (Vann, 1961), which was the traditional method of all the other professions and preferred in Britain (Grogan, 2007). Dana argued that educational and training programs would give librarianship equal status with 'the learned professions'

(Dana 1900), although Fletcher denied unequivocally that librarianship qualified as such (Vann, 1961). Arthur E. Bostwick, ALA president 1907/08 and librarian in New York City and later St. Louis, Missouri, opined that "library schools are trying to do for librarianship what the law school does for the legal profession, West Point for the army, the normal school for the teacher, or the theological school for the ministry." [He emphasized that] "school instruction . . . needs to be supplemented by practical work" (Vann, 1961, p. 137-8) because members of the established professions all completed some form of internship after graduation, and, as the first chair of the section on "Professional Training for Librarianship," set its goal as accomplishing "for library education what Abraham Flexner's committee had done for medical education" in 1910 (Vann, 1961, p. 210).

Much of the controversy revolved around the appropriate professional education and roles for men and for women. The curriculum and goals of Dewey's school appealed primarily to white, middle-class young women with some college education. Courses emphasized the utilitarian, the pragmatic, and the practical. Students were expected to become skilled in the techniques of running a library rather than knowledgeable about the principles of administration and policy. Later schools headed by graduates of his school replicated his methods, with an emphasis on apprenticeship, work assignments, and practical experience (Shera, 1972; see also Vann, 1961).

Aksel G. S. Josephson, director of the John Crerar Library at the University of Chicago, called for a "school of bibliography and library science, affiliated with one of the great universities" (Vann, 1961, p. 81), in order to attract more men to the profession and thus improve the image and status of librarianship. H. L. Elmen-dorf, director of the St. Joseph, Missouri Public Library, proposed that a one-year program in library administration and

policy be designed specifically for men (Vann, 1961), while Chalmers Hadley, ALA president 1919–1920 and director of the Denver (Colorado) Public Library, agreed that such a program would attract more men to the field, rather than courses that appealed “largely to the house-wifely instincts” (Vann, 1961, p. 149). Such sexism was not restricted to the United States. When James Duff Brown, one of the first examiners of the British Library Association, visited Dewey’s school in 1893, he expressed his fervent hope that the School’s “operations not in the course of time flood the universal globe and librarianship with a ‘monstrous regiment of women’ which neither trumpet blasts nor acts of legislature will ever keep in check” (Grogan 2007, p. 7).

The leaders of the ALA, nearly all middle-class, college-educated white males, envisioned the construction of librarianship as a traditional white Western masculine profession of equal status to the other white masculine professions. Entrance would be dependent upon formal training in the academic discipline of “library science” and accreditation or certification awarded by the professional organization. Professional roles would be those which were historically and culturally constructed as appropriate for each gender. Women’s training would be limited to the routine, clerical, “house-wifely” tasks while men would be educated in administration, policy, library science, and the scholarly field of bibliography. Women would be the supporting players, providing the foundation upon which the men would build their reputation, their distinction, and their profession. This construction would become the dominant, and ultimately sole, construction of the profession and education for it in the United States and would exert a strong influence on education for librarianship in the rest of the world.

### **Committee on Library Training**

One of the consequences of this con-

struction of education for librarianship was the formation of the ALA Committee on Library Training in 1903. The purpose of this committee was to evaluate education for librarianship and making recommendations about its future structure and content. The Committee consisted of the heads of five university-affiliated library schools: Mary Wright Plummer of the Pratt Institute, Salome Cutler Fairchild of the New York State Library School, Katharine L. Sharp of the University of Illinois, Alice B. Kroeger of Drexel, and Mary E. Robbins of the Simmons College. The Committee evaluated the six kinds of library training programs then in existence: (1) one- and two-year programs from schools offering courses during the regular school year; (2) summer school or summer programs; (3) apprentice classes in libraries; (4) courses in bibliography and the history of printing offered by colleges; (5) normal schools offering courses in librarianship; (6) correspondence courses offered by schools and by individuals (Vann, 1961, pp. 107–108). None of the programs was evaluated on the quality of its graduates or on placement rates, nor were those who employed these graduates surveyed. They were evaluated solely on their adherence to the Committee’s pre-determined standards, which were the standards that they had implemented in their own programs. The Committee itself acknowledged this conflict of interest and bias, saying that it was “sensible that it might have been composed of persons less likely to be thought prejudiced” (Vann, 1961, p. 107).

The Committee privileged the first type as formal education in the academic discipline of librarianship and paid scant attention to the remainder. The nine existing summer programs were evaluated on the basis of only two standards: whether they admitted only those working in libraries and whether they provided opportunities for practice work in small libraries. None of the programs met these standards. They all admitted students who were not working in libraries without any standards for



admission, and none provided practice work (Vann, 1961). Although the Committee could not simply ignore the 33 existing apprenticeship programs (23 of whom returned the questionnaires), representing as they did the majority of opportunities for training as well as trained librarians, it “expressed concern over the development of such programs” not due to the methods employed, but because of the hypothetical damage to the profession by a library that takes in persons not engaged in library work and not under appointment, without any test of their general knowledge by examination, uses them for its own needs only (requiring no fee from them and hence not responsible for them) and at the end of six months or so sends them out with a letter to seek positions in other libraries (Vann, 1961, p. 112).

The objection was not that there had been complaints that apprenticeship programs were producing unqualified and incompetent librarians, but that the apprenticeship programs did not follow the model of the university-based academic programs of the masculine professions which the ALA leadership had determined was the only acceptable form of education for librarianship. Correspondence courses that were taught by individuals fared even worse, with the Committee expressing “grave concerns” because the courses were not taught under the regulation and control of an “authoritative body” (Vann, 1961, p. 113) such as a university. Although the Committee established standards for apprentice and correspondence courses in 1905 (Vann, 1961), these programs were not included in any of the subsequent evaluations, as the die had been cast against them.

The 1903 Committee evaluated nine schools in the first category (New York State Library School, Pratt, Drexel, University of Illinois, Columbia, University of Chicago, Syracuse, Simmons, and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh) according to how well they emulated the educational programs of the male professions. Faculty

members were expected to have been educated in the one of the established schools, students should have at least three years of college for admission to the program, were to be full-time, matriculated students in residence and were to be awarded a degree or a formal certificate from the institution,, and an internship was a necessity (Vann, 1961). The Committee singled out three programs for criticism: Syracuse, Columbia, and University of Chicago. All three were criticized for having too few faculty, and faculty without library school training, and for admitting students with fewer than three years of college. Columbia and Chicago were also criticized for admitting non-matriculated students who completed only part of the program. These were also the only three programs which were not represented on the Committee (Vann, 1961), which suggests a conflict of interest both in the evaluation itself as well as in the evaluation standards which were employed. As a consequence, the University of Chicago program closed shortly after the release of the report (Stauffer 2015).

With the acceptance of this report, the ALA also signaled its acceptance of the construction of librarianship as the equivalent of a masculine profession and its privileging of the construction of education for librarianship as formal training based on science and the control of knowledge and its application. This is especially evident when comparing the two programs in the state of Illinois—The University of Illinois Library School and the University of Chicago Course in Library Science (Stauffer 2015). The University of Illinois Library School was designed in accordance with the educational programs of the other extant professions. It was integrated into the university curriculum and had the full support of the administration as a legitimate degree program (Vann, 1961). It met all of the criteria established by the masculine professions: the head of the school, Katharine Sharp, and all of the faculty were graduates of a library school; three years of college were required for admis-

sion to the program; a B.L.S. was awarded on completion of the two-year program; only full-time students were admitted; 260 hours of practice work were required the first year and 330 the second (Vann, 1961); and bibliography was a key component of curriculum (Vann, 1961).

The University of Chicago Course in Library Science was representative of the losing side of the conflict (Stauffer 2015). Although the head, Zella Allen Dixson, was a college graduate with multiple graduate degrees, all of her library training was obtained through informal means, much of it through the trial-and-error of experience. The faculty included, at various times, Josephine Robertson, another University of Chicago librarian without formal academic education in librarianship, Hervey Foster Mallory, head of the University Home Study Department, and Mary E. Downey, a graduate of the program who would go on to head the Chautauqua Institute summer library school from 1906–1936 (Stauffer 2005b). It was offered through University Extension, as a correspondence course, with a certificate for completion not a degree, and was at best application-oriented, at worst simply vocational. It emphasized the “housewifely” rather than the “learned” aspects of librarianship. Rather ironically today, she was criticized for her outreach to working librarians who had no formal training, allowing them to attend part-time or to take only those courses which they found immediately relevant, and teaching most of the classes in the evening and in off-campus locations (Stauffer, 2015). This worked against the program in the eyes of the Committee, which at least leaned in the direction of formalized education for librarianship in 1903, and was already concerned with improving the image and status of librarianship as a profession and increasing the number of men it. While the Committee and ALA itself may have been undecided about the exact form that education for librarianship should take in 1903, they agreed that the profession and

therefore, education for it, should be the equivalent of the other so-called ‘learned professions,’ all of which were masculine-gendered. By 1924, they had formalized and institutionalized education through a recognized college or university as the only acceptable form of education for librarianship with the creation of the Board of Education for Librarianship (BOE) which issued the first minimum standards for library education programs in 1926 (Thomison, 1978).

### **Education for African-American Librarians**

In 1925, one year after its formation, the BOE, in cooperation with the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the General Education Board created by John D. Rockefeller, and the Julius Rosenwald Fund, founded a school for the education of African-American librarians at the racially-segregated Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia. The Institute was founded in 1868, three years after the end of the American Civil War, to educate African-Americans in agricultural and industrial vocations and trades. Its most famous graduate was Booker T. Washington, who founded the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama in 1881 along the same principles (DuMont 1986; Martin & Shiflett 1996). Although a full discussion of the history of the education of African-American librarians is beyond the bounds of this study, the few scholarly articles on the topic do allow a discussion of the intersection of race in the construction of the profession and demonstrate that the white middle-class leadership of the ALA imposed its definition of the profession and of education for that profession on the African-American community.

The articles by DuMont (1986) and Martin & Shiflett (1996) lack a critical analysis of the social and cultural contexts in which these efforts were taking place and fail to examine the intersection among race, class, politics, and history. Although

they both note that the establishment of education for librarianship for African-Americans in the U.S. was dominated by middle-class white men and funded by white corporations, and that the library school at the Hampton Institute was founded over the objections of the few African-Americans in librarianship, neither seems to be aware that what they are describing is white middle-class male hegemony. Both articles document that the Louisville Free Public Library had been providing formal library education for black library workers under the direction of Thomas Fountain Blue for nearly 20 years when the Hampton Institute school was opened, and that the director of that program, George Settle, "had approached ALA about the possibility of establishing some sort of official role in the training of Black library workers" (Martin & Shiflett 1996, p. 301). Yet both proceed under the assumption that the only acceptable form of training is in an academic institution. DuMont (1986) concludes that the Louisville Free Public Library program reflected "the limited nature of library service to blacks at the beginning of the twentieth century" (p. 235), as if the training itself were necessarily inadequate, without any consideration of the curriculum or the quality of the graduates. Neither article reports on any efforts by the BOE to determine what library services the various African-American communities wanted, or needed, or how to best train librarians to provide those services and meet those needs.

From this research, it is clear that no one in the African-American library community had been included in the discussions of where African-Americans were to be educated for librarianship, let alone how and for what purpose, and certainly no other members of the African-American community had been consulted. Ernestine Rose, an advocate for service to African-Americans and head of the Harlem Branch of the New York Public Library, wrote to ALA president Charles F. Belden that the plans had been made without "open dis-

ussion or inquiry among many of those most deeply interested . . . I refer to [white] librarians like myself . . . and to influential and progressive Negroes, the very people it is proposed to serve." Walter White, assistant secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People also wrote to Belden that "this proposed school will not only not be approved by thinking colored people, it will be vigorously opposed and resented" (Martin & Shiflett, 1996, pp. 305-306). The decision to open the school at Atlanta University in 1941 was, again, made by the white leadership of ALA and over the objections of black library leaders such as Wallace Van Jackson (DuMont, 1986).

Martin and Shiflett, in a stunning display of tone-deafness, despite acknowledging that "Hampton never enjoyed the widespread support from the Black community, which felt that it perpetuated segregation," not only neglect to explore the issue from the perspective of black librarians and the black community, but, in fact, declare that it "is time to close the book on the mystery of Hampton and move on to other intriguing questions in the development of libraries and librarianship" (p. 322).

### **Library War Service and the Masculinization of Librarianship**

The efforts at masculinization of the library profession did not end with establishing a masculine form of education, primarily because it did not have the desired effect of increasing the number of men in the profession. It remained a primarily female profession with a relatively few white men in administrative and leadership positions. ALA leaders looked for other opportunities to attract men to the profession and found one in the Commission on Training Camp Activities of the U.S. War Department, charged with entertaining American troops training for deployment to the front in World War I. The ALA Executive Board established the



preliminary Committee on Mobilization and War Services on April 6, 1917, with Herbert H. Putnam as chairman. It joined six other organizations—the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), the War Camp Community Service, the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA), and the Salvation Army—in the Commission. The War Service Committee was created by ALA in June, 1917, to raise funds for books and recruit trained librarians and shortly thereafter the ALA Library War Service assumed responsibility for 35 camp libraries (Young, 1981; Daniels, 2008). They saw this as an opportunity to improve the image and status of librarianship as a profession, and finally attract large numbers of men to it, as only men were permitted to serve as librarians in the hyper-masculine environment of the military camps. In the segregated military of that day, there was no question that these men would be white.

The discourse surrounding this effort reflected the earlier gendered division of labor, with men sought for the roles of leaders and administrators, while women were relegated to supporting roles. In addition to encouraging male librarians to enter the Library War Service, the ALA asked for the names of former male librarians as well as the names of men without library experience, “men of real executive ability . . . men of common sense, of some dignity, and men who are used to roughing it, who can stand strenuous work” (More workers needed, 1918, p. 421), constructing the positions as both mentally and physically rigorous, and demanding. The work was described as “arduous. Every person on the staff thus far has been a man who is willing and able not only to do library work, but also to handle 200-pound bags of magazines and large boxes of books, to shovel coal and to drive and care for an automobile. Most of these things women librarians could not do” (Putnam, 1918, p. 9). Josephine A. Rathbone, then vice-director of the Pratt Institute Library School,

wrote in an appeal that “There is one need, persistent and recurring, for which there is by no means an adequate supply. The work calls for men of tried executive ability, of maturity and experience to serve as camp librarians.” She further characterized it as “a national service” (Rathbone, 1918, p. 4), taken on at the behest of the War Department and, by implication, the equivalent of active service in the military.

Male librarians saw it as “an opportunity to demonstrate to the MEN of America . . . that library work is a profession” (Personal note, 1917, p. 5), reflecting a frustration among male librarians with the lack of status and recognition of the profession. Librarian Frederick Goodell at Camp Wheeler, Georgia, argued that the “Camp Library should be as business-like as the Ordnance Corps or the Quartermaster’s Department” [and urged other camp librarians to] “guard against that favorite vice of librarians—fussiness” [and not attempt to] “pass rules and fuss about regulations,” [because] “In the camps we must appeal to red-blooded he-readers or close up shop . . . Let us not spoil it all by hanging May baskets on door knobs” [and employing] “cute little tricks that hold the Swamp Hollow Ladies’ Library Association breathless . . . Let us pull together to keep the cream puff school of library science out of the camps” (Goodell, 1918, p. 423), leaving no doubt as to his opinion about female librarians and their influence on the profession and on education for librarianship.

The construction of the camp library as a male domain was enhanced by the fact that, at least initially, nearly all were established by the Young Men’s Christian Association, located in YMCA buildings, and administered jointly with the YMCA (Koch, 1918). Meanwhile, the YWCA built and staffed Hostess Houses, where service men could visit with wives and girlfriends in a “homelike atmosphere complete with a surrogate mother figure” (Daniels, 2008, p. 288), which included small libraries of books for the use of the fe-

male visitors (Library War Service, 1918b). Women were alien others in the world of the masculine military camp and permitted only in chaperoned, domestic settings.

Not only did ALA actively recruit male librarians, it just as actively discouraged female librarians from volunteering for service. At the same time that librarians nationally were being encouraged to cheerfully “spare your experienced [male] assistants by training new apprentices, even at the sacrifice of some of your less essential activities” (War Service for Librarians, 1918, p. 38) and Rathbone was praising male librarians for serving as camp librarians, saying “The bigger the man, the greater the opportunity seemed to him; the more urgent, the more vital, the more rewarding” (Rathbone, 1918, p. 4), women librarians in small towns were discouraged from applying even for positions as assistants. “Remember there are others who may be able to fill these newer places [associated with war activity], those who are willing to give this service because it is more attractive. But in each town there is but one librarian, and few who are willing or able to replace her . . . none of these influences for better living can be spared or allowed to deteriorate” (War Service for Librarians, 1918, p. 38). Such blatant discriminatory language further promoted the gendered division between the red-blooded, masculine world of the camp libraries, and the feminine, cream-puff world of the Swamp Hollow Ladies’ Library Association. Female librarians’ role was to keep the home fires burning while the men carried out the serious business of war.

The same authorities who objected to women’s employment in the camp libraries, however, strongly encouraged their use as volunteers, often in the same speech or article, suggesting that the real reason was not to protect women from the arduous labor but to promote librarianship as a masculine profession. The Camp Library Handbook promoted the use of volunteers as an opportunity for the camp librarian “to show his organizing ability” (Library

War Service 1918a, p. 19), while Putnam in particular advanced this gendered view of the Library War Service and librarianship (he was likely the author of “War Service for Librarians” and other anonymous articles on the topic), maintaining that women were serving the war effort in all of the traditional housewifely ways. “They are “in it” in the aggregate far more than men. They were in it during the campaign for funds, they are in it in every library soliciting books, sifting them, preparing them, forwarding them” (Putnam, 1918, p. 9). He called female librarians who applied to work in the camps irresponsible and selfish, referring to “Children’s librarians anxious to get away from the job to go into filing work in the ordnance division. Think of it! A children’s librarian, in war time, willing—eager—to abandon such a work as that for the work of a file clerk! Believe me, I cannot name a man in war time service in Washington who can do for the future of this country what the librarians of a children’s department can do at this very moment” (ALA Bulletin, 1918, p. 287).

Thus it can be seen that the view of the leadership of ALA in this period was that librarianship was, or ought to be, a gendered profession in the image of other gendered professions and that the Library War Service would succeed where professional education had failed. However their hopes were dashed. By 1918, ALA was encouraging camp librarians to hire female library assistants, not only because there were more trained female librarians than male available, but also because men who were fit for military service were ineligible. By the end of the war, camp librarians were primarily young women and old men, a far cry from the earlier vision of “men who are used to roughing it, who can stand strenuous work” (More workers needed, 1918, p. 421).

## Conclusion

Librarianship in the United States con-

tinues to be a female-intensive profession that attempts to construct itself as masculine. By doing so it is denying its own history, values, and identity, so that children's librarians, who do work traditionally associated with women, are accorded much less status and prestige than system's librarians, who do work traditionally associated with men. It attempts to serve a multi-cultural and multi-racial population with white, middle-class librarians who have been educated in the tradition of the "successful professional projects of class-privileged male actors at a particular point in history" (Witz, 1990, p. 675). Women comprise nearly 85% of the profession (DPE, 2015), yet ALA continues to promote a white Western male middle-class construction of professional education as formal education based on science and the control of knowledge and its application. Education for librarianship continues to be imposed upon the profession by the faculty of schools of library and information science rather than being informed by the members of the profession. There are continuing attempts by the faculty of such schools to change the profession into something more culturally "masculine" particularly by incorporating information science and technology into the curriculum and thereby increasing the number of men in the profession, as if a female-intensive profession is a problem to be solved. This also assumes that men as a whole are attracted to technology and not to traditional librarianship solely on the basis of their gender.

It is tempting to ask what form a female profession or a black profession or an Indian profession would take and how education for that profession would be provided, but those are the wrong questions. Those questions perpetuate a traditional gendered and race-based construction of profession and its reflection of Western cultural masculine ideals as normative. What we need to ask is what the context is in which librarianship as a profession is performed, or better, what the multiple and varied

contexts are. We need to ask about the extended web of institutional relationships within which that librarianship exists, how it is formed by the intersections of the institutions of race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, socio-economic status, culture, politics, the market and the state. We need to determine what professional identity the members of the profession derive from it, and if there are also multiple identities. How does that identity help members to make sense of their role and their position within their context, existing as it does at the intersection of race, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status?

We need to establish a research agenda that rejects all preconceptions about profession and professional education and is open to alternate models and paradigms of the professions (Hannigan & Crew, 1993; Maack, 1997). We must employ the methods of qualitative research—ethnography, grounded theory, discourse analysis—in order to recognize, identify, examine and explore the many intersections within the web—or webs—of institutional relationships of the specific community and individuals we are studying. Only in this way can we identify the traits and structures that are the most productive, efficient, and effective within that context.

We must explore what it means to be a straight black female librarian in the rural southern United States, a gay white male librarian in a northern metropolitan city, a Native American librarian on a reservation in the western United States, or a first-generation Asian-American librarian serving an immigrant Vietnamese community in New Orleans. Library educators internationally need to ask appropriate versions of these questions for their social and cultural contexts and identify the intersections among race, gender, ethnicity and socioeconomic status in their contexts. We all need to discover what services communities actually need from libraries and librarians, as well as how those communities function, rather than educating professionals to impose services

upon them in the form designed for white, middle-class American communities in the 20th century.

Education for librarianship in the 21st century must be informed by, and grounded in, the actual practice of librarians in their communities. We must accept that there will be multiple answers to the question of how best to educate for librarianship, which means that we must be open to alternate forms, including teaching libraries and apprenticeship programs (Moss, 1980; Gorman, 1981; Kelly, 2013), undergraduate degrees for para-professionals, and certification of individuals in addition to accreditation of graduate programs.

## References

- Adams, J., Clemens, E. S., & Orloff, A. S. (2005). Introduction: Social theory, modernity, and three waves of historical sociology. In J. Adams, E. S. Clemens and A. A. Orloff (Eds.) *Remaking modernity: Politics, history and sociology* (pp. 1–72). Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- ALA Bulletin. (1918). 12
- ALA. (1999). Library directors: gender & salary. Retrieved March 17, 2106. <http://www.ala.org/research/librariystaffstats/diversity/libdirectorshhttp://www.ala.org/research/librariystaffstats/diversity/libdirectors>
- Boone, E. (2003). Cross border influences for librarianship: The Toronto experience. *Journal of Educational Media & Library Sciences*, 41(2), 163–170.
- Bruce, L. (2012). Professionalization, gender, and librarianship in Ontario, 1920–75. *Library & Information History* 28(2), 117–34.
- Coleman, S. J. Jr. (2014). ‘No room for her here!’ The numerical feminization of public librarianship in England, 1871–1914. *Library & Information History* 30(2), 90–109.
- Dana, John C. (1900). Report of the Committee on Library Schools. *Library Journal* (July), 83–86.
- Daniels, C. (2008). “The feminine touch has not been wanting.” Women librarians at Camp Zachary Taylor, 1917–1919. *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 43(3), 286–307.
- Davis, D. G. Jr. (2005). Ninety years of education for the profession: Reflections on the early years. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 46(3), 266–274. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40323850>
- Department for Professional Employees. (2015). Library workers: facts and figures. Retrieved March 17, 2016. <http://dpeaflcio.org/programs-publications/issue-fact-sheets/library-workers-facts-figures/>
- Du Mont, R. R. (1986). The educating of black librarians: an historical perspective. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, 26(4), 233–49. doi:10.2307/40323272.
- Dyab, M. M. (2002). Development of Library and Information Science Education in Eastern and South Africa: An Historical Review. *Herald of Library Science*, 41(1/2), 5–16.
- Eddy, J. (2001). “We have become too tender-hearted”: the language of gender in the public library, 1880–1920. In T. Augst and W. Wiegand (Eds.) *Libraries as Agencies of Culture* (pp. 155–172). Madison: University of Madison Press.
- Freeman, M. (1992). In transition: Some thoughts and musings on the evolution of British librarianship. *New Library World* 93(6), 22–24.
- Freeman, M. (1997). Is librarianship in the UK a true profession, a semi-profession or a mere occupation? *New Library World* 98(2), 65–69.
- Garrison, D. (1979). *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876–1920* (New York: Free Press, 1979).
- Goodell, F. (1918) Camp Wheeler, Georgia. *Library Journal* 43(6), 423.
- Gorman, M. (1981). The new teaching library. *American Libraries* 12, 670–671.
- Grogan, D. J. (2007). Education for librarianship: Some persistent issues. *Education for Information*, 25(1), 5–26.
- Grotzinger, L. A. (1994). Invisible, indestructible network: women and the diffusion of librarianship at the turn of the century. In L. A. Grotzinger, J. V. Carmichael, and M. N. Maack, (Eds.) *Women’s work: vision and change in librarianship: papers in honor of the centennial of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science* (pp. 7–16) Urbana: Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois.
- Gupta, S. (1993). Development of the library profession and education in Ethiopia. *International Information & Library Review*, 25(1), 73–83. doi :10.1080/10572317.1993.10762311
- Hannigan, J. A., & Crew, H. S. (Dec 1993). A feminist paradigm for library and information science. *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 68, 28–32.
- Harris, R. (1992). *Librarianship: the erosion of a woman’s profession*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Hildenbrand, S. (1983). Revision versus reality: women in the history of the public library movement, 1876–1920. In K. Heim (Ed.) *The status of women in librarianship: historical, sociological, and economic issues* (pp. 7–27). New York: Neal-Schuman.



- Hildenbrand, S. (1992). A historical perspective on gender issues in American librarianship', *Canadian Journal of Information Science/Revue Canadienne des sciences de l'information*, 17 (3), 18–28.
- Hildenbrand, S. (1996). Women in library history: from the politics of library history to the history of library politics. In S. Hildenbrand (Ed.) *Reclaiming the American library past* (pp. 1–23). Norwood: Ablex.
- Hildenbrand, S. (2000). Library feminism and library women's history: activism and scholarship, equity and culture. *Libraries & culture*, 35 (1), 51–65.
- Honma, T. (2005). Trippin' over the color line: The invisibility of race in library and information studies. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies* 1(2), 1–26.
- Kelley, M. (2013, May). Can we talk about the MLS? *Library Journal*. p. 8.
- Koch, T. W. (1918) *War Service of the American Library Association*. Washington, D.C.: ALA War Service.
- Kumar, K., & Sharma, J. (2010). Library and Information Science Education in India: A Historical Perspective. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 30(5), 3–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14429/djlit.30.609>
- Library War Service. (1918a). *Camp Library Handbook*. Washington D.C.: ALA War Service.
- Library War Service. (1918b). *Soldiers, Sailors and Books*. Washington, D.C.: ALA War Service.
- Lin, S. C. (1985). Historical development of library education in China. *Journal of Library History*, 20368-386.
- Lo, M. M. (2005). The professions: Prodigal daughters of modernity. In J. Adams, E. S. Clemens and A. A. Orloff (Eds.) *Remaking modernity: Politics, history and sociology* (pp. 381–406). Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Maack, M. N. (1994). Women as visionaries, mentors, and agents of change. In L. A. Grotzinger, J. V. Carmichael, and M. N. Maack, (Eds.) *Women's work: vision and change in librarianship: papers in honor of the centennial of the University of Illinois graduate school of library and information science* (pp. 105–130) Urbana: Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois.
- Maack, M. N. (1997). Toward a new model of the information professions: embracing empowerment. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 38(4), 283–302. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40324190>
- Martin, R. S., & Shiflett, L. (1996). Hampton, Fisk, and Atlanta: The foundations, the American Library Association, and library education for blacks, 1925–1941. *Libraries & Culture*, 31, 299–325.
- Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, V., & Tsatsaroni, A. (2008). Library and information science education in Greece: Institutional changes and current issues. *Education for Information*, 26(2), 85–100.
- More workers needed. (1918). *Library Journal* 43(6), 421.
- Moss, R. (1980). Schools for the axe? *Library Association Record* 82, 328, 331.
- Passet, J. (1994). *Cultural crusaders: Women librarians in the American West, 1900–1917*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Personal note from a librarian. (1917). *War Library Bulletin* 1(2), 5.
- Putnam, H. (1918). Women and the work they do. *War Library Bulletin*, 1(4), 9.
- Raghavan, K. S. (2005). Education for knowledge organization: The Indian scene. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 41(2), 105–119.
- Rathbone, J. A. (1918). Mobilizing Librarians. *War Library Bulletin* 1(6), 4.
- Richardson, J. V. (1992). *The gospel of scholarship: Pierce Butler and a critique of American librarianship*. United States of America: Scarecrow Press.
- Richardson, J. V. (2000). The origin of Soviet education for librarianship: The role of Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, Lyubov' Borisovna Khavkina-Hamburger, and Genrietta K. Abele-Derman. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, 41(2), 106–128. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40324059>
- Shera, J. H. (1972). *The foundations of education for librarianship*. New York: Becker and Hayes.
- Shiflett, L. (1994). The American Library Association's quest for a black library school. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, 35(1), 68–72. [doi:10.2307/40323158](http://doi.org/10.2307/40323158).
- Stauffer, S. M. (2005a). Polygamy and the public library: The establishment of public libraries in Utah before 1910. *Library Quarterly* 75(3), 346–370.
- Stauffer, S. M. (2005b). "She speaks as one having authority": Mary E. Downey's use of libraries as a means to public power. *Libraries & Culture*, 40(1), 38–62.
- Stauffer, S. M. (2011). A good social work: Women's clubs, libraries, and the construction of a secular society in Utah, 1890–1920. *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 46(2), 135–155.
- Stauffer, S. M. (2014). The intelligent, thoughtful personality: Librarianship as a process of identity formation. *Library & Information History* 30(4), 254–272.
- Stauffer, S. M. (2015). "Mr. Dewey is crazy and Katharine Sharp hates the University of Chi-



- icago": Gender, power, and personality and the demise of the University of Chicago Course in Library Science 1897–1903. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 56(2), 101–113. doi: 10.12783/issn.2328-2967/56/2/5
- Thakur, U. M. (2004). UGC and Library & Information Science Education in India. *Herald of Library Science*, 43(1/2), 76–80.
- Thomison, D. (1978). *A history of the American Library Association 1876–1972*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Vann, S. K. (1961). *Training for librarianship before 1923: Education for librarianship prior to the publication of Williamson's report on training for library service*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Walia, P. K. (2010). Library and Information Science education in North India. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 30(5), 9–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14429/djlit.30.610>
- War Service for Librarians. (1918). *Library Occurrent* 5, 38.
- Wiegand, W. A. (1986a). Perspectives on library education in the context of recently published literature on the history of professions. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 26 (4), 267–80.
- Wiegand, W. A. (1986b). *The politics of an emerging profession: The American Library Association, 1876–1917*. New York: Greenwood.
- Wiegand, W.A. (1989). The development of librarianship in the United States. *Libraries and Culture*, 24 (1), 99–109.
- Wilson, C. S., Kennan, M. A., Willard, P., & Boell, S. K. (2010). Fifty years of LIS education in Australia: Academization of LIS educators in higher education institutions. *Library & Information Science Research*, 32(4), 246–257. doi: 10.1016/j.lisr.2010.07.006.
- Witz, A. (1990). Patriarchy and professions: The gendered politics of occupational closure. *Sociology* 24(4), 675–590.
- Young, A. P. (1981). *Books for Sammies: The American Library Association and World War I*. Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu.
- Zhou, N., & Lin, L. (1990). Forty years of development of library and information science education in China. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, 31(2), 162–169. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40323402>