

History of American Library Science: Its Origins and Early Development

John V. Richardson Jr.

Department of Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.

Abstract

The narrow purpose of this entry is threefold: 1) to identify the key events and players in the origin and early development of the discipline of library science in the United States (and perhaps North America more generally, but certainly not Europe, much less India, other than to mention its origins in Germany); 2) to describe the intellectual foundations and history for the discipline of library science as developed at the University of Chicago's GLS; and 3) to briefly identify the knowledge and skills as well as values associated with this emergent field. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is not a discourse on computer science, informatics, information science, information studies, or for that matter, the history of librarianship nor books and libraries; neither is it a history of literary endeavors, printing, writing, or scholarly communication per se, but rather it is an introductory orientation to a highly specialized field of knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

Library science has its origins in early nineteenth century Germany, notably as *bibliothekswissenschaft*. Despite the fact that thousands of Americans studied in Germany before the World War I, Schrettinger^[1] and Schmidt^[2] are unknown or forgotten today; elsewhere, someone might answer the provocative question: "whereas Germany hugely influenced US universities, almost all disciplines, and university research, what was the German influence on library science in the United States?"^[3] The narrow purpose of this entry is threefold: 1) to identify the key events and players in the origin and early development of the discipline of library science in the United States (and perhaps North America more generally, but certainly not Europe, much less India, other than to mention its origins in Germany); 2) to describe the intellectual foundations and history for the discipline of library science as developed at the University of Chicago's GLS; and 3) to briefly identify the knowledge and skills as well as values associated with this emergent field. For a detailed chronology of significant events in education for librarianship rather than a discussion of three major thematic elements, see Appendix A.

In other words, the scope of this entry covers only the field as it developed in the United States: as the profession of library economy first, with a strong emphasis on efficiency in library techniques due to the influence of Melvil Dewey at the New York State Library in Albany. In the later nineteenth century and into the first quarter of the twentieth century, the field also adopted certain overtones of the Social Gospel movement as librarians viewed themselves as "apostles of culture"^[4] and the field embraced

the cult of efficient and scientific management under the influence of F. W. Taylor and Charles McCarthy.^[5] Importantly, though, the outdated nineteenth century natural history worldview based upon Enlightenment ideas: "Let's see what's there and we'll record it," did not survive as the principal means of knowing, but that heritage or genealogy is still occasionally present and or at least lamented in some quarters.

In what I wish to call its protohistory, library science then, evolved out of a library apprenticeship or a silent reading on one's own like the early study of law. Indeed, many practitioners adopted a kind of intuitive approach until Melvil Dewey's school at Columbia College appeared on the scene in the last decades of the nineteenth century (see Ref. [6])—as a side note, most early programs of librarianship were affiliated with academic or public libraries and provided their students with firsthand, practical experience with, and knowledge of, these library collections; given this American pragmatism (i.e., the practical problem solving orientation of their teachers and their students), it is not surprising that these programs produced little, if any, research per se, unless the compilation of descriptive, annotated bibliographies counts as research.

Certainly, this early kind of "library science," with its emphasis on applied workability and scientific knowledge, was based on a notion of American exceptionalism, which is "the idea that America occupies an exceptional place in history, based on her republican government and wide economic opportunity" (see Ref. [7]). In other words, library science then was one of those rather American social sciences which began coalescing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as part of the move to

professionalize vocational activities and as such would include dairy science, management science, military science, mortuary science, political science, and even creation science/intelligent design today. In the early twenty-first century, the term is still used interchangeably with librarianship, library and information science, and perhaps even information science, but there are important semantic differences. So, this entry will define what library science meant to a group of practitioners and professors after the turn of the twentieth century.

In Chicago during the late 1920s, a group of local librarians rallied for something more substantive than the existing institutionally based library programs after the appearance of the highly influential C. C. Williamson Report of 1923, which argued for dividing library clerical tasks from professional ones. Education for the latter, Williamson argued, should take place in universities where instructors would hold higher academic degrees and have had prior teaching experience. Hence, a so-called advanced or “Graduate Library School” was established at the University of Chicago to meet the Association of American Universities’ standards, and which imbued a more exact meaning to this previous hollow phrase.

By “library science,” they now meant the scientific study of the intersection of books and people.^[8] In other words, attention shifted away from a library economy and its focus on institutional structures and processes to the user of the library—as an aside, American glossaries may have dropped the phrase “library economy” in the late 1920s, but *bibliothécomie* remained in French with its equivalents in other Romance languages.

Notably, the first Graduate Library School faculty at Chicago, under the leadership of George Works, embraced the twin concepts of original, independent research and promoted the publication of the results of their investigations (notably, diffusion via books in the “Studies in Library Science” series and in refereed articles in journals such as the *Library Quarterly*). Carleton B. Joeckel’s *The Government of the American Public Library* of 1935, part of this SLS series, is particularly noteworthy for drawing upon political science for its theoretical orientation; according to some international reviewers, this work “at once placed American library research on a higher plane... [and, as a result, it] received the James Terry White Award in 1938 for ‘notable published writing.’”^[8]

In January 1931, the school published the first issue of *The Library Quarterly*, a double blind refereed “journal of investigation and discussion in the field of library science,” edited by William M. Randall, who was assisted by a distinguished international advisory board. Rather than serve as a news magazine like the extant publications, the *LQ* was intended to strengthen the scientific underpinnings of the profession by stressing the social significance of the library rather than its internal operations and by publishing “exploratory rather than merely descriptive articles.”^[8] To understand this new conception of research, one need only

read the lead article: C. C. Williamson’s “The Place of Research in Library Service.”^[9]

The journal was edited at the University of Chicago until Stephen Harter (PhD, Chicago) at Indiana University took over in October 1990; John Richardson at UCLA served as editor from 1994 to 2003; next, Wayne Wiegand and John Bertot of Florida State University served as coeditors from 2003 to 2008; and from October 2008 to the present, John Carlo Bertot and Paul T. Jaeger serve as coeditors.

LQ, though still respected, has long since lost its absolute preeminence in the field with the rise of such scholarly journals as *College and Research Libraries* (1939), *Journal of Documentation* (1945), and the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (formerly *American Documentation*, 1950). Nonetheless, to understand more fully the role and contribution of the journal over time, one should consult Arthur P. Young’s 2006 *LQ* article which identifies *LQ*’s leading contributors (i.e., Howard Winger and Lawrence Thompson), the most cited authors (i.e., Don Swanson and Abe Bookstein), and the most cited articles (see his top thirty list presented as table five) between 1956 and 2004.^[10]

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (OBJECTS OF STUDY)

The essential skill provided by librarians, curators, archivists, and others is the provision of information, especially via organized collections of reading materials. Hence, how one might best provide this information is the main problem. Concomitantly, the dual mission of this field is to ensure the preservation of such materials (thus, the leading intellectual question is: what should you save, if you can’t save everything?) and then delivering access to these materials (hence, the main intellectual question is: how to best do so, given the variety of formats and technologies?). Therefore, these are the two primary theoretical questions which one must answer.

Historically, these skills demanded a knowledge set related to bibliographical access control: 1) bibliographical description (aka rules for cataloging) and 2) bibliographical arrangement (aka systems for classification) as well as infrastructural concerns (such as the proper administration and management of complex institutions); furthermore, the desire for more scholarly librarians, ones capable of creating new knowledge about the interaction of books and people, required the use of statistical techniques and interpretive models (drawn from history or cultural anthropology, in particular).

Once highly valued by bibliographers and librarians in the nineteenth century, the compilation of bibliographies (even rigorous or systematic annotated ones) came to be viewed as merely the parent of real research, as merely the first step prior to solving a research problem. At Chicago,

Waples' graduate courses in research methods drew upon interdisciplinary sources including history (i.e., of books, libraries, and printing), psychology (i.e., of the patron, reader, or user's information seeking behavior), and sociology (i.e., a rigorous and systematic community analysis or needs profiling is necessary prior to building diverse, useful or viable collections of materials for library users). Now the classic methods textbook, Waples' 1939 *Investigating Library Problems*, with its emphasis upon the validity and reliability of evidence, served several generations of graduate students. In essence, this text and his course inspired the confidence of young researchers to conduct research independently; to communicate and thereby share their findings; pursue adaptive, critical, and reflective thinking; undertake logical problem solving; and respect for the diversity of opinions. Library science would not develop its own unique methodologies until the introduction of a kind of statistical bibliography, also known as bibliometrics or citation counting, until the 1950s. And even so, that is still debated by some writers who attribute its true origins to psychologists in the early 1900s; clearly, though, E. Wyndham Hulme coined the phrase "statistical bibliography" in 1922–1923 and such work appeared in the *Bulletin of the International Institute of Bibliography* as early as 1911. This point is important to those who hold that to be considered a discipline, library science must have its own unique methods.

To achieve what Harvard University had done for law and what Johns Hopkins University had done for medicine, then a true "library science" would have to be offered at the graduate level. There would be no place for the holder of a high school degree or some mere technical/trade school curricular orientated worker (which would produce a technician who knew how to do something, rather than a professional who also knew why do something in the first place by investigating the philosophical underpinnings of such actions). In other words, what some graduate educators sought was a diagnostician of professional tasks, not a mere mechanic suited to routine library clerical tasks.

So, in the mid-1920s onward, the American Library Association's Board of Education for Librarianship, influenced by the Williamson Report, mandated a set of admissions requirements to accredited programs of librarianship. One of the explicitly, stated entrance requirements now included a college degree (commonly held in English literature, American history, or a western European foreign language—a social science major, if present, was rather more common than the natural or physical science backgrounds of the small remainder of applicants). This stance is well articulated in Pierce Butler's *Introduction to Library Science* and Douglas Waples' *Investigating Library Problems* which taken together, established an epistemological stance toward our activities—with a good science and good practice, things should take care of themselves.

As expressed in Butler's *Introduction*, the scope of library science covered the sociological problem (e.g., the role of books in society), the psychological problem (e.g., the psychological motive for reading among individuals or the effect of reading on the reader), and the historical problem (e.g., the literary history of scholarship). By the 1990s, increased interest was paid to the distinction between tacit and implicit knowledge as well as the difference between declarative (i.e., know what) and procedural (i.e., know how) knowledge.

The relationship between the empirical knowledge as generated by GLS faculty and its doctoral graduate students and the practical knowledge which could be applied by practitioners is most clearly demonstrated in their Annual Library Institutes beginning in 1936. Topics are those of pragmatic interest to practitioners and cover such topics as book selection (1939), acquisition and cataloging (1940), and reference service (1943). For more thematic issues, one can consult the list of these annual institutes through 1951 in Appendix B.

TYPES OF LIBRARIES (INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURES)

Early education for librarianship in the late nineteenth century possessed a strong applied or pragmatic work orientation due to its being situated within the institutional framework of a local public or academic library. At the University of Chicago, the new appointed faculty members, except for Pierce Butler who came from the Newberry Library and Harriet E. Howe, a peace offering to American Library Association, were not library practitioners. Rather they held degrees in various academic disciplines including education (Howe and Works), educational psychology (Waples), ecclesiastical history (Butler), linguistics (Randall), and philological studies (Wilson). Nonetheless, they continued to teach about types of libraries: college (Randall and Wilson); public (Wilson and Joeckel), and school (Waples).

GLS graduates also played an important role in shaping American education for librarianship, as they became deans and directors there and in the other leading programs across the nation: Bernard R. Berelson at the University of Chicago; J. Periam Danton at UC, Berkeley; Raynard Swank at UC, Berkeley; Jesse Shera at Case Western Reserve University; and Ralph Shaw of Rutgers University.

Later in the 1950s, library science programs, such as those at the University of Michigan and the University of Illinois, downstate at Urbana-Champaign (and populated with GLS alumni including Thelma Eaton, Herbert Goldhor, Rose Phelps, and Mary A. Lohrer), would shift their curricular emphasis from types of libraries to library services (which would include functional activities such as abstracting and indexing, acquisitions, cataloging and

classification, collection development, outreach to underserved populations, programming, reader's advisory, and reference work). Most recently, the curriculum has shifted yet again, this time to the role of information in society.

VALUES

As articulated in Butler's *Introduction*, "a scientist always selects the field of his observation. In his eyes not all facts are of equal importance. He does not devote his days to the endless multiplication of his sensual perceptions in the hope that perhaps something new will come to his notice. . . His professional ambition would prefer that his name should be used to designate a new theory than any number of previously unrecorded species. His concern is, first of all, functional significance. He has also a perverse curiosity about the unexplained."^[11]

In the narrowest institutional terms, Butler's classic work helped the library profession understand the mission of an Advanced, Graduate Library School, serving as an aspirational document of what the GLS's goals and objectives were. Concomitantly, Waples research methods textbook is a companion piece on how to undertaking reliable and valid social science research. Waples recommends that a would-be researcher focus on stating a research problem, examine the validity of evidence, draw an adequate sample to ensure reliability, and pay attention to sources of evidence.^[12] Basically, Waples' text offered readers a structured way of thinking about the field of library science.

Many thoughtful writers today suggest that library science has been shaped by an instrumental, positivistic social science during its Chicago years. Despite later claims of being value-free or neutral (which necessarily arise when talking about the need to build balanced collections of library materials, at least if one wishes to be respectful of the diversity of different points of view and provide these different perspectives on socially controversial matters), a complex constellation of values exists (namely, the perceived need for preservation and the concomitant access services for library users and their right to know as well as equity of access; literacy is foundational for the preceding, but not numeracy per se; rights to privacy and free speech, contextualized inside a democratic society, often associated with a liberal or advanced capitalism). In short, many of us believe that it is better to be informed than ignorant because access to information reduces social inequities.

One of the best examples is the *Public Library Inquiry* of 1949^[13] which posits the American public library as a democratic institution, responsible for social equalization. Many librarians would agree with the following belief statement (aka articles of the Library Faith): that the act of silent reading of nonfiction as well as fiction is desirable; libraries should avoid censorship and support intellectual freedom by offering a balanced or unbiased

collection of authoritative or at least credible materials, be public, free of direct use fees; furthermore, these cultural nonprofits are good or desirable while large, for-profit companies are bad (if not, lazy or even evil)—or simply put, many librarians would respect intellectual property rights (but support the notion of fair use within the bundle of copyrights), yet oppose the increasing "commodification" of information, a term which dates to the 1970s.

Controversy exists about the proper role of pure versus applied problem solving; see, for example, Works' cooperative research agenda proposal.^[14] Likewise, Butler initially argued for a strongly interdisciplinary approach, drawing upon the three academic disciplines of history, sociology and psychology.^[11]

Like other research university disciplines, though, original, independent research in the form of a dissertation or thesis is still expected, if not valued, as is the desirableness of seminars, or scholars' workshops, over large classroom lectures (although popular, asynchronous online courses as offered by some LIS programs may be cited as a counterexample). Despite some antagonism at the outset and continuing today because one's research agenda may be set by the agency or philanthropic organization, nonetheless, the role of extramural funding is significant in research universities (note that the Chicago GLS got its start from the Carnegie Corporation with a one million dollar grant); and in situ, may explain, at least partially, the rise of the I-school movement.^[15] Perhaps someone else should write on its origins in the research university because it is out of scope for this entry on library science. Certainly, a recent tension has emerged between two models—the scholarly professor and the research professor. Early on, the former model, aka the "lone wolf" model (i.e., an independent scholar working alone in the library/archives writing a monographic volume, published by a leading university press) dominated the discipline of library science. Later, the field witnessed a shift to the other model, which may have begun with the introduction of information science into the more traditional library service programs in the 1960s and 1970s. At this time, another group of individuals, largely from mathematics (such as Robert M. Hayes) and the physical sciences (such as Don R. Swanson) were hired into library science programs, and with them came an interest in extramural funding, a strong sense of the need for collaboration, a major role for microfilm and computer technology including punch cards, and a rather ahistorical approach to the profession. They called themselves information scientists (note that one rarely encounters a library scientist).

Perhaps the rise of superior Soviet technology in the late 1950s (notably, the successful launch of Sputnik, the first man into space, as well as the first ICBM), caused the U.S. Congress to pass the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and in turn caused the federal government to spend even more on competitive research grants in higher

education, benefiting the information science types in library programs; certainly, there is also evidence of the Cold War, the National Science Foundation, and Big Science before these events, however, which could also explain the large-scale U.S. federal grant making.

Doug Raber's *The Problem of Information: An Introduction to Information Science*^[16] brings a strongly humanistic orientation to the discussion of representation of information, relevance, and the value of semiotics. Likewise, the library science field has embraced the inclusion of archival sciences in the 1980s and informatics (not to be confused with computer science) in the 1990s. Since computer science focuses on algorithmic solutions to improving the speed and space domain of computation, library science stresses the more humanistic interests (or, the people aspects) in the intersection of science, technology and society.

Philosophically speaking, library science researchers believe that things can be measured; on the other hand, that may well beg the more fundamental question of what cannot be measured. The differing methodological orientations have caused the discipline to divide into two camps at times: the "quals" versus the "quants." The desire for universalistic abstraction (rather than mere descriptive chronologies of the local library^[17] can be cited as a model in this regard) has been problematic even in the historically oriented side of the house. In any event, however, the fundamental unity in library science lies in the rigorous, spirit of inquiry as articulated at Chicago. The following example from the 1930s of Leon Carnovsky's spirit of inquiry is illustrative: while walking on the Midway with Wilson, Carnovsky challenged on the vendors hawking an expensive cigarette lighter called the everlasting match. "See here, Mister, there is something wrong with that assumption. If one match is everlasting, why get three?"^[8] By the mid-to-late 1930s, Butler had begun to recognize a possibly fatal flaw in the GLS approach mainly that of scientism, the overly narrow focus on only the quantifiable aspects of the field. He wrote on this topic in 1941 and again in 1951; by then, he had become absolutely convinced that "there was no room for humanistic concerns in this new world view. Although [Butler] believed that the GLS's 'highest intellectual achievement was the establishment of library science on a sound basis in a few areas,' the humanistic side of librarianship had been displaced by practitioners of a narrow objectivity. Librarianship had, in fact, been replaced by a pseudo-science in Butler's opinion. Ideas were supplanted by facts, or even worse, by mere data. The field risked becoming truly anti-intellectual, lost in 'the simplicity of its pragmatism.'"^[11]

CONCLUSIONS

"Within the recent past, librarianship had placed a heavy emphasis upon tradition and custom as a way of doing

things."^[11] Yet, many of these earlier works by bibliographers and librarians were viewed as "too practical and obvious to merit" attention in a research-oriented environment like the American university,^[8] nonetheless the introduction of a library economy, similar to home economics or domestic science, by Melvil Dewey and other events in 1876 are two of the important watershed events in the history of library science. In addition, the establishment of the Graduate Library School at Chicago was a pivot watershed event in the establishment of a real library science in the United States and the subsequent professionalization of education for librarianship. At Chicago, early writers "described library science 'as the science of the care and use of books both for the control of knowledge already in existence and for the discovery of new knowledge through researches in books themselves or with books in connection with other sources of information'...Waples, as acting dean, in 1931 defined research in library science as 'extending the existing body of knowledge concerning the values and practices of libraries in their many aspects, and including the development of methods of investigation whereby significant data are obtained, tested, and applied.'"^[8] The affiliation of a program with a research oriented university like the University of Chicago imparted a more theoretical dimension to librarianship; the key players and staunch supporters of this movement include the early GLS faculty such as George Works, William M. Randall, Douglas Waples, and Pierce Butler (at least until near the end of his life, when he began to have grave doubts). GLS alumni, such as Herbert Goldhor, also played a role in the adoption of social science research methodologies.^[19] In short, I have argued that the American notion of library science is largely a creation of the GLS at Chicago. I have not intentionally ignored other library science programs, or Shera's foundation of a new kind of school at Case Western Reserve University, where the introduction of graduate studies in what became known as documentation led eventually to the idea of an information science. Simply, these ideas are out of scope for the purposes of this entry.

More recently, writers, notably John Budd,^[20] have remained optimistic about the role of hermeneutical phenomenology ("which combines a kind of realism with understanding of the dynamics of human action and perception") which brings a sense of intersubjectivity to combat the repressive aspects of scientism in library science.

"Whether 'books' was too narrowly understood [at Chicago] to mean the codex rather than the 'generic book,' thus ignoring scientific report literature and giving rise to the new intellectual discipline of information science, is outside the scope of this article (although there appears to be evidence for this hypothesis)."^[8] The introduction of library automation in the 1960s buoyed the field.

Likewise, information studies (a recently emergent dimension) seems to offer the softer intersection of information resources, information technology processes, and

user needs. Yet, the recent discussions of a humanistic I-school seem strongly reminiscent of this library science as understood by the University of Chicago and their being situated in large research universities will influence much of their research agenda. Of course, only time will tell if this “school of thought” holds up. Certainly, the intellectual history of specific programs is yet to be written; a notable one would look at the aggressive expansionism at Berkeley by Danton followed by the underestimated intelligence and strategic shrewdness of Ray Swank.^[3]

More than ten years ago, a fellow encyclopedist observed that “although research in library science has come a long way, it still has not reached the maturity of other disciplines. . . [and struggles with] an academically imposed inferiority complex and linguistic dilemmas on the meaning of research for an applied and service field”^[18] and it is hard to disagree with his assertions. In fact, the continuing relevance of a “library science” to an information society remains an open question and Blaise Cronin has provocatively asserted that “there is, and can be no such thing as ‘library science.’”^[21]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work benefited from the comments of two anonymous reviewers as well as one of the editors, Mary Niles Maack. In addition, I greatly appreciate the fact that Larry Olszewski; Boyd Rayward; John Budd; and Michael Buckland answered my questions, contributed ideas as well as took the time to read and comment on an earlier draft of this entry.

APPENDICES

A. Chronology of Significant Events in Education for Librarianship

1870s

1879, May: Melvil Dewey suggests a “librarians’ college” which would be attached to a normal school with a considerable library.

1880s

1883, August: Dewey proposes school of library economy at Columbia College.

1886, July: Dewey announces his school will open in October at Columbia College.

1887, 5 January: First class in library economy offered at Columbia College.

1888: Dewey argues for correspondence courses in special library and small library services (hence, first distance education program).

1889: First class graduates from Columbia College; school transferred to New York State Library in Albany on 1 April; August: Annie C. Moore argues for special training of children’s librarians.

1890s

1890, June: Pratt Institute, Brooklyn offers its first class in cataloging followed by library economy courses.

1891: Drexel Institute started offering library economy courses.

1893, September: Armour Institute Library Class first term under direction of Katharine L. Sharp in Chicago.

1895: First separate course in government publications offered by F. Jackson at Armour Institute.

1897: Transfer of the Armour Institute to University of Illinois, Urbana.

1898, August: New York State Library’s Library School offers specialized instruction for law, medical, education, and engineering librarians.

1900s

1901: Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh establishes Training School for Children’s Librarians; Western Reserve proposes library school.

1902, August: Four year library training class announced by Simmons College, Boston.

1903: New York Public Library establishes training class; Western Reserve receives endowment for library school from Andrew Carnegie; American Library Association’s Committee on Library Training recommends correspondence work offerings

1905: Melvil Dewey suggests that only three schools are needed: one at Albany, one in Midwest, and another at the University of California; University of Washington offers their first annual summer school for library training; Syracuse University establishes Library School; Andrew Carnegie tells library school class serve that “nowadays professionally trained people are needed.”

1906, June 16: First MLS (*honoris causa*) degree conferred at SLS, Albany.

1907: Library School faculty from various schools met for the first time at Asheville, NC, American Library Association Convention (ALA).

1910s

1911: Roundtable of Library School Instructors formed in ALA.

1915: Association of American Library Schools founded.

1919: University of Texas establishes School of Library Science; September: Andrew Keogh (Yale) argues that academic librarians need advanced library training; Charles C. Williamson publishes ground-breaking *Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training*.

1920s

1922: Charles C. Williamson transmits "Training for Library Work" to Carnegie Corporation.

1923: Williamson's *Training for Library Service* appears in print; ALA's Executive Board appoints Temporary Library Training Board.

1924: ALA establishes Board of Education for Librarianship with Carnegie Corporation assistance.

1925: Tse-Chien Tai's "Professional Education for Librarianship," PhD dissertation, University of Iowa.

1926: Carnegie Corporation funds the first Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago, which offers first summer institute for Library Science; the Albany Library School and NYPL Library School merge and transferred to Columbia University.

1927: GLS at Chicago appoints George Works first dean; ALA launches Curriculum Study under the direction of W.W. Charters.

1928, Fall: GLS at Chicago admits students working toward PhD degree.

1929, April 12: George Works resigns as Dean of Chicago GLS.

1930s

1930: First PhD in library science: Eleanor Upton's "A Guide to 17th Century Materials in the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of Great Britain to Date" at University of Chicago.

1932: Louis Round Wilson appointed dean of Chicago GLS.

1933: Publication of Pierce Butler's *An Introduction to Library Science*; ALA Board of Education for Librarianship establishes qualitative Minimum Requirements for library schools.

1936: Two major studies appear: Ralph Munn's *Conditions and Trends in Education for Librarianship* and Ernest J. Reece's *The Curriculum in Library Schools*.

1940s

1942: Louis Round Wilson retires as Dean of Chicago GLS.

1943: Publication of Metcalf, Osborn, and Russell's *Program of Instruction in Library Schools*.

1946: Publication of Joseph L. Wheeler's *Progress and Problems in Education for Librarianship* and J. Periam Danton's *Education for Librarianship*; ALA Council establishes Library Education Division.

1947: Harriet E. Howe moves the University of Denver program from a BLS to a one year MLS degree; Florida State University sends library science educators throughout the state in automobiles.

1948, 1 August: ALA's BEL suspends accreditation of library schools; University of Illinois and University of Michigan offer PhD program in library science.

1949: Twenty-seven of the thirty-two accredited schools adopt the new MLS degree (or in process of doing so); publication of Bernard Berelson's *Education for Librarianship*.

1950s

1951, July: ALA adopts new *Standards of Accreditation* making MLS entry level degree.

1952: Columbia University offers Doctor of Library Science.

1956: Western Reserve University offers PhD degree.

1959: Robert M. Hayes at UCLA teaches first course ever on information storage and retrieval; University of California at Berkeley offers PhD degree; ALA Council adopts Standards and Guidelines for Undergraduate Programs in Library Science

1960s

1960: Rutgers University offers PhD degree.

1961: *Journal of Education for Librarianship* established; publication of Sarah Vann's *Education for Librarianship Before 1923*.

1962: ALA appoints Commission on a National Plan for Library Education.

1965: U.S. Office of Education establishes position of Library Education Specialist; NDEA Institute funds made available for school librarianship; HEA, Title II Part B provides funds for institutes and fellowships.

1966: ALA establishes Office for Library Education; UCLA establishes two year MSIS degree program.

1968: ALA's COA establishes subcommittees on undergraduate and graduate standards for accreditation.

1970s

1970: ALA Council adopts Library Education and Manpower policy (so-called Asheim statement); Publication of Hal Borko and Robert Hayes' *Education for Information Science* and C. Edward Carroll's *The Professionalization of Education for Librarianship*.

1972: ALA's COA establishes revised *Standards for Accreditation*; Jesse Shera's Foundations of Education for Librarianship; UCLA establishes two-year MLS degree incorporating MSIS degree.

1974, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University, established.

1975: Publication of Charles Churchwell's *The Shaping of American Library Education*.

1980s

1980: Publication of *The Conant Report: A Study of the Education of Librarians*.

1982: Publication of Richardson's *The Spirit of Inquiry, the GLS at Chicago, 1921–1951*.

1983: AALS changes name to Association for Library and Information Science Education.

1986: ALISE and ALA celebrates 100 years of education for librarianship in New York City.

1988: ALA executive Board endorses joining the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education as a specialty organization for the purpose of accrediting first professional degrees for school library media specialists.

1989: Library and Information Science Distance Education Consortium formed; Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, closes.

1990s

1990: ALA Executive Board appoints a Special Committee on Library Closings.

1992: *Standards for Accreditation*, 1992, adopted by the Council of the American Library Association; ALA

president-elect, Marilyn Miller, announces Project Century 21, a major research and study project for the development of library and information science education.

1993: Columbia University, echoing its 1889 action, once again closes its School of Library Service.

1996, School of Information, University of Michigan, established.

2000s

2001, iSchool, University of Michigan, established.

2002, School of Information, University of Texas at Austin, established.

2005, First conference of i-School Community at Pennsylvania State University.

Sources: Updating John V. Richardson Jr. et al., *Chronology of Significant Events in Education for Librarianship, 1879–1986* (Chicago, IL: American Library Association Standing Committee on Library Education, 1987); John V. Richardson Jr. with Jane B. Robbins, reprint ed., *In Education for the Library/Information Professions: Strategies for the Mid-1990s*, edited by Patricia G. Reeling (Jefferson, NC: McFarland Publishing, 1993), pp. 73–76.

B. Annual Library Institutes Held in the GLS at Chicago, 1936–1951

Volume Number	Title of Institute	Dates of Institute	Volume Editor	Publication Date
1	Library Trends	3–15 Aug. 1936	Louis R. Wilson	March 1937
2	The Role of the Library in Adult Education	2–13 Aug. 1937	Louis R. Wilson	December 1937
3	Current Issues in Library Administration	1–12 Aug. 1938	Carleton B. Joeckel	April 1939
4	The Practice of Book Selection	31 July–13 Aug. 1939	Louis R. Wilson	February 1940
5	The Acquisition and Cataloging of Books	29 July–9 Aug. 1940	William M. Randall	December 1940
6	Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy	4–9 Aug. 1941	Douglas Waples	February 1942
7	Reference Function of the Library	29 June – 10 July 1942	Pierce Butler	1943
8	The Library in the Community	23–28 Aug. 1943	Leon Carnovsky and Lowell Martin	June 1944
9	Library Extension: Problems and Solutions	21–26 Aug. 1944	Carleton B. Joeckel	1944
10	Personnel Management in Libraries	27 Aug.–1 Sept. 1945	Lowell Martin	1946
11	Library Buildings for Library Service	5–10 Aug. 1946	Herman H. Fussler	1947
12	Youth, Communication, and Libraries	11–16 Aug. 1947	Frances Henne, Alice Brooks, and Ruth Ersted	1949
13	Education for Librarianship	16–21 Aug. 1948	Bernard Berelson	1949
14	A Forum on the Public Library Inquiry	1949	Lester Asheim	1950
15	Bibliographic Organization	24–29 July 1950	Jesse J. Shera and Margaret E. Egan	1951
16	Librarians, Scholars, and Booksellers at Mid-Century	1951.	Pierce Butler	1953

Source: John V. Richardson Jr., *The Spirit of Inquiry: The GLS at Chicago, 1921–1951*. Foreword by Jesse Shera, ACRL Publications in Librarianship, No. 42, American Library Association, Chicago, IL, 1982, p. 173.[8]

REFERENCES

1. Schrettinger, M.W. *Versuch eines vollständigen Lehrbuchs der Bibliothek-Wissenschaft, oder Anleitung zur vollkommenen Geschäftsführung eines Bibliothekärs*; Verlag des Verfassers and J. Lindauersche: München, 1808–1829.
2. Schmidt, J.A.F. *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft, der literatur-und buücherkunde*; Weimar: B.F. Voigt, 1840.
3. Michael Buckland to John Richardson, 11 August 2007.
4. Garrison, D. *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876–1920*. Foreword by Christine Pawley. *Print Culture History in Modern America*. University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, WI, 2003.
5. Casey, M.; McCarthy, C. *Librarianship and Reform*; American Library Association: Chicago, IL, 1981.
6. Wiegand, W.A. *Irrepressible Reformer: A Biography of Melvil Dewey*; American Library Association: Chicago, IL, 1996.
7. Ross, D. *The Origins of American Social Science*; Ideas in Context, No. 19. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1992.
8. Richardson, J.V. Jr. *The Spirit of Inquiry: The GLS at Chicago, 1921–1951*. Foreword by Jesse Shera. *ACRL Publications in Librarianship*, No. 42. American Library Association: Chicago, IL, 1982.
9. Williamson, C.C. The place of research in library service. *Libr. Quar.* **January 1931**, 1, 1–17.
10. Young, A.P. Library Quarterly, 1956–2004: An exploratory bibliometric analysis. *Libr. Quar.* **January 2006**, 76, 10–18.
11. Butler, P. *Introduction to Library Science*; University of Chicago: Chicago, IL, 1933; reprint ed., Richardson, J.V. Jr., *The Gospel of Scholarship: Pierce Butler and a Critique of American Librarianship*; Scarecrow Press: Metuchen, NJ, 1992.
12. Waples, D. *Investigating Library Problems*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, 1939.
13. Raber, D. *Librarianship and legitimacy: The ideology of the Public Library Inquiry*. *Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science*, no. 90 Greenwood Press: Westport, CT, 1997.
14. Richardson, J.V. Jr., George Alan Works (1877–1957): Seeking neither fame nor fortune, *J. Libr. Hist.* Spring **1984**, 19, 298–304; reprint ed., Supplement to the Dictionary of American Library Biography. Libraries Unlimited: Littleton, CO, 1990.
15. Geiger, R.L. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of the American Research University*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, U.K., 1986.
16. Raber, D. *The Problem of Information: An Introduction to Information Science*; Scarecrow Press: Lanham, MD, 2003.
17. Shera, J.H. *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England, 1629–1855*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, 1949.
18. Stielow, F.J. Library and Information Science Research. In *Encyclopedia of Library History*; Wiegand, W.A., Davis, D.G. Jr. Eds.; Garland Publishing Inc.: New York, 1994.
19. Goldhor, H. *An Introduction to Scientific Research in Librarianship*, Monograph number 12. Graduate School of Library Science: Urbana, IL, 1972.
20. Budd, J.M. *Knowledge and Knowing in Library and Information Science: A Philosophical Framework*; Scarecrow Press: Lanham, MD, 2001.
21. Cronin, B. Pierce Butler's An introduction to library science: A tract for our times? A review article. *J. Libr. Inform. Sci.* **December 2004**, 36, 183–188.