

Anne Welsh

3 “Expertise ... Certification ... Cultural Capital”

The Education of Librarians in the UK

Introduction

“I desire also to bring to the notice of the Trustees that better provision should be made for the higher education of librarians. It is very desirable that the higher training in librarianship should be associated with university institutions” (Adams 1915, 23). This was the assertion of the report to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust that investigated the provision of libraries in the country, calling for an enhanced education for librarians in order to improve service overall. Almost 100 years later, we find ourselves revising the routes into librarianship, with a re-examination by our national library association, CILIP (the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals), of the core knowledge and skills that employers and the public should expect of its members. This chapter explores the history of librarianship in UK Higher Education and the impact of that history today.¹

Apprenticeship

The standard work on the history of library education in the UK presents a narrative arc beginning with workplace training and ending with Information as a graduate career (Bramley 1981). The birth of librarianship as a profession, variously marked in Britain by the passing of the Libraries Act 1850, the founding of the Library Association in 1877 and the granting of its Royal Charter in 1898 (Munford 1976), coincided with a reform of British universities in the mid nineteenth century that educational historians identify as having begun a shift from practice into higher education (Jarausch 2004).

Within older professions, such as medicine and law, practitioners were involved in self-regulation and certification, to the extent that it has been observed

¹ A briefer, earlier version of this paper was presented at CILIP’s Umbrella Conference on 2 July 2013.

that “For professional careers, it was not expertise as such, but its certification which created cultural capital” (Jarusch 2004, 367). The history of qualifying associations stretches back to the founding of the first of the Inns of Court, Gray’s Inn, in 1391, but it is noteworthy that Millerson’s chronological list for England and Wales records only seven such organizations founded between 1391 and 1629, then none in the eighteenth century, followed by an explosion in the period 1800–1949, of which forty-two came into being in the nineteenth century. As a new profession, librarianship was part of a larger movement towards professionalization in the period, with similar career disciplines forming qualifying associations around the same time: the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors in 1868; the Institution of Municipal Engineers in 1873; the Royal Institute of Chemistry in 1877; the Institute of Bankers in 1879 and the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales in 1880 (Millerson 1964, 246–258).

From the mid nineteenth century onwards, we can trace a tension between the principles of universities, with their culture of general and theoretical education, and practitioners across all vocational disciplines, demanding an ever-greater part in training relevant to the circumstances of particular jobs (Burrage 1984). Librarianship was comparatively slow to settle into higher education. In the USA, the first library school, founded by Melvil Dewey, ran classes at Columbia University from 1887 until 1889, when it transferred to the New York State Library at Albany (Miksa 1988). Here, classes were taught by a mixture of academic staff – who followed Dewey to Albany – and librarians (Mitchell 1950), setting the pattern for American library schools: “of the fifteen US schools founded before 1920 several were set up in libraries rather than in academic institutions” (Grogan 2007, 8).

In the UK, the Library Association tried a variety of approaches, ranging from correspondence courses to lectures held at the London School of Economics (LSE), eventually establishing several library schools for full-time study (Bramley 1981), most of them founded after 1946, in non-university settings, usually technical colleges, to provide a Library Association syllabus over which the teachers at the schools had neither control nor input (Grogan 2007). Eventually each of the surviving library schools became affiliated to universities, granting their own degrees and diplomas (Bramley 1981). In the UK, library and information programmes are accredited by CILIP, but the examining of students is conducted in the same way as other degrees, by the teaching staff of the university. Accreditation is an important check and balance for the universities, “confirm[ing] the relevance of the course to current and developing practice in librarianship and information science, including very specialist sectors, and thus improve[ing] ... employability” (CILIP 2013a). Since 2014, “All accredited programmes are

assessed using the Professional Knowledge and Skills Base which identifies the core knowledge and skills of the profession” (CILIP 2014).

Qualification and Chartership

Today, successful completion of an accredited course of study at university entitles an alumnus to refer to themselves as a “qualified librarian”. After obtaining a job, they can then enrol in CILIP’s chartership scheme, which includes a period of mentorship and reflective practice, reported in a portfolio which is assessed by members of CILIP. After successful completion of this process, a professional is entitled to refer to themselves as a “chartered librarian”.

The current system of chartership by portfolio is the latest form of assessment for individual accreditation administered by CILIP since its formation in 2002, and, before that, since the 1960s, by its predecessor bodies, the Library Association and the Institute of Information Scientists. Accreditation of practitioners is defined by Forth et al. (2011, x) as pertaining to “situations in which an individual may apply to be accredited as competent by a recognized professional body or industry association ... the criteria governing accreditation and the procedures regarding enforcement are entirely the responsibility of the accrediting body rather than the state”.

The system is voluntary: those who are not chartered may practise as information professionals. An examination of 180 job advertisements in CILIP’s *Library and Information Gazette* between May 2006 and May 2007 found only 30 instances in which chartership was mentioned, as compared to 34 mentions of “customer service skills” and 129 mentions of relevant work experience (Orme 2008, 628). Even allowing for Orme’s point that the *Gazette* was only one source in which advertisements might be placed, and for Harper’s general caveats around the limitations of studies of advertisements in general and particularly his point that “Job adverts may be written to reflect a desired future state, rather than a current reality” (Harper 2012, 31), Orme’s figures and the absence in similar UK articles of a specific category for chartership² do seem to indicate that there is plenty of space for those who are not chartered to practice as information professionals. Indeed, the latest figures for overall membership of CILIP (chartered and otherwise) stand at 13,470 (Dada and Colbert 2014, 7), a decline of around 10,000

² Davies’s (2008) study of 97 health information vacancies between 1 April and 30 September 2006 found “Evidence of CPD (Continuing Professional Development)” was sought in 10% adverts, compared to 25% seeking “postgraduate qualification” and 51% seeking a “degree or diploma”. “CPD” would encompass chartership, alongside with other activities.

members since 2005, when Broady-Preston (2006, 48) quotes a figure of “up to 23,000 members working in all sectors” given on the CILIP website.

Despite this website assertion, traditionally, certain sectors have valued CILIP / Library Association qualifications more highly than others. Wood (1997, 10) notes the formation of the Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux (ASLIB) in 1924 as an indication that the Library Association was focused more on public libraries than special libraries. More recently, in an article that examines the various CILIP and non-CILIP groups of interest to the commercial sector, Newgass (2010, 116) asserts that “Practically no-one, particularly in the business, industry, and legal sectors, asks for a chartered professional today”.

Certainly, the number of bodies that information professionals may join is extensive. Alongside CILIP, prominent organizations include the Art Libraries Society UK (ARLIS/UK), the British and Irish Association of Law Librarians (BIALL), the British Cartographic Society Map Curators Group, the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres / UK and Ireland (IAML/UK and Ireland) and the Special Libraries Association UK Chapter (SLA/UK). ASLIB, mentioned above, is still thriving, with the slogan “The Association for Information Management” (ASLIB 2011), and, of course, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) has been organizing projects, meetings and activities since 1927 (IFLA 2015). There are also organizations with overlapping interests, such as the Archives and Records Association (ARA), British Computer Society (BCS), and the Worshipful Company of Stationers and Newspaper Makers, “the livery company for the Communications and Content Industries” (Stationers’ Company 2016), which has grown from the guild formed in 1403 for the City of London’s booksellers. It is clear that for information professionals operating in certain areas of UK librarianship, the market-place for associations is fairly crowded.

In any self-regulating career discipline, the success of accreditation schemes like chartership relies on recognition by members of the profession, the public and, significantly, employers (Tamkin et al. 2013). Henczel (2013, 8) attributes decline in membership of library associations to “factors such as shrinking financial support from employers, greater demands on the professional’s time, the presence of a broad choice of relevant associations including those established to support non-library professions ... the cost of membership and / or a perceived lack of value for money and irrelevance”.

However this “irrelevance” may be perceived, and however we may view membership figures, Library Association and later CILIP accreditation has been and continues to be a vital stamp of authority for both undergraduate and graduate university LIS courses in the UK. As Dalton and Levinson (2001) point out, although it is notionally possible that a student might take courses in the area of

Library and Information Studies (LIS) that are not accredited, by the time they were writing at the start of the new millennium it was the case that “Market forces ha[d] determined that potential LIS workers in the UK demand qualifications that confer professional status” – in this case, courses that are accredited by CILIP.

Professionalism and Professionalization

The term “professional status” is somewhat problematic. Watson (2002, 94) has asserted that “notions of “profession” and the “professional” ... are slippery and ambiguous”. He goes on to suggest that certain occupational groups have used the concept of professionalization as a means of reinvention, of “getting this honorific label attached to them” (Watson 2002, 99) – a label that denotes a level of altruistic public service as opposed to commercial motivations for jobs undertaken by members of that occupational group.

Wilensky’s (1964) work outlines the evolution of certain professions (including librarianship, which he classes a “borderline area”) from occupations to professions: “Any occupation wishing to exercise professional authority must find a technical basis for it, assert an exclusive jurisdiction, link both skill and jurisdiction to standards of training, and convince the public that its services are uniquely trustworthy” (Wilensky 1964, 138). Having considered a range of existing and emergent professions, he finds common “crucial events in the push towards professionalization” (Wilensky 1964, 142–146). He includes librarianship as an example in his table of “The Process of Professionalization”, with a note stressing that the dates given concern the USA. If we look at the “crucial events” he identifies, with regard to UK librarianship, we find four out of the five entirely completed and one partially so.

Full-time occupation: Full-time librarians may have been operating before 1600, but we know that by that date Bodley’s first librarian, Thomas James, “found he was obliged to work as long as ten hours a day in the library” (Clement 1991, 273).

First national professional association: the Library Association was founded in 1877 and granted its Royal Charter in 1898 (Munford 1976).

First training school: First summer school organized by the Library Association in London in 1893 (followed by Manchester in 1895, Aberystwyth in 1917, Birmingham in 1928); classes held at London School of Economics in 1902, preparing attendees for the Library Association examinations; first library school founded at University College London (UCL) in 1919 (Bramley 1981).

Code of Ethics: The Library Association’s *Code of Professional Conduct* was approved in 1983. Sturges (2003, 95) discusses the “implicit” nature of the set of values he encountered when he entered the profession in 1960, and the awareness of the American Library Association’s *Code of Ethics*, which had been introduced in 1938.

Demand for statutory protection of the area of work: Wilensky’s (1964, 145) exact wording is “There will be persistent *political agitation* in order to win the *support of law* for the protection of the job territory and its sustaining code of ethics” [his italics]. This type of protection, that is, licensing according to Forth et al.’s (2011, ix) definition, “in which it is unlawful to carry out a specified range of activities for pay without first having obtained a licence which confirms that the licence holder meets prescribed standards of competence”, has not been achieved, although the Library Association sought and received endorsement by the state through the granting of its Royal Charter in 1898, and maintains a register of chartered librarians.

Certainly, viewed through this lens, librarianship can be seen to be fulfilling several criteria in terms of its claims to be a profession. Wilensky’s “optimal base of knowledge or doctrine for a profession” (1964, 149) hints at the difficulties that librarianship has sometimes faced in “claiming a monopoly of skill or even a roughly exclusive jurisdiction”. He asserts that the baseline “is a combination of intellectual and practical knowing, some of which is explicit (classifications and generalizations learned from books, lectures and demonstrations), some implicit (“understanding” acquired from supervised practice and observation)”. These “make long training necessary to persuade the public of the mystery of the craft”.

Library Education inside the Academy

This brings us to the second component of that problematic phrase, “professional status” Status is a difficult concept to quantify, and in this respect we might turn to Catherine Minter’s discussion of the impact of eighteenth and nineteenth century library reform on what she terms “the ambivalent ideal of the librarian.”. In this, she identifies “a multiplication of the librarian’s duties and responsibilities, which meant that the office was no longer, or could no longer be treated as, a sinecure” (Minter 2013, 26). Certainly, at this period, the self-image of those involved in the curation of knowledge was evolving towards a more scientific model, in common with other newly-emerging professions (Rothblatt 1983).

From its foundation in 1877, the Library Association sought “to unite all persons engaged in or interested in library work, for the purpose of promoting the best possible administration of existing libraries” (Bramley 1981, 12). From 1880 onwards, there were motions at the Annual General Meetings considering the training of library assistants, whose education at the time varied from library to library, with some excellent apprenticeships, such as those at the Bodleian and Birmingham Public Library, but there were concerns about the general education of junior assistants across the country (Bramley 1981, 13–19). Examinations according to a Library Association syllabus were held from 1885, but the numbers of those presenting themselves to be examined were low, and pass-rates even lower, even after the introduction of summer schools in London (in 1893) and Manchester (in 1895) and regular classes at the London School of Economics held from 1902 until the outbreak of World War I.

1915 brought the call for the involvement of universities in the education of librarians by Adams (1915) in his report to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust which opened this paper, and this sentiment was echoed by Sidney Webb two years later, in a letter to the same organization: “In my view, the Library School ought to be part of a University institution; but then it ought to educate, and train in the best sense, cultivated Librarians, not juvenile assistants, who *merely* fetch and carry books. It ought to be open only to persons of 18 or 19 of fair secondary education; and it ought to provide a quite good undergraduate course of instruction in which the technical elements of Librarianship would play a part (but only a part)” [his italics] (letter of 25 June 1917 as cited in Munford 1976, 147–148). In this call, we can see the general unease Bramley (1981, 19) reports as being felt by some parts of the Library Association with regard to the general education of junior assistants. Indeed, the importance of “a broad general education (topics from other disciplines) as a significant component of the total educational programme for the library / information professional” (Smith, Hallam and Ghosh 2012) continues to be considered, and is enshrined in guidelines for educational programmes today.

In the USA, the impact of a university education of librarians on their status had been considered by Dewey when, in 1883, he first proposed that his library school be established at Columbia: “We hardly over-rate the importance of the proposed undertaking to the library interest of the entire country in raising our work to the full rank of a regular profession, with its recognized courses of instruction, its certificates and degrees conferred by the university” (Conference of Librarians 1883, 288). As Rayward puts it, “It is clear that what Dewey wanted above all was that the mantle of academic respectability be thrown upon education for librarianship” (Rayward 1968, 309). As Jackson has pointed out, although “it is in no sense a criterion of professionalism whether certification is incorporated within

a university framework ... it has been usual for aspirant professions to find incorporation within the structure of universities for their training” (Jackson 1970, 5).

The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust followed this usual route when in 1917 it called for “A technical training – based upon a sound preliminary course of general education” as “necessary to improve the status of the librarian, and to create a different attitude towards librarianship from that adopted today by those in whose power the financial prospects of the profession largely rest” (Carnegie United Kingdom Trust 1917, 18). After meetings with University College London, in 1918 proposals were drawn up by the Library Association for library schools across the country.

A grant of £1,500 a year for five years was given by the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust for the formation of a library school at University College London (UCL), governed by the university authorities and the Library Association, covering all the subjects on the Library Association syllabus, but resulting, after two years, in the award of a diploma from the University of London, the parent body that granted all UCL degrees at that time. The award of this separate qualification resulted in an intense backlash from practitioners, led by the Library Assistants Association, who feared a two-tier system of qualifications, in which the university diploma was “likely to carry more weight with library authorities (on account of the words ‘London University’ on it than that of the Library Association)” (Fry 1921, 108). From 1923, the diploma was not awarded until candidates had completed a year’s post-qualification experience. On the other hand, by 1925, obtaining the UCL diploma exempted students from the Library Association’s Sectional Certificates: the completion of a thesis admitted them to the Register of Chartered Librarians (Bramley 1981).

In this balance between the university education and the practical experience required of library school graduates, we can detect Wilensky’s (1964, 149) “intellectual and practical knowing” acquired through “a long training”. We can also see a *temporal* and *spatial* divide between the intellectual and the practical learning, with the former gained at university and the latter outside it; the university study coming first followed by the workplace experience.

Scholarly Discipline

As Noordegraaf (2011, 470) has discussed, “Education is generally seen as one of the major means for (re)making professionals, not only because it provides technical skills, but also because it socializes students into a professional field and teaches the social and moral sides of professional behavior”. As such, it is a fun-

damental role of professional associations, and, as outlined above, the Library Association saw itself as a *qualifying* association from the outset. Any move away from its monopoly on the examination of entrants to the library profession was bound to be seen by some members of the LA as undermining a primary *raison d'être*.

The tension between university and professional education is also fundamental. As Soffer (1987, 168) has described, early English universities (Oxford and Cambridge) “had deliberately created a closed community purposefully segregated from the outside world so that a ‘higher’ life could be assimilated and practised. Both the isolation and the emphasis upon a superior set of values persisted when the university became a secular, increasingly national institution”. Normally expressed in Britain as “liberal education” and in France as *culture générale*, we can hear its echoes in Webb’s (1917) assertion that a university-based library education “ought to educate, and train in the best sense, *cultivated* Librarians” [my italics]. University could, in other words, offer cultural capital as well as functional, explicit knowledge.

As co-founder of the London School of Economics, Webb had, of course, been involved in the strategic management of the LSE classes for the Library Association exams, and his perspective was fairly wide, as a founder and former chair of the London County Council Technical Education Board. Whereas J.S. Mill is quoted by Bramley (1981, 11) as being hostile to the concept of university evolving to be “a place of professional education”, Webb had a clear agenda to introduce university liberal education to the profession, and warned the Library Association against too narrow a curriculum: “If we are ever to attain the goal of a university course of study for librarians, with the opportunity of taking a degree, in which some recognition is given to the librarian’s special subjects ... we must provide for a much wider general culture” (Webb 1902, 201).

In Higher Education teaching today, we recognize that students may undertake deep learning, in which they engage with our teaching in a conceptual way, making links between different elements of our syllabus and forming connections in a way that transforms their understanding. Alternatively, students can undertake strategic learning, in which they engage with elements of the syllabus in a task-oriented way, in order to pass exams. As educators, it is our role to devise our teaching materials in such a way that deep learning is encouraged, motivating the student to look below the surface of the information with which we are presenting them, since too much strategic learning can result not in understanding and knowledge but memorization of a list of seemingly unrelated facts (Biggs 1999).

An emphasis on culture and cultivation can be seen to be an emphasis on deep learning. That is not to say that every “university man” of the pre-twenti-

eth century era can be said to have engaged deeply with *all* aspects of his university curriculum – but, certainly, the aims expressed by Mill and Webb and other educational thinkers of their era indicate a motivation on the part of higher education providers. The scientific knowledge of the university was intended to develop mastery of a scholarly discipline. If librarianship were to become such a field, more was required than the strategic learning that was tested in the Library Association exams.

However, it is not clear from the surviving records that the Library Association was approaching a university setting (first the LSE and then UCL) because it wished to found a scholarly discipline. Calls for university involvement centre on aspects of status – university is recognized as being appropriate for a “higher training in librarianship” because of the cultural capital associated with it. The Library Association felt competent to devise and administer a syllabus and exam. Yet, in the time that the LSE taught librarianship, we can see evidence of academe influencing the Library Association syllabus. Most notably, James Duff Brown’s lectures in Bibliography influenced the instructions to LA examiners on the marking of the Bibliography papers. In 1904, Duff Brown was appointed as one of the tutors for the Association’s correspondence course, and so his teaching influenced a wider range of students outside London.

Indeed, first at the LSE and then at UCL, we see not only the first UK cohort of university-educated librarians, but also the first generation of librarian university teachers. Prominent members of the profession were appointed. Duff Brown himself worked in Clerkenwell, and before teaching at LSE in 1902 had already published a *Handbook of Library Appliances* (1892), *Guide to the Formation of a Music Library* and a *Manual of Library Classification and Shelf Arrangement* (1898). His *Manual of Practical Bibliography* was published in 1906, along with the first edition of his *Subject Classification*, which went into three editions. His most successful work was his *Manual of Library Economy*, first published in 1903, and still bearing his name through seven subsequent editions, although edited by others after his death in 1914.

One of those others was W.C. Berwick Sayers of Croydon Public Library, whose own *Introduction to Library Classification* (first edition, 1918; 9th edition, 1958) and *Manual of Classification for Librarians and Bibliographers* (first edition, 1926; 5th edition revised by Arthur Maltby, 1975) were seminal for over half a century. Sayers is also credited with publishing the first manual for children’s librarianship, *The Children’s Library* (1912) and, twenty years later, *A Manual of Children’s Libraries* (1932). The UCL library school’s first Bibliography instructor, Arundell Esdaile, was a life-long member of staff at the British Museum Library, and his *Student’s Manual of Bibliography* (first edition, 1931; 4th edition revised by Roy Stokes, 1967) drew on his experience as a published bibliographer, and

remained the standard text until the publication of Gaskell’s *New Introduction to Bibliography* in 1972.

This first generation of UK library academics did not give up their work in libraries: teaching was an activity they undertook as part of their commitment to the profession – a commitment that was also reflected in their involvement with the professional associations. Sayers served as Secretary and later President of the Library Assistants Association and was responsible for the Classification element of the Library Association’s correspondence course from 1905. He became President of the LA in 1938. Other than his *Manual of Bibliography*, Esdaile is probably best known as editor of the *Library Association Record* for thirteen years, and for serving as LA President for six years (1939–1945) throughout the Second World War, a time which heralded great changes for library education in the UK.

Uneasy Co-existence

The tensions between the Library Association and the LSE when the exams were set by the LA were a small precursor of further tension between the LA and the library school at UCL. While on the one hand, universities offered not only status but also a theoretical foundation for librarianship as a discipline, there were ongoing doubts as to the need for *so much* academic education in a practical discipline. Fry’s (1921, 108) (in)famous charge, that the university was guilty of “representing ... the ton of theory without the ounce of practice” was only the first of many such accusations to dog library schools. In current times, the most vocal, though by no means the only, critic of overly theoretical teaching is Michael Gorman, born and trained in the UK before settling in the United States, and most famously editor of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* 2nd edition (AACR2). He asserts, “If you study the evolution of library education, you will see a long march from the early period of vocational education of the practical type; to a middle period of a worthwhile amalgam of professional and intellectual education; to the current period in which abstract theory, especially in areas only marginally related to librarianship dominates” (Gorman 2004, 100).

Certainly, in the 1920s and 1930s, and despite having been funded by money from the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, whose general mission was the improvement and sustenance of public libraries, UCL alumni found that their professional route forward was not, generally, to be employees of London local authority libraries. As Bramley (1981, 78–79) quotes L.A. Burgess as saying in 1936, “The theory that one can raise the standards of our profession by advising

local authorities to refrain from promoting their experienced and competent staff in order to fill all senior posts with highly trained and cultured, but practically inexperienced, graduates was, from the first, doomed to unpopularity and ridicule". Despite low employment rates (of 33–62.5%) in the year following library school in the 1930s (when the entire country was suffering a depression), from the first alumni generally went into posts in special libraries and information bureaus in London, or in public libraries in rural areas, where Chief Librarians tended to have less of a pool of trained staff from which to make appointments. Wood (1997, 10) highlights Baker's contribution to the conference which led to the formation of ASLIB in 1924, and in which the library school director reached out to colleagues in special libraries to establish their ongoing educational needs.

In any case, whether it was the campaign waged by the Association of Assistant Librarians; the storm over the propriety or otherwise of appointing as the UCL school's first director Ernest A. Baker, who had led the LA side of the negotiations with the university; Baker's openness to other emerging professional bodies; the school's production of employees for special libraries instead of London municipal libraries; or simply a change in the make-up of the Library Association Education Committee, the idea that Baker had championed within the LA of a network of university-based library schools across the country did not come to fruition.

In essence, the period from the end of World War I to the beginning of World War II saw three concurrent systems in place for the education of librarians:

- Library Association exams, for which study could be undertaken by correspondence, or at one of the summer schools that had grown up and continued to run, or at some of the larger libraries through in-house training schemes, or through independent study;
- Diploma of the University of London at the library school at UCL, which exempted students from the LA exams;
- Stand-alone training schemes that were neither affiliated to a university nor to the Library Association.

A good example of this third category is the Bodleian Library at Oxford. A highly developed training scheme for "boys" had been put in place by Edward Nicholson, Librarian 1882–1912, as a means to recruit cheap staff who could be trained for promotion in-house, and according to Craster (1952, 258) this continued until World War II.

It is important to note that there was no "big bang" moment at which the old apprenticeship system of training ended and was superseded by the LA examinations or by tertiary educational qualifications. There are today still occasional examples of senior librarians who have completed neither professional qualification (MA LIS or equivalent) nor chartership. In the School Library sector, adver-

tisements often require a library qualification *or* a teaching qualification (Markless et al. 2009, 1–24). The rise of technology in libraries has also given birth to a new class of library worker, skilled in systems development work, some of whom, having decided against undertaking a library qualification or chartership, are happy to self-identify as “shambrarians” (Koster 2012). We might observe that of these three routes, the first two remain unchanged, while the third, “stand-alone training schemes” has been replaced by libraries recruiting and promoting staff with skills that the library values, whether or not the staff member holds library qualifications.

Full-time Education

The period after World War II provided opportunities for the Library Association to think again about training schools across the country. The LA’s Emergency Committee (1940–1945, coinciding with Esdaile’s presidency mentioned above) published the McColvin Report (McColvin 1942), which made proposals for post-war reorganization of the public library system. Amongst other things, the report called for a system of progression in public libraries comparable with that used in schools (also governed by local authorities): “The equivalent to the “certification” which qualifies teachers for scale payment will be either Associateship of the L.A. as obtained under present conditions or as obtainable in future ... it is hoped that this will involve a two years’ course at a library training school. Graduation will bring the benefit for librarians, as for teachers, of an advanced increment” (McColvin 1942, 176). University was identified as the learning space best able to equip the new workforce: “We must, as soon as we can, require that professional entrants should have enjoyed the educational, cultural and personal advantages of attendance at a university ... The graduate desirous of entering a library would pass to a library school immediately upon graduation. There he would take a two-year course after which he would start his library career, being placed on the professional scale and awarded the increments due for his qualifications” (McColvin 1942, 177).

Of course, the changes suggested were happening in an era in which conscripted men were returning from war, and the government was keen that they should find employment, backing this up with Further Education and Training Grants from the Ministry of Labour. At the same time, libraries had been staffed throughout the war by those who had not been conscripted, and women had occupied relatively senior roles in the absence of male colleagues. This is not the place for a full discussion of the gender balance in UK libraries, but it is worth

noting in passing that McColvin (1942, 179) called for the implementation of the “basic principle of equal pay for equal work”. The post-war library workforce consisted of those who had not been conscripted (male and female) who had worked in libraries during the war; returning servicemen whose library career had been interrupted by war-time service, and those who were new to librarianship entirely. In terms of both financial opportunity and workforce motivation, the McColvin Report was well-timed.

Negotiations between the Library Association and various universities and bodies representing universities did not bear fruit. The old issues over who should set the examinations was a major block, and in the end, library schools were set up in 1946 in colleges and institutions of further education: Brighton Technical College (opened in 1947); City of London College; Glasgow and West of Scotland College of Commerce (the Scottish School of Librarianship); Leeds College of Commerce; Loughborough College; Manchester College of Science and Technology; and Newcastle-upon-Tyne Municipal College of Commerce (opened in 1947). The “1946 library schools” were joined in 1949 by Spring Grove Polytechnic, Isleworth and in 1950 by Birmingham College of Commerce.

These library schools all prepared students for the Library Association examinations. As Grogan has put it, “Not only were the teachers allowed no say over the syllabus, they were also specifically excluded from any part in the setting or marking of the examinations used to assess their students”. For those of us teaching today, in an environment in which constructive alignment between syllabus and assessment is advocated as important for effective education, this situation seems intolerable. Banned from sitting on the LA Education Committee, the heads of the schools formed the Schools of Librarianship Committee in 1952, as a forum in which they could discuss common interests.

Meanwhile, ASLIB was growing in size and began to make representations to the Library Association that they should widen their syllabus to accommodate the educational needs of special libraries. A joint Library Association/ASLIB syllabus committee was established in 1954, which again excluded the library schools. Only after this syllabus was rejected by LA members were the schools allowed representation on the Association’s Syllabus Subcommittee of 1957.

The resulting 1964 syllabus was accompanied by the proposal that the normal mode of study should be full-time. The move from part-time to full-time study resulted in some assistants not being able to complete qualifications. The City and Guild’s Library Assistant’s Certificate was introduced in 1967 in an attempt to provide some training for junior staff, but, despite its popularity, a major flaw remained that, post-1964, it was not possible in public libraries to progress from it to a professional level: the full-time qualification was required (Russell 1985). On top of this, a list of duties suitable for professional and non-professional staff had

been published (Library Association 1962), which contributed to a debate that continues today regarding the differences between library assistants and assistant librarians.

A Graduate Profession

The existence of other library schools, most notably the one nearby at City of London College, enabled UCL to focus on postgraduate education. Alumni were required only to take the Final Part III Literature paper of the Library Association examinations. After this, they were entitled to apply to be Fellows of the Library Association (FLA). Fry’s (1921, 108) “two-tier system” had come into being: alumni of the newer schools, assessed using the Library Association’s own exams, were Associates (ALA), required to take the Literature paper and the other three Final Examinations to become Fellows.

It was not until the changes of the 1960s that UCL was joined by other degree-awarding bodies. One driver for change came from within the Library Association itself, which decided to allow “internal examining” of the exams at library schools who met certain criteria. This was significant as the start of accreditation of library school courses in the way that we understand it in the UK today.

One of the criteria to qualify for internal examining was that the library school should have degree-awarding status, either independently, or at least with “direct access to the principal officer (or board)” (Library Association Education Committee 1964). This was, clearly, a limitation for some of the library schools, but the establishment of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) in 1964, empowered by Royal Charter to award degrees, offered new opportunities. Its Librarianship Board was established in 1966, and the first degree course was approved the following year at Newcastle. Leeds, Birmingham and the North Western Polytechnic in London were approved in 1968, with the London qualification being an honours degree. Alumni of each of these courses were exempted by the Library Association from its exams (Wood, 1997).

After having missed out on an opportunity in 1946, when a library school had been suggested at Cardiff, the College of Librarianship Wales was established in 1964 in Aberystwyth, the home of the National Library of Wales, and site of summer schools 1917–1925. Alongside Leeds, North Western Polytechnic, London and Birmingham, it was one of the first to gain the rights for internal examining of the LA Part I (Intermediate) paper, and, through entering into an arrangement with the University of Wales was able to offer a joint honours degree. In North-

ern Ireland, the Queen's University Belfast School of Library Studies opened in 1965, after negotiations with the Library Association regarding exemptions from LA exams since 1963. It is worth noting in passing that Eire already had a library school, established at University College Dublin in 1927, with courses led by academic faculty and library staff (Brown 2009).

Meanwhile, England's second university library school was opened in 1963 after discussions between the Librarians of Leeds University and Sheffield University and a working party organized by Sheffield University (Bramley 1981, 179). Like UCL, it had control over its curriculum, with the same exemptions for Library Association exams. The health and diversity of opportunity of UK library education were greatly enhanced by Sheffield's progressive attitude to its new postgraduate courses: "We could think our syllabus through from first principles, the only predetermined factor in the pattern being that special consideration should be given to supplementing our courses for the more traditional types of library work, by special provision for science and technology graduates wishing to prepare for scientific and industrial information work" (Saunders 1965, 170).

Arguably one of the strengths of LIS education in the UK is the different emphases of the focus of each of the courses. Today, each of the library schools accredited by CILIP has different strengths: Sheffield had maintained its reputation for technology, including MSc courses in Information Systems, Digital Library Management and Health Informatics, while UCL remains very traditional, still focusing on Cataloguing and Classification and still offering options in Bibliography and Services to Children and Young People. Aberystwyth, the first of the library schools to take up distance learning, continues to offer online courses, including some undergraduate and some second-level Masters (for those already holding qualifications in Information Studies). Northumbria also specializes in distance learning. Newer institutions that have been accredited recently indicate the wide scope of the discipline and the job market: Cranfield University offers MSc/PG Diploma Information Capability Management; King's College London offers MA Digital Asset and Media Management; and Glyndŵr University in Wrexham offers not only a BSc (Hons) but also a Foundation Science qualification in Library and Information Practice. For students wishing to study overseas (or for overseas students wishing to proceed to charter with CILIP), Cologne University of Applied Sciences offers postgraduate and undergraduate qualifications (with teaching in German and English), and UCL Qatar offers an MA (with teaching in English), modelled on, but distinct from the course offered in London (CILIP 2014).

Core Skills

With such diversity in education, it would be fair to ask what are the core skills that link the offerings. In redesigning its Chartership and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) schemes, CILIP has led the way in establishing these. The current scheme, launched in 2013, is the Professional Knowledge and Skills Base (PKSB). A strength of this scheme and its predecessor, the Framework of Qualifications launched in 2005, is practitioner consultation and involvement (CILIP 2013b, 1). As well as providing a framework for skills assessment, and documenting the wide range of skills sought by employers in the sector, it forms the backbone of Chartership and re-validation in which CILIP members engage and is “used to assess which academic and vocational qualification are directly relevant to the profession” (CILIP 2013b, 1).

Information professionals are not expected to have expertise in every single area of the PKSB at point of career entry, but they should have an awareness of the breadth of their profession, and, certainly, they should be able to demonstrate the core ethics and values that forms the centre of the “PKSB Wheel”, a diagram that outlines the headings. The ring of qualities surrounding core ethics and values are “professional expertise and generic skills” including organizing knowledge and information; knowledge and information management; using and exploiting knowledge and information; research skills; information governance and compliance; records management and archiving; collection management and development; literacy and learning; leadership and advocacy; strategy planning and management; customer focus, service design and marketing; IT and communication. These are surrounded by the “wider library, information and knowledge sector context”, which is itself surrounded by the “wider organization and environmental context” (CILIP 2013b, 2).

Part of the documentation that library schools provide to the CILIP Accreditation Panel is a mapping of each of their course modules to the PKSB, and part of the discussion with the panel concerns this mapping. This is more than an administrative or background tool. If students are to progress from library school to become chartered librarians, it is, of course, helpful for their learning to have a narrative arc that is similar to the narrative arc that their chartership and CPD will take. It is early days for the PKSB, but it is perhaps the case that we now have achieved an equitable balance between our main professional association and our library schools: academics are able to structure the curriculum in a way that incorporates the core skills that the professional association has identified. In this way, it is to be hoped that those wishing to enter the profession have an educational path in which they benefit not only from the academic status of the university, but also from career academics’ skills in curriculum design and

constructive alignment between course and examinations, as well as in catering for the learning styles of different students. Crucially, the curriculum has at its core the needs of the professional association, and through it practitioners and employers.

Education in the UK is healthy, but it is not Nirvana. The concerns of the Library Advisory Councils for England and for Wales in the 1960s regarding supply and demand have not been addressed: in a higher education setting, there will always be a potential over-supply of qualified candidates, so that some will gain a vocational qualification that they are not able to use immediately. Following the Browne Report (Browne 2010), the cap on tuition fees for students in England and Wales rose from £3,290 to £9,000. This means that students are acquiring £20,000–£30,000 in fees alone during their undergraduate degree, and then face a further £6,000–£9,000 increase in debt to obtain their postgraduate qualification. Reduction in student numbers is, therefore, a threat to departments, while the cost of library education is a deterrent to students' taking the qualification as soon as they are ready. The ladder from paraprofessional status to professional status is hard for some individuals to climb.

Nevertheless, the importance of university education to many practising remains: beyond the MA LIS, many school and academic librarians return for postgraduate qualifications in teaching to assist in their roles within Information Literacy, while others take advanced courses in Information Science. Information Studies has come of age, both as a profession and as an academic discipline. In Jarausch's (2004, 367) words in the title of this paper, it displays "Expertise ... certification ... [and] cultural capital", three important elements of professional education.

References

- Adams, W.G.S. 1915. *A Report on the Library Provision and Policy to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust*. London: CUKT.
- ASLIB. 2011. "History of ASLIB." Available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20111216172032/http://www.aslib.com/about/history.htm>. Accessed on 21 January 2016.
- Biggs, John. 1999. "What the Student Does: Teaching for Enhanced Learning." *Higher Education Research and Development* 18(1): 57–75.
- Bramley, Gerald. 1981. *Apprentice to Graduate: A History of Library Education in the United Kingdom*. London: Clive Bingley.
- Broady-Preston, Judith. 2006. "CILIP: a twenty-first century association for the information profession?" *Library Management* 27(1/2): 48–65.
- Brown, Barbara Traxler. 2009. "Towards 100 years of LIS education and research at UCD." *Aslib Proceedings* 61(3): 282–301.

- Browne, John. 2010. “Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education: An Independent Review of Higher Education Funding & Student Finance. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills”, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-browne-report-higher-education-funding-and-student-finance>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Burrage, Michael. 1984. “Practitioners, Professors and the State in France, the USA and England.” In *Education for the Professions: Quis Custodiet?* ed. Sinclair Goodland, 26–38. Guildford: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Carnegie United Kingdom Trust. 1917. *Third Annual Report of Trustees*. London: CUKT.
- Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP). 2013a. “Courses in Library and Information Studies Currently Accredited by CILIP.” <http://www.cilip.org.uk/cilip/jobs-careers/qualifications/accreditation/pages/default.aspx>. Page no longer available on 12 July 2014.
- Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals CILIP. 2013b. *Your Professional Knowledge and Skills Base: Identify Gaps and Maximise Opportunities Along Your Career Path*. London: CILIP.
- Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals CILIP. 2014. “CILIP Accredited Qualifications.” <http://www.cilip.org.uk/cilip/jobs-careers/starting-library-and-information-career/how-become-librarian-or-information>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Clement, Richard W. 1991. “Librarianship and polemics: The Career of Thomas James (1572–1629).” *Libraries & Culture* 26(2): 269–282.
- Conference of Librarians. 1883. “Conference of Librarians, Buffalo, August 1883: The proceedings.” *Library Journal* 8: 287.
- Craster, Edmund. 1952. *History of the Bodleian Library, 1845–1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dada, Bose and Jill Colbert. 2014. “January to May 2014 Management and Membership Report.” <http://www.cilip.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Finance%20and%20membership%20report%208%20July%202014.pdf>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Dalton, Peter and Kate Levinson. 2001. “An Investigation of LIS Qualifications Throughout the World.” *SET Bulletin* 2(1): 12–24. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Davies, Karen. 2008. “Job Hunting in the UK Using the Internet: Finding Your Next Information Professional Role in the Health Care Sector and the Skills Employers Require.” *Health Information and Libraries Journal* 25: 106–115.
- Forth, John, Alex Bryson, Amy Humphris, Maria Koumenta and Morris Kleiner. 2011. *A Review of Occupational Regulation and its Impact: UK Commission for Employment and Skills Evidence Report 40*. London: UKCES.
- Fry, W.G. 1921. “Presidential address to the North Western Branch of the Library Assistants Association, held at the John Rylands Library, October 8th 1920.” *The Library Assistant* 15(270): 108.
- Gorman, Michael. 2004. *The Concise AACR2*. London: Facet Publishing.
- Grogan, Denis J. 2007. “Education for Librarianship: Some Persistent Issues.” *Education for Information* 25: 5–26.
- Hall, Richard H. 1968. “Professionalization and Bureaucratization.” *American Sociological Review* 33(1): 92–104.
- Harper, Ray. 2012. “The Collection and Analysis of Job Advertisements: A Review of Research Methodology.” *Library and Information Research* 36(112): 29–26.
- Henczel, Susan. 2013. “Professionalism: exploring the role and responsibility of our professional associations.” Paper presented at the LIANZA Conference, 20–23 October, Hamilton, New Zealand, <http://www.lianza.org.nz/sites/default/files/>

- Sue%20Henczel%20-%20Professionalism%20Exploring%20the%20role%20and%20responsibilities%20of%20professional%20associations.pdf. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- IFLA. 2015. "About IFLA". <http://www.ifla.org/about>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Jackson, John A. 1970. "Editorial Introduction." In *Professions and Professionalization*, edited by John A. Jackson, 3–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaraus, Konrad H. 2004. "Graduation and Careers." In *A History of the University in Europe. Volume III. Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945)*, edited by Walter Rüegg, 363–389. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koster, Lukas. 2012. "I, Shambrarian." *LIS New Professional's Toolkit*. <http://lisnewprofs.com/i-shambrarian/>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Library Association. 1962. *Professional and Non-professional Duties*. London: Library Association.
- Library Association Education Committee. 1964. "Report of the LA Subcommittee [on] Internal Examining." *Library Association Record* 67(6): 203.
- Markless, Sharon, Elizabeth Bentley, Sarah Pavey, Sue Shaper, Sally Todd and Carol Webb. 2009. *The Innovative School Librarian*. London: Facet.
- McColvin, Lionel Roy. 1942. *The Public Library System of Great Britain: A Report on Its Present Condition with Proposals for Post-War Reorganization*. London: Library Association.
- Miksa, Francis L. 1988. "The Columbia School of Library Economy, 1887–1888." *Libraries & Culture* 23(3): 249–280.
- Millerson, Geoffrey. 1964. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Minter, Catherine. 2013. "Academic Library Reform and the Ideal of the Librarian in England, France and Germany in the Long Nineteenth Century." *Library & Information History* 29(1): 19–37.
- Mitchell, Sydney B. 1950. "The Pioneer Library School in Middle Age." *Library Quarterly* 20(4): 272–288.
- Munford, William Arthur. 1976. *A History of the Library Association, 1877–1977*. London: Library Association.
- Newgass, Oriole. 2010. "A Candle in the Wind or a Beacon for the Future? Professional Associations – Facing an Uncertain Future?" *Business Information Review* 27: 112–117.
- Noordegraaf, Mirko. 2011. "Remaking Professionals?: How Associations and Professional Education Connect Professionalism and Organizations." *Current Sociology* 59: 465.
- Orme, Verity. 2008. "You will be – : A Study of Job Advertisements to Determine Employers' Requirements for LIS Professionals in the UK in 2007." *Library Review* 57(8): 619–633.
- Rayward, W. Boyd. 1968. "Melvil Dewey and Education for Librarianship." *Journal of Library History* 3(4): 297–312.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon. 1983. "The Diversification of Higher Education in England." In *The Transformation of Higher Learning*, edited by Konrad Jaraus, 131–148. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Russell, Norman J. 1985. "Professional and Non-professional in Libraries: The Need for a New Relationship." *Journal of Information Science* 17: 293–310.
- Saunders, Wilf L. 1965. "Inside the Library Schools 6: Postgraduate Education in Librarianship in the University of Sheffield." *Library World* 67(786): 170.
- Smith, Kerry, Gillian Hallam, and S.B. Ghosh on behalf of the Education and Training Section of the International Federation of Library Associations. 2012. "Guidelines for Professional

- Library Educational Programs.” <http://www.ifla.org/publications/guidelines-for-professional-libraryinformation-educational-programs-2012>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Soffer, Reba N. 1987. “The Modern University and National Values, 1850–1930.” *Historical Research* 60(142): 166–187.
- Stationers’ Company. 2016. “About Us.” <http://www.stationers.org/about.html>. Accessed on 11 January 2016.
- Sturges, Paul. 2003. “Doing the Right Thing: Professional Ethics for Information Workers in Britain.” *New Library World* 104(3): 94–102.
- Tamkin, Penny; Linda Mitler, Joy Williamson and Paul Casey. 2013. *Understanding Occupational Regulation: UK Commission for Employment and Skills Evidence Report 67*. London: UKCES.
- Watson, Tony. 2002. “Professions and Professionalism: Should we Jump off the Bandwagon, Better to Study where it is Going?” *International Studies of Management & Organization* 32(2): 93–105.
- Webb, Sydney. 1902. “The Library Service of London: Its Coordination, Development and Education.” *Library Association Record* 4: 201.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. “The Professionalization of Everyone?” *American Journal of Sociology* 70(2): 137–158.
- Wood, Kate. 1997. “Professional Education: Historical Overview.” In *The Education of Library and Information Professionals in the United Kingdom*, edited by Judith Elkin and Tom Wilson, 1–30. London: Mansell.