The Librarian–Scholar in "General Reference *Wonderland*": A Concurrent Career Academic Librarian's Journey to Keeping Her Scholarly Identity

Melissa Ursula Dawn Goldsmith, Nicholls State University

Many academic library reference position postings require candidates to have expertise in a field outside of library and information science. Some potential academic librarians go beyond these requirements, pursuing concurrent careers as librarian–scholars. They balance their librarian duties with a pursuit of scholarship in both librarianship and their secondary area to increase interest in libraries while contributing to the prestige of their institution; however, attitudes towards librarian–scholars within the library, within the institution, and within the profession are not always welcoming, open–minded, or even trusting.

Down the Rabbit Hole, or The Incredible Shrinking Music Librarian Position

Having followed the elusive advanced degree into the hole that academia can sometimes be, I pause to ask, did all the years in educational programs—those semesters of feeding my head and laboring enthusiastically at research, writing, and publishing in my areas of expertise—set me up for a bad trip? As a musicologist with a PhD, and as a librarian with an MLIS and a certificate in advanced studies (CLIS), I found myself after graduation in a perplexing position search that lasted over four years. I now ponder the many factors affecting that search. For example, though I was willing to make either near or far geographic moves to a new workplace, my position search was hindered as it took place during catastrophic events in U.S. history: it began just before 9/11, and it ended about a year after the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. I consider the learning curve, too. For example, I understood that most academic libraries request résumés, whereas most academic departments and fellowships request curriculum vitae

(c.v.), and I appreciated that all application materials must be written specifically for each position.

During the entire search, I dutifully hit the pavement running by writing book reviews and articles. Most were both library and music related—a large bibliographic essay on film music for *Choice* and a discographic essay on lounge music for *Notes* (the journal of the Music Library Association). I also dutifully presented papers at conferences at every level, from local to international, and was an active member of committees in national organizations. During my academic career, leading up to graduation, I dutifully worked for twelve years in libraries while working for at least seven years as a teaching and research graduate assistant. None of this experience helped to make me an attractive enough candidate to be granted an interview for a library position. When the position search became increasingly problematic, I networked more than ever, consulted my alma mater's career development office, and polished my application materials. But in those four years, I was asked for just two interviews, neither in academic librarianship.

My impression of such position search issues may seem surprising, given the emphasis on second advanced degrees in academic librarian searches. But I was left with no choice but to believe that my multiple degrees and perhaps even a publishing record worked against me. Likewise, I believe that my student work in libraries and my library degrees worked against me in my search for academic positions outside of librarianship, specifically in music departments. While at first glance these observations seem to be sweeping generalizations or speculation, they were confirmed several times in follow–up discussions with other librarians I met while applying for positions and while participating in interviews at conferences. The tell–tale comment came from a library director who said that she did not think highly of librarians with PhDs (though my

application materials clearly listed the CLIS and MLIS). Apparently, she was not alone in this attitude: Todd Gilman, Librarian (and Professor) for Literature in English at Yale University's Sterling Memorial Library, in "Subject Experts Need Not Apply," (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*) addressed the problem of libraries keeping potential candidates with master's and doctoral degrees in the humanities "out of the running."[1] In my own experience, I have seen less qualified candidates obtain positions for which I applied, and like Gilman, I know people who are now in the same situation I faced during my position search. My situation had some similarities to that of the English PhD with an MLIS mentioned in Gilman's final account. I was not a PhD looking for a library position in order to obtain job security; like the English PhD Gilman mentions, I had the necessary library degrees and had enough work experience to understand fully that librarians need specialized education and training to do what they do best.

The Mad Hatter's Parties: "I'll Never Go There Again"

Gilman hints at who he believes is to blame for that particular candidate's having to send almost 200 applications before she attained a position:

> While some people may assume that the fault lies mainly with the applicant—that she was selling herself too much as a scholar, not enough as a librarian, and finally succeeded because she figured that out—other culprits are not hard to find, in light of the recent job postings we are seeing.[2]

Gilman positions scholar versus librarian, suggesting that for librarians there may be such a thing as too much scholarship. Thinking back, I should have clued in to the practice of librarians at my own degree–granting institution: those with doctoral degrees did not have their PhDs or other post–master's degrees listed in the catalog—or on their business cards for that matter. That the candidate figured out not to sell herself "too much as a scholar" so she could obtain a

professional position demonstrates clearly how some academic librarians have doubts about librarian–scholars who apply for jobs.[3]

An opinion piece that appeared recently in *American Libraries* demonstrates another negative attitude towards the librarian–scholar, in the guise of questioning the necessity of a second graduate degree. Here, Katelyn Angell ponders financial issues that librarians without secondary graduate degrees face when pursuing more education. She also considers her own experience as a graduate of prestigious Wesleyan University, having completed an honors thesis in psychology with substantial research experience. She complains that despite her academic background she would find it difficult to attain a specialist position in psychology (some readers may react by thinking, of course she is complaining—she does not have the secondary graduate degree). A caption by her picture reads, "Requiring a person to have a subject–specific MA or PhD in addition to an MLIS is inflexible and even unrealistic."[4] I always thought librarians received a good dose of "law of least effort" in graduate school. Apparently, this declaration does not hold true when it comes to necessary additional degree(s), which would enable librarians to conduct research and write in that field and to work further with academic faculty (beyond an excellent undergraduate preparation) not only during graduate school but afterwards. Reading further, Angell does suggest that one resolution would be for a university library to hire someone without the secondary degree for the specialist position "with the clarified stipulation that the employee must receive a (free) subject master's from the university in a fixed amount of time."[5] This suggestion belies the caption's message that appeared next to her picture and her earlier arguments. The fact that the magazine of the American Library Association published this piece does not bode well for MLIS recipients with secondary graduate degrees searching for

employment or for librarian–scholars who possess promise in doing important work not only in library and information science but also in another academic field.

Unfortunately, very little has been published about how academic librarians view librarian–scholar applicants; however, there is a large body of literature that focuses on how academic faculty perceive librarians. These articles often suggest that in order for library faculty to be taken seriously by teaching faculty, they should pursue either additional graduate work and/or have a rigorous motivation for writing and publishing. Talk about a rock and a hard place. I read several of these articles while earning my MLIS, but I always held my colleagues in musicology in high esteem—surely, I thought, they would know better than to view the MLIS as a kind of downgrading of my PhD. After all, I determined that my library and information science studies would be as relevant to my musicology studies as possible, and I knew of very few other fields of scholarship that valued source studies more than musicology. In point of fact, one of my musicology general exams, a partial requirement towards the doctoral degree, tested my knowledge of music resources as well as how to think about them critically. Nonetheless, during several position interviews at conferences for musicology positions, music scholars repeatedly asked for clarification regarding my more library–related activities. For example, they wondered why I presented at an international symposium on electronic theses and dissertations (perhaps disregarding the title I supplied that explained I focused on music, particularly musicology theses and dissertations) or why I wrote book reviews for *Choice*. They did not understand what it meant to be inducted as a member of Beta Phi Mu, the international library and information science honor society. At one interview I was asked, "if you were interested in a teaching position in musicology, why did you work in libraries for such a long period of time?" I had to remind the interviewer not only that I held a graduate assistantship that involved teaching

concurrently with my library graduate assistantship, but also that librarianship had a public side to it that involved teaching.

In those four years I spent applying for various positions as well as humanities fellowships in musicology, I applied for positions in academic music libraries. My understanding was that whether I became an assistant professor of music or a music librarian, I would be happy combining my research and writing expertise with teaching, collection development, cataloging, and public service or liaison work. Writing and rewriting cover letters, c.v.s, and résumés according to position postings, I spent the four years chasing rabbits: some did not really know what they wanted; others doubted my versatility and probably faulted me for being unfocused; some did not want a colleague who published several articles and reviews before her first appointment in a tenured position; many assumed I would find employment somewhere else; and a few were merely curious about the applicant pool out there. By the end of this period, I came to realize that I needed to broaden my position search further. Eventually, I applied for a position not as a music librarian but as a reference librarian. Though my search differed from what I was doing before, I kept true to myself by keeping my publications on my résumé and c.v. I also described my research interests. After finally being hired, I became a librarian–scholar in "General Reference *Wonderland*." What I have discovered there follows here.

Change Places, or Exploring the Fantastic World of General Reference

My position was obviously not my first encounter with general reference. To a musicologist who is also a librarian, this wonderful underworld with its mixture of current and historical atlases, books of quotations, various dictionaries and encyclopedias, grant writing sources, and format manuals makes my researcher's heart sing. Unlike in a music library, the sources at one's fingertips are not limited to a particular field; they are far reaching. More

importantly, the general reference position enables librarian–scholars to learn about interests of a diversity of colleagues and scholars, and about the fields of other librarian–scholars. In my case, I was encouraged to diversify and expand my interests, which in turn increased my interdisciplinary scholarship. Additionally, since many general reference librarians are involved with information literacy or research education, the general reference librarian–scholar finds herself teaching classes to library users and students who are extremely diverse, leading to intellectual exchanges beyond discipline borders and boundaries, dialogues with other librarians, teaching faculty, staff, students, and members of the community.

I also discovered that being a general reference librarian fostered my scholarship by helping me with access to materials. Because the librarian *is* the library, there are reduced opportunities for miscommunication when procuring sources and resources, through collection development or interlibrary borrowing departments. In many ways, the librarian–scholar in general reference has better access to materials for courses they teach or for their own research than do teaching faculty. For starters, the ergonomics of general reference make research easy and efficient, since so many resources reside close to the librarian's fingertips. Although far from quiet during the day, an academic librarian's office space during downtime offers more quiet for research than any other spot on campus. (This is especially true of music departments, which often have faculty offices adjacent to practice rooms.) Often librarian–scholars also have better access to space for hosting meetings, organizing events, creating displays, or teaching classes than do teaching faculty. Outreach opportunities allow librarian–scholars a network in which to share their research and teaching. There is also a stark contrast in teaching possibilities: With a position in musicology, I would have likely had opportunities to teach an occasional cross–listed course, compared to the greater number of opportunities I have had to serve as an invited lecturer

of music for a far greater variety of courses as a librarian with a PhD in musicology. These courses included English (The Blues Idiom in Literature), art history, and mass communications (Public Speaking).

"Feed Your Head," The Doormouse Said: More Literature about the Librarian–Scholar

The phrase librarian–scholar is an umbrella term, a large mushroom that canopies librarians of various backgrounds who also happen to be established scholars. Despite attitudes towards librarian–scholars mentioned earlier in this article, the term describing them is neither a new nor an emerging one. An early description of the librarian as scholar is mentioned in passing in Ernest Hatch Wilkins's 1934 article "The Librarian as Colleague," which gives the perspective of a college administrator. Wilkins's idea of librarian–scholar stresses teaching and remaining interested in fields outside of library and information science:

> There is a sense, also, in which the librarian acts as colleague in so far as he is teacher or scholar. . . . The possibility that the librarian as teacher may well serve not only in the fields which are commonly regarded as his own—the use of books, bibliography, the history of the book—but also in the field of his own special scholarly interest, if he has such an interest in any departmental field, and in the teaching and perhaps in the organization of general co–operative courses, such as the survey courses now given in many institutions, or special co–operative courses, such as the Survey of the Renaissance, formerly given in the University of Chicago.[6]

A 1977 issue of *American Libraries* had an interview with David Kranzler, who at the time was head of the Social Sciences Department at Queensborough Community College Library, City University of New York. Kranzler earned his PhD at Yeshiva University and had a library degree from Columbia University. Kranzler's dissertation was about the 18,000 Jews who found a home

in Shanghai as an escape from the Holocaust. He demonstrated how his library education and experience helped him with research on a project that began with interviews and involved documentary sources.[7]

Too often, the descriptor ("scholar–librarian" or "librarian–scholar") is associated only with librarians with PhDs, when obviously it is not necessary for the librarian to have a doctorate. Many librarians stop with an MLIS and a master's in another field. They have publishing and presenting achievements that are at least tantamount to (if not more impressive than) some scholars with doctoral degrees. While having a doctorate certainly affected my own journey in attaining a position as a reference librarian, the advice and observations here apply to all librarian–scholars, with diverse educational backgrounds.

Several writers have already offered a glimpse into the life of a librarian–scholar and the benefits of having someone with a scholarly identity as a library faculty member. Gilman has written many articles for an audience beyond that of solely librarians. Originally written for the "First Person" column of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, they include "Becoming a Librarian," "Suspicious Minds," "Putting Your PhD to Work in the Library," and his best known article, "A Matter of Degrees." Gilman's focus is on the librarian with a PhD, and he often offers advice for the position application process, with résumé *versus* c.v. writing, and on how to conduct oneself during the application process. In "Becoming a Librarian," Gilman describes his experience of arriving at the decision to work at a library after earning his PhD. He recalls his frustrations with an impacted job market and rejection, grading students, the low pay and ineligibility for benefits, and no foreseeable opportunity to teach upper level courses. But he loved teaching students about the research process, and he enjoyed his previous work in the library as a graduate student.[8] As a follow–up, his "Putting Your PhD to Work in the Library"

addresses the many who contacted him who had experiences that were similar to his own and those who wanted more information about attaining library positions. His advice focuses on obtaining initial contacts, turning the c.v. into a librarian's résumé, and writing cover letters for pre–professional positions.[9] In "A Matter of Degrees" Gilman cautiously advocates that PhDs earn their library degrees and again stresses his belief that "academic librarianship is a great career alternative for many humanities PhDs who choose not to teach."[10] He addresses the problem of hiring too many librarians with PhDs if they forgo obtaining library science degrees. Administration may be enamored by increasing their percentages of PhDs on campus since the practice promises improved nationals rankings, but, according to Gilman, they could create a glass ceiling for librarians with master's degrees in library science.[11]

Other potential problems exist. Many scholars (regardless of having the PhD) attracted to finding employment at the library soon discover that while they offer expertise in their subject area and enjoy collection development and interacting with faculty members in their fields, they learn they are less suited for other aspects of library work. For instance, they realize they dislike cataloging and troubleshooting, and thus the work piles up. Since these scholars have not cut their teeth on the American Library Association's *Code of Library Ethics* or have gone through the thought processes and practices of exploring them, some (with or without knowing it) bungle their responsibilities. In "Suspicious Minds" Gilman gives attention to librarians who "were less than thrilled with his encouragement" for PhDs to explore the possibilities of library careers.[12] Here he discusses the resistance librarians with PhDs face as well as his own experiences (for example, a department head at a research library explained to his class that someone with a PhD has merely "plodded along long enough to get the degree").[13] Rather than offering suggestions for encountering this kind of resistance, Gilman accepts this reality and returns to giving advice

for PhDs looking for library positions. Although he brings to light some of the trust issues that take place between library faculty with and without PhDs, the scope of his article falls short of giving attention to librarians without PhDs who have become experienced scholars and writers in their fields, or to librarians with both the PhD and the master's degree in library science for that matter. Three years later, Gilman finally addresses this resistance to such applicants in his article "Subject Experts Need Not Apply."

In the field of library and information science there have been discussions about feral professionals, those without library degrees who now staff the library and often for less pay take the place of librarians with the master's in library science. Some have master's degrees in other fields, while others have PhDs. According to James G. Neal, filling these positions this way as well as offering streamlined programs for the master's degree have placed the library master's degree in question, a concern that echoes Gilman's glass ceiling.[14] The problem with this fear is that it seems to lead to situations in which listing other advanced degrees alongside the MLIS on the c.v. somehow triggers questions about (and even hostility towards) the candidate. This kind of transference ignores the reality that in academic libraries, librarians must specialize in at least one secondary field in order to serve as a liaison. It also fosters the false dichotomy that the librarian needs to decide to be either a librarian or a scholar. Fear of librarians with secondary advanced degrees also hurts the teaching mission of the academic library. According to Peter Macauley, current and future librarians, regardless of their education level, will need to develop a higher level of information literacy, one that reaches beyond accessing or assisting in accessing materials, but gravitates towards "higher order information literacy [which] involves critical analysis, interpretation, repackaging and value adding."[15] Macauley stresses that "to move forward, the profession needs more research, development, and collaborative publishing to

become a more visible and valued profession."[16] Two of his observations about librarians with doctorates could also be applied to established librarian–scholars: their high quality research and writing talents would be recognized by their peers; they bring to their libraries and institutions their research expertise and are capable of creating new knowledge.[17]

Stealing Tarts?: Some Issues and Problems of Librarian–Scholars

From the very beginning of the librarian–scholar's interest in finding a position at a library, there were job market issues. How does a librarian–scholar create a convincing résumé or c.v.? How can they avoid being written off since people could assume they are not serious or they want a "fall–back position?" How can they avoid being written off by others who want to greet their applications instantly with the notion that they are sure to find a position with their credentials somewhere else?

The librarian–scholar must often face the Queen of Hearts, a not–so–nice card in the deck, who represents librarians who may not be concerned about writing and research, and who are focused on spur–of–the–moment access and information getting, not on critical thinking or forwarding the field through research. Trust issues exist, and as likely as not the Queen will shout "off with her head." And when Alice declares to the Queen that her views represent a house of cards, the deck flies up through the air. Even if Alice the librarian–scholar manages to grow in size and convince fellow librarians that she is first and foremost a front line soldier, she may have to inhabit and face another house of cards: the way scholars in other disciplines view librarians. I remember the day a fellow musicology student suggested that members of the music faculty wondered if I was taking their program for granted because I was working on both degrees concurrently. It was difficult for me to see my program of study as a devious plan. First,

musicology program requirements were (and are) not easy. Second, and more important, I was always mindful about how my musicology education dovetailed with my library and information science education. Third, I appreciated how both were helpful to my research and writing. I loved my field, and what librarians and libraries stand for, and teaching, research, and writing. I had to wonder why such identity issues intertwined with trust issues.

Some answers exist in the literature about the history of how teaching faculty view librarians in the United States. For example, Princeton's University Librarian William Sheperd Dix in the early to mid twentieth century was considered the most eminent "scholar–librarian." On one hand, Dix succeeded in promoting academic librarianship as a career; he also chaired the American Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee and took on many leadership roles in the Association of Research Libraries. On the other hand, he may have directly and indirectly contributed to that stereotype of scholar–librarian, who prioritized his career interests ahead of the library. Michael H. Harris and Mary Ann Tourjee's article about him addresses the issue librarians were facing (and still do) concerning their image and status within the university. Published in 1983, the authors described these librarians as "locked in a support role dominated by faculty elite" and that they were experiencing "status anxiety" or "status inferiority." It is interesting that Harris (who was a professor of library and information science and teaching faculty at the University of Kentucky) and Tourjee (who earned her master's in library and information science in 1979 at the same institution; by this date, it appears she had never attained a professional position in academic libraries) viewed the contemporary academic librarians' desire for faculty status as often irrational.[18] Though one must be cautious of their bias, Harris and Tourjee's study has some valuable historical information about Dix. According to them,

academic librarians believed that Dix was a hero who would help them advance their own status in the eyes of academic teaching faculty:

> This desire to *be* faculty, or at least to be accepted by faculty as equals, has led academic librarians to respect, even adore, the few scholars who have openly embraced librarianship as a profession, for the scholar's deliberate identification with librarianship helps ease the collective sense of inferiority librarians suffer in comparison to faculty at their respective institutions.[19]

But Harris and Tourjee pointed out that Dix really should not be considered in a list of top leaders in library and information science of his time because he was not interested in academic library management at all, but rather "found every excuse to absent himself from Princeton to engage in activities more appealing to his sense of significance."[20] According to them, Dix was not a great scholar, but rather someone who wrote "self–effacing essays" and, regardless of these facts, librarians frequently exaggerated Dix's scholarly achievements and reputation.[21] Harris and Tourjee observed that academic librarians ultimately failed when they positioned Dix as someone to challenge teaching faculty's negative perceptions of them. They confirmed that Dix had his own inferiority status:

> Dix suffer[ed] considerable anxiety at his prominence as librarian and not *scholar*. Dix had no doubts about his success as librarian, but he drew his real sense of worth from his identity as scholar. And as a scholar, in the formal sense, Dix had failed. Only librarians hailed him as a great scholar; scholars saw him as a librarian, a scholar–librarian to be sure, but librarian nevertheless.[22]

The tone of Harris and Tourjee's history leads one to think of Dix's history as a story with a moral for academic librarians everywhere: if we fight for faculty status, make sure we do not

invest too heavily in librarians who are scholars; they may put their concurrent scholarship or their careers before the library. Beware that their scholarship is marred by the fact that they are librarians, so it may be best to not position them in the foreground of our fight for faculty status or for being seen in a more positive light by teaching faculty. The librarian–scholar is therefore left to fight this stereotype.

The rift between librarians and teaching faculty began earlier than Dix. At times, librarians were the ones who viewed themselves as better if not superior teachers of library usage or research than teaching faculty and scholars. In *Origins of American Academic Librarianship*, O. Lee Shiflett explains that in the late nineteenth century, American librarian and educator Melvil Dewey believed that reference librarians, not teaching faculty, should be the ones to teach students how to use the libraries' various catalogs and indexes for their research in addition to guide these students through reader advisory. Dewey went as far as to remark that if the university library was good enough, professors would be unnecessary in higher education.[23] Dewey was likely referring to faculty teaching rather than scholarship, but his argument is an early example of how librarians juxtaposed themselves against teaching faculty in order to carve out their appropriate niche as well as a moment of role reversal in which librarians view themselves as superior to faculty at teaching students how to use library resources. Librarians defining scholarly roles in academic librarianship as being the ability to use indexes and cataloging (and eventually databases and online public access catalogs), even when they stressed that these roles were not routine or clerical, may have contributed to negative teaching faculty views of them, especially since it is easy to confuse today's critical information literacy skills and research methodology with point–and–click user instruction.[24]

In turn, stressing repeatedly the notion of the library's service to scholarship—in the literature and speeches written by university administrators, educators, or librarians themselves––certainly contributed to librarians' inferiority status. In contrast to Dewey, Shiflett pointed out that American academic administrator and educator Daniel Coit Gilman "at the ceremonies dedicating Cornell's Sage Library in 1891, affirmed that a library dedicated to the service of scholars must be headed by a scholar."[25] This remark may be interpreted that not the academic library but the librarians themselves were incapable of leadership within their own entity.

Shiflett also traces this triangulated U.S. history of academic librarians in pursuit of faculty status. The issues of librarian inferiority, librarian faculty status, and librarianship versus scholarship are intertwined. Just a year prior to the ceremonies dedicating Cornell's Sage Library, Raymond Cazallis Davis, a librarian at the University of Michigan from 1877 to 1905, read a letter supporting the notion that librarians should have equal faculty status to teaching faculty at the ALA Fabyan House Conference.[26] William Elmer Henry, a librarian at the University of Washington, went further than Davis at the ALA conference in 1911 in Pasadena by explaining that the librarians' education, not their teaching or librarianship responsibilities, should determine their ranks (from instructor to full professor).[27] Shiflett points out that before the 1920s, when academic librarianship was to become a full–time occupation in the United States, "some librarians were hired to assist the professor who held titular control of the library."[28] But by the 1920s, he observes, academic librarians very clearly understood that their education and roles in the university "entitled them to a recognized place in the hierarchy of American higher education on the *same* basis as other ranked faculty members of the institutions."[29]

Appropriate degrees would be recommended and decided by the Association of American Universities (AAU), headed by scholars, in 1924, which turned down the idea of BLS and MLS degrees in favor of the MA or MS. No PhD work in library science was considered, but rather the AAU advised that librarians who wished to seek doctoral work should do so in "'scholarly fields.'"[30] According to Shiflett, the notion of a doctorate in library science as the appropriate terminal degree was "formally abandoned by the ALA in 1925."[31] Prior to this decision, librarians like Edith Coulter and Andrew Keogh supported the idea that bibliographic work would be viable scholarly work for librarians, but Columbia University law librarian Frederick C. Hicks and others disagreed about this notion because they firmly believed that reference librarians in particular should have PhDs. He argued, with accurate forethought of the profession, that teaching faculty would not view or allow bibliographic work to be considered as tantamount to doctoral research.[32] Shiflett faults librarians for not finding ways to develop their own scholarship at the doctoral level:

> Rather than promote research into library operations or library problems, academic librarians generally agreed that systematic bibliography was their special province and concluded that bibliographic compilation should be the vehicle through which their scholarship would be recognized. But this level of research failed to win the academic community's support as evidence of sufficient scholarly attainment.[33]

Insufficient training and education in the field of academic librarianship was addressed and answered by the establishment of library schools that offered terminal master's programs. History also shows how librarians struggled against scholars to gain autonomy, which gradually became the central issue, according to Shiflett, by the late 1920s and into the 1930s.[34] At this time, many aspects of the library (including budget allocation and collection development) were

controlled by teaching faculty and their committees rather than by librarians.[35] Distrust between teaching faculty as well as librarians developed during these formative years of the academic library in the United States.

Literature dating from the late twentieth century into the early twenty–first century possesses many of the same themes outlined in Shiflett's monograph. Just last year, Todd Gilman and Thea Lindquist surveyed librarians in North America who had either a PhD or a secondary terminal degree in order to examine the employment trends of doctorates. The survey reveals that today librarians with doctorates have a greater tendency to be hired at research universities than at other academic institutions.[36] These findings can be interpreted variously: it is possible that concurrent career librarian–scholars are finding positions more easily at research institutions than at teaching colleges, and it is just as possible that they apply more frequently to research institutions than to four year– and two year–colleges. I realize other factors such as the kind of position offered (tenure–track versus administrative/professional status) enter the big picture. Regardless of the emphasis of the institution, advanced degrees contribute to its prestige.

Presently in Louisiana, there are certainly more librarians with PhDs at LSU, the state's "flagship institution," than at any other public university or college in the state; this observation stresses the numbers rather than the percentage of librarians with PhDs working at each university or college's academic library in the state. Further research is needed to track concurrent career librarian–scholars since many are not as outspoken as I am about their roles in academic libraries. I am aware of situations in which I have felt a need to downplay, even hide, my concurrent career as a musicologist; I know people throughout the state who feel they must do the same concerning their concurrent careers as literary scholars, artists, or poets.

The question I have always had is why is there a need to hide this important aspect of librarian–scholars, especially when their work informs and enriches their library work. Are colleagues viewing them as stereotypes, as disgruntled, passed–over teaching faculty who view librarianship as a part–time job? Are the problems associated with those feral librarians, scholars without the MLIS who took advantage of library positions, coloring their perceptions? And what of the apparent cherry–picking being done from the ALA's *Code of Ethics*, which states that,

> We treat co–workers and other colleagues with respect, fairness, and good faith, and advocate conditions of employment that safeguard the rights and welfare of all employees of our institutions.
>
> We do not advance private interests at the expense of library users, colleagues, or our employing institutions.
>
> We distinguish between our personal convictions and professional duties and do not allow our personal beliefs to interfere with fair representation of the aims of our institutions or the provision of access to their information resources.
>
> We strive for excellence in the profession by maintaining and enhancing our own knowledge and skills, by encouraging the professional development of co–workers, and by fostering the aspirations of potential members of the profession. [37]

Though two items stress that we (librarians) should not place our interests and personal convictions above library users, colleagues, or institutions, two others focus on treating colleagues fairly, striving for excellence, and encouraging their professional development. Colleagues may exist internally (within the library) or externally (outside the library). One would think the *Code of Ethics* would enable librarians and directors today to put aside misgivings

about and distrust of scholars, but the published literature and my own experience demonstrate that this necessary attitude adjustment has not been fully realized.[38]

To complicate matters, librarian–scholars also face tenure assessment issues. Alice B. Veaner's *Academic Librarianship in a Transformational Age: Programs, Politics, and Personnel* focuses primarily on library administration, but she considers teaching faculty views of librarians as well as academic librarians' pursuit of autonomy, faculty status, tenure, and peer review. Tenure and peer review, though informed by the teaching faculty's nebulous understanding of librarians and the nature of their work, involve components of an appraisal system of librarianship *or* teaching (preferably by measurable results), of publication, and of university or student services.[39] As a concurrent career librarian–scholar, I find that some of my activities may be considered more library–related by my colleagues than others. Sometimes these conclusions are curious: for example, would it be more merit–worthy in the eyes of my colleagues if I were a book reviews editor for a reference librarianship journal than for a film music one? Would someone on library faculty be splitting hairs in deciding if my discographic essay on lounge music was not as integral to collection development as a bibliographic essay, despite the fact that both are based on exactly the same principles and serve the same purpose, that of directing library purchases? In my experience, most librarians understand how subject specialization fits into the larger picture of librarianship, but I have come to know some librarians with rigid views of how those theoretical terms manifest themselves in practice. Regardless of any perspectives that emerge during peer or tenure review, I am sure to continue what I am doing, defining myself as a librarian–scholar, since it is what I love.

Waking from the Bad Dream: What the Librarian-Scholar Brings to the Academic Library

Despite the challenges of being a librarian–scholar, there are many positive reasons for pursuing the path of a concurrent career. With additional degrees, publishing experience, and specialization, such academic librarians find that they routinely use for their own research the very sources they teach students to use. If their research and writing is current, they have their ear to the ground concerning both student and faculty research, as well as their writing needs, and they can relate to these needs intimately. They know the lowdown of at least two fields of study. Since they often do not assign grades themselves, some students may still perceive these librarians as being on the periphery of their discipline; nevertheless, some may appreciate the dual role and pursue further research instruction and career advice from librarian–scholars. During my own office hours, I receive questions about research in general, but I also see a number of music majors working on papers and projects, students wondering about graduate studies in library and information science or music, and students wanting to learn more about writing about music or music criticism.

Like their colleagues, librarian–scholars may provide instruction and outreach by designing library resource sessions on request, by organizing a lecture series or colloquium on a topic, by organizing events related to the librarian–scholars' specializations, or creating their own brown bag lunch featuring repeat readings of conference presentations or by organizing and/or participating in performances. They also have untapped potential for recruitment and positive marketing in the university community, for their accomplishments can be reported through official university relations publications. As a by–product, they serve as marketing for the library by increasing its visibility. Librarian–scholars can also use their publishing and research experience to help less experienced writers (colleagues in the library and new teaching

faculty in other departments), and they can collaborate with other publishing scholars, as well as grant writing faculty. By going through the electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) submission process themselves, some librarian–scholars with recent additional graduate work may be able to help their colleagues who are working on advanced degrees go through that process.[40] If a librarian–scholar has experienced submitting an ETD, then s/he may be useful for scholars desiring to submit articles to online journals. Librarian–scholars who have worked on submitting a thesis or dissertation electronically may also possess a much needed technological expertise (for example, the ability to create charts, sound and video files, and to convert documents into different kinds of files). This expertise may be used to draw students and faculty into the library, but it may also help smaller institutions and colleges develop their own electronic submission programs and repositories to preserve and disseminate their faculty and students' scholarly work.

Librarians with concurrent scholarly careers have already developed a rapport with scholars at other institutions and often seek to network and build rapport with faculty on their respective campuses. Negative perceptions of librarian-scholars by teaching faculty still linger, but it should go without saying that not all teaching faculty view them negatively. Active librarian–scholars develop a network of colleagues who respect them and their work; in other words, it does not matter that they are librarians; their work can be analyzed, evaluated, and assessed for its own merit. Librarian–scholars can also help improve communication between librarians and scholars by elucidating the similarities and differences between them. For example, I know musicologists who believe they would be wonderful librarians. From the point of view of instruction and collection development, that may be true; however, cataloging a source (or working with its metadata) requires a different approach, and for some musicologists this aspect of music librarianship may be frustrating. I have also had to explain ALA's *Code of*

Ethics to many colleagues in other scholarly departments, they are unique to library and information science.

These interesting times may be dangerous and intimidating ones for librarian–scholars, but there are also opportunities never seen before that would enable them to improve their situation and take an important part in sculpting the emerging new library culture. Most new discussions about academic libraries—from turning libraries into hollowed out learning centers to Return on Investment Analysis (ROI)—possess the recurring theme that librarians, not libraries, are the most important resources of the library, the heart of the university. Librarian–scholars offer their academic libraries unique scholarly profiles, a heartiness of character, eminence, and diversified experience, traits that should make them as desirable as academic librarians who focus solely on librarianship. Librarian–scholars will surely live double or triple lives, but if they love what they are doing, especially as junior faculty, they will thrive and will come to realize that success in a concurrent scholarly field should not be hidden, and they should not allow it to be undermined. Perhaps once academic librarianship goes through the looking glass and glimpses the multidisciplinary future of the university, the librarian–scholar will be valued and encouraged.

Melissa Ursula Dawn Goldsmith *is an Assistant Professor/Reference Librarian at Nicholls State University in Thibodaux, Louisiana. She earned her CLIS and MLIS from Louisiana State University. She also earned her PhD in musicology and master's in liberal arts from LSU. Previously, she earned her master's of arts in music and bachelor's of arts in music and biochemistry from Smith College. Goldsmith is a concurrent career librarian/scholar who writes about various topics in library and information science as well as film music, popular music, and expressionism in music. In addition to teaching research classes, Goldsmith teaches music appreciation. She may be contacted at melissa.goldsmith@nicholls.edu.*

[1] Todd Gilman, "Subject Experts Need Not Apply," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1 July 2008, p. 3 of 4, accessed 9 December 2009, http://chronicle.com/article/Subject-Experts-Need-Not-Apply/45867/. The article appeared previously under the section "First Person."

[2] Ibid., 4.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Katelyn Angell, "Squeezing Out Specialists: Questioning the Need for a Second Graduate Degree," under "Opinion: On My Mind," in *American Libraries* 40 (May 2009): 39.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ernest Hatch Wilkins, "The Librarian as Colleague," *The Journal of Higher Education* 5, no. 4 (1934): 184–85.

[7] David Kranzler, "The One and One–Tenth Lives of a Librarian/Scholar," unsigned interview, under "Personalities," in *American Libraries* 8, no. 2 (1977), 65. The interviewer also mentioned that Kranzler had to overcome "the special obstacle of being a full–time librarian" to his scholarship: he was limited to applying for summer grants only, which suggests that he was unable to receive university administration's permission for leave in order to further his research—permission that teaching faculty with similar background to him received. See ibid.

[8] Todd Gilman, "Becoming a Librarian," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 17 October 2003, p. 2 of 3, accessed 8 December 2009, http://chronicle.com/article/Becoming-a-Librarian/45189/. The article appeared previously under the section "First Person."

[9] Todd Gilman, "Putting Your PhD to Work in the Library," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 April 2004, p. 1 of 4, accessed 8 December

2009, http://chronicle.com/article/Putting-Your-PhD-to-work/44559/. The article appeared previously under the section "First Person."

[10] Todd Gilman, "A Matter of Degrees," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 18 May 2005, p. 2 of 3, accessed 8 December 2009, http://chronicle.com/article/A-Matter-of-Degrees/44967/. The article appeared previously under the section "First Person."

[11] Ibid., 2.

[12] Todd Gilman, "Suspicious Minds," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 March 2005, p. 1 of 3, accessed 8 October 2009, http://chronicle.com/article/Suspicious-Minds/44869/. The article appeared previously under the section "First Person."

[13] Ibid., 1–2.

[14] James G. Neal, "Raised by Wolves," in *Library Journal* 32, no. 4 (2006): 443.

[15] Peter Macauley, "Why You Need a PhD," interview by Geraldine Barkworth, under "Librarians on the Edge," in *Cite* 27, no. 3 (2006): 22.

[16] Ibid., 23.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Michael H. Harris and Mary Ann Tourjee, "William S. Dix," in *Leaders in American Academic Librarianship: 1925–1975*," ed. Wayne A. Wiegand, *Beta Phi Mu Chapbook*, no. 16 (Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu, 1983), 63. At the time of publication, Tourjee was the former director of the Mercer County Public Library in Harrodsburg, Kentucky. She has since attained several positions in public libraries. For instance, she later worked as a children's librarian, supervisor, school librarian, and consultant for the Regional Library Children's Services Consultant in

Massachusetts. She eventually became adjunct faculty at the University of Rhode Island's

Graduate School of Library and Information Studies and Director of the Lilly Library, a public

library located in Florence, Massachusetts. In other words, her professional career has been

outside of academic libraries.

[19] Ibid., 63.

[20] Ibid., 62.

[21] Ibid., 62, 63.

[22] Ibid., 68.

[23] O. Lee Shiflett, "The Scholar and the Librarian," chap. 3 in *Origins of American Academic Librarianship*, Libraries and Librarianship (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981), 146. Shiflett cites Melvil Dewey in "Libraries the True Universities for Scholars as Well as People," *Library Notes* 1 (June 1887): 49–50. See ibid., fn. 68.

[24] Ibid., 151. For example, Shiflett's discussion of Justin Winsor, who described the responsibilities of academic librarians as scholarly.

[25] Ibid., 152. Shiflett cites Daniel Coit Gilman, *University Problems in the United States* (New York: Century, 1898), 254–55.

[26] Ibid., 153.

[27] Ibid., 154. Shiflett goes into further detail about Henry's influence on the College and Reference Library Section of the ALA as well as on the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration and the ALA Committee on the Classification of Library Personnel. See ibid., 154–56.

[28] Ibid., 158.

[29] Ibid., 159. Italics are mine.

[30] Shiflett, "Professionalization of Academic Librarianship," chap. 4 in *Origins of American Academic Librarianship*, 200. In fn. 90 Shiflett cites the Association of American Libraries, "Report of the Committee on Academic and Professional Higher Degrees," *Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Association of American Universities* 26 (October 31– November 1, 1924): 25–26.

[31] Ibid., 201.

[32] Ibid., 202–203. Shiflett cites Frederick C. Hicks, "Where Shall University, College, and Reference Library Assistants Be Educated," in *American Library Institute, Papers and Proceedings, 1918* (Chicago: ALA, 1918), 23.

[33] Shiflett, 212.

[34] See Shiflett, "Neither Power Nor Dignity," chap. 5 in *Origins of American Academic Librarianship*, 221, 230–31, 233.

[35] Ibid., 231.

[36] See Todd Gilman and Thea Lindquist, "Academic Librarians with Subject Doctorates, Data and Trends, 1965–2006," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 8, no.1 (2008): 31–52. Gilman summarizes some of these findings on the kinds of positions and rankings academic librarians with PhDs are attaining within the university in "Academic Librarians and Rank," under "Manage Your Career," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 4 January 2008, pp. 1–5 of 5, accessed 9 December 2009, http://chronicle.com/article/Academic-LibrariansRank/45926/.

[37] American Library Association, *Code of Ethics of the American Library Association* (2008), accessed 9 December 2009, http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/ codeofethics/codeethics.cfm. The American Library Association (ALA) adopted the *Code of*

Ethics in June 1995 (the current website mentions that it was adopted by the ALA Council on 28 June 1997). It was amended in January 2008.

[38] For example, see William B. Badke, "Can't Get No Respect: Helping Faculty to Understand the Educational Power of Information Literacy," in *Relationships between Teaching Faculty and Teaching Librarians*, ed. Susan Kraat (New York, London, and Victoria, Australia: Haworth Information Press, 2005), 63–80. A treasure trove of librarian attitudes towards teaching faculty and their scholarship in Canada appears in Heidi Julien's and Lisa M. Given's "Faculty–Librarian Relationships in the Information Literacy Context: A Content Analysis of Librarians' Expressed Attitudes and Experiences," *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science/La Revue canadienne des sciences de l'information et de bibliothéconomie* 27, no. 3 (2002/03): 65–87. Parts of the article, "Les relations des bibliothécaires universitaires dans le context des connaissances informationelles: une analyse du contenu du comportement et des experiences," appeared in French. The authors did a follow–up article, "Finding Common Ground: An Analysis of Librarians' Expressed Attitudes towards Faculty," *Reference Librarian* 43, no. 89/90 (2005): 25–38.

[39] Alice B. Veaner, "Performance Appraisal," chap. 9 in *Academic Librarianship in a Transformational Age: Program, Politics, and Personnel* (Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1990), 320.

[40] Librarians may have to receive approval or formal sanction from their libraries, administration, graduate school, or other campus units.