

Notes on British Library Education

英国の図書館学教育について

Ronald Staveley

ロナルド・ステイヴリー

要 旨

英国では 1972 年に 2627 名が図書館学校に在籍し、うち 63 名は修士・博士課程にある。542 名は postgraduate コース（大卒 1 年）、1406 名は図書館協会 (LA) の司書資格をめざし、学部 2 年課程に在籍している。残り 616 名は学部で図書館学を専攻とする学士号コースにある。

全日制図書館学校は 15 あるが、そのうち university にあるのは、ストラスクライド、シェフィールド、ベルファストおよびロンドンの 4 大学のみである。他は college または polytechnic に含まれるが、そのうちウェールズおよびブラバタ、およびリーズは隣接の university との間に学位コースの特約を結んでいる。College 等では Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) の学科別認定により学位（学士相当）を授与できるが、現在 6 校のみが認められている。この制度はカレッジ教育の水準を高め、学生の成績優秀なものは、上級学位への接続を可能ならしめるための処置である。英国では終局的には学部 2 年制の LA 受験コースは廃止され、CNAA コースに代えられるであろう。

図書館学校の数が増加するとともに、英国図書館学校協会 (ABLS) が組織された。当初は少数の個人会員により、教科についての研究などが行われ、むしろ LA の統一試験のために教授理念の統一が目的であった。1964 年に学校をメンバーとする組織に改組されてから、活動目標は政策、管理にむけられるようになった。今日、ABLS は大学の管理部門と LA との中介者として行動し、たとえば図書館審議会、CNAA、あるいは教育・科学省の委員会などに代表を送っている。

LA と ABLS の共通の問題として、たとえば中年から図書館職への転入者とか、学生の奨学金の問題がある。学部学生はほとんど奨学金を得ているが、postgraduate では約半数である。研究助成金はもっと少いが、これによってフルタイムの研究助手の採用が可能であり、修士以上の学位を取得するものも若干ある。

図書館は本来他のすべての学問に奉仕するものであるから、学際研究はそれ自体我々にとって新しいものではなく、今日その程度がさらに高くなったことが新しい問題点を呈示している。図書館学は一見その研究領域を広げたようであるが、その基盤に対する反省は不十分であった。カレッジあるいはユニヴァーシティ内での他専攻との協力はこの点でも必要であるが、これを実現するためにはより以上の

Ronald Staveley, Director of Library Studies, School of Library, Archive and Information Studies, University College London.

ロナルド・ステイヴリー： ロンドン大学ユニヴァーシティ・カレッジ、図書館・文書館・情報学科 図書館学主任

善意と忍耐を要するであろう。

学際研究のはなやかさに惹かれて図書館学の中心となるものを手ばなす危険をおかさないためには、読書の研究が唯一的に重要である。このことはテレビジョンの影響を調査するために政府が設置したTV調査委員会の勧告により、マス・コミュニケーション研究センターが設立され、学際研究が行なわれて、再確認されるようになったことから裏書されている。(小林 胖)

Professor Shigeo Watanabe has made my task easier by summarising many of the courses offered by British schools in his contribution to this journal's tenth issue of 1972. I shall first offer a few statistics to indicate the scale of these schools' combined activities, then comment on recent trends in this field, and finally make some personal observations on a few matters that have seemed to me important.

Figures for 1972 showed 2,627 students registered in library schools. 63 of these were working for higher degrees, the rest were seeking a first professional qualification. This balance of 2,564 included 542 graduates on one-year postgraduate courses, 1,406 non-graduates on two year courses, almost all for a Library Association qualification, and 616 who were at some stage of a first-degree course wholly or mainly in librarianship.

There are 15 full-time library schools. Two are in Scotland—the one at Strathclyde in Glasgow is part of the university, the Aberdeen school is in a non-university college. There is one school in Wales, at Aberystwyth. This is an independent college, mainly residential, the largest and probably best equipped British school, with 411 students last year. It has useful working arrangements with the nearby University College of Wales and has therefore many of the advantages of a university school. Northern Ireland has one school in Queens University Belfast. There are 11 schools in England. In student numbers the largest is at the Polytechnic of North London (337 students), the smallest is at the University of Sheffield (49 students). The other university school is the one I come from, University College London. At Loughborough the school is in a College of Technology that is for most

practical purposes in the university and a chair of library studies has already been established and filled. The school at Leeds has one or two teaching arrangements with the university there.

The range of courses and qualifications is now wide. The former pattern was simple. Dominating the field were syllabuses and examinations prepared and conducted by the Library Association, the courses being primarily concerned with non-graduates. Graduates were excused from the first half of the course and examinations. The only alternative was to be found in the University College London school, postgraduate exclusively after the war, which offered a one year diploma course devised and conducted under its own arrangements.

The important new elements are, the multiplication of schools, the Library Association's decision that all first professional qualification should be on the basis of full-time study at library schools, its later decision in favour of progressive devolution of responsibility for examinations to the non-university schools teaching to the Association's courses, and the appearance in the country of a new degree-awarding body, the Council for National Academic Awards. This last is a government body, upgraded from its predecessor that was concerned with the award of higher national certificates for young people at work in technical and industrial fields, or planning to work there. The new CNAAs degrees are gained in polytechnics and colleges of technology, engineering or further education, and they reflect governmental decisions to give high priority to advanced training and education, in colleges concerned directly with practical fields of employment. The study level

expected is at or near university standards, and most universities would be willing, as is London for example, to enrol good CNAA graduates for higher degree study in relevant fields. A higher degree structure is also planned for CNAA degree colleges, some M.A. and M.Sc. courses are already being framed or submitted, and Ph.D. work will doubtless be approved in colleges which establish high standards. Most of the non-university schools of librarianship have shown interest in CNAA degrees. Six are operating them already. One school, Leeds, has courses for both B.A. and B.Sc. The large Polytechnic of North London School has a three years general course and a four years honours course, with candidates who prove themselves being permitted to stay for the extra year. Most other courses are of three years. Birmingham's course lasts four years, but a full year of practical library work is 'sandwiched' in the middle. This was a characteristic of schemes in technology and industry in earlier post war years; it is not now so popular. The only other ways in which library or information studies are offered in first degree work are as follows:— the University of Strathclyde offers a B.A. degree that may have librarianship as first principal subject, with other academic subjects subordinate. The College of Librarianship Wales contributes half a degree course, the University College of Wales the other academic half, to a Bachelor of Librarianship degree of the University of Wales. There is a similar arrangement at Loughborough, where the result is a B.A. degree. In London University, B.Sc. honours candidates may choose to devote the whole of their final year to studies in either librarianship or information science. The resulting degree is not however intended to be a professional qualification, though means of supplementing it for professional purposes in librarianship are provided. A further year of study is required, on a part-time basis, and a year of employment in a library, concluding with an individual postgraduate diploma examination. The origin of this London B.Sc. provision is inter-

esting. A lengthy 'follow-up' of jobs taken by B.Sc. graduates showed a very much wider range than the B.Sc. syllabus and options had been taking into account. A new Honours B.Sc. syllabus with course unit basis was therefore provided, offering much more choice in each year of study. The aim of the degree has become, to cater for as many as possible employing areas in which recruits with some understanding of science can contribute in useful ways. The library and information fields were thought of first for this purpose.

The case for, and against, first degrees in library studies can of course be argued endlessly. Aside from the educational merits of this or that course, one must remember the following points, at least. Very few young people know with certainty at eighteen years of age what career they want, whether their thoughts about it match reality or are based on misconceptions, and whether they will in fact suit the kind of job. Yet librarianship studies and information science studies are demonstrably of degree level quality and, properly organised, require and reward genuine academic competence. It is equally true that the practice of librarianship is often helped considerably by degree level knowledge in a non-librarianship subject. And finally, the important thing is to make sure that good recruits are attracted, not deterred. Librarians are usually competing with other employers for both good school leavers and good university leavers. So far as Britain is concerned, I think the CNAA type degree will largely replace the two year non-graduate courses in most schools of librarianship eventually, but I do not expect either employers or students to value less highly than now a conventional first degree and a good postgraduate professional qualification.

I think I could usefully mention the Association of British Library Schools. The changes it has undergone form an interesting commentary on postwar developments. It began in the early 1950's as the Schools of Librarianship Committee, with few and small schools and therefore few members. They

gathered together in a common struggle against entrenched professional attitudes and jealously guarded professional control of teaching, syllabus content, and examining. The independence of the University of London school, started as long ago as 1919, was a tiresome irritant that should never have happened, to some, and a pointer to the future for others. Its favourable location in an area rich in libraries made individual study a commonsense procedure, and experiments in teaching, study, and examining could be carried out with only academics to gainsay us. To say 'only' in that context is not to understate the obstructive possibilities of academic persons and practices; one simply means that these things happened in only one field, not in two. Other schools had greater difficulties with both the educational and professional systems. Twenty years later, we in University College are now one of the smaller schools; others can explore teaching practices as well or better, many have far greater resources; we have to think rather harder about the central and essential, and we have worked rather hard in the important area of higher degree studies and the encouragement of professional research.

Until 1964 the Association of British Library Schools was always seeking common attitudes, united stands, on most educational issues. The schools reached security, maturity and general acceptance as an important part of the profession with a specialised contribution to make, when full-time attendance at a school became the recruit's normal and natural way of entering the profession. Since then, uniformity has been thought of as much less important than sensible realisation of all the local possibilities. Lecturers used to meet regularly in subject groups, despite the geographical difficulties, for mutual help in preparing candidates for the same externally devised examination papers, and to hold post-mortems on them afterwards, and there used to be fairly regular week-end conferences as a means of keeping in touch and staying informed. Membership of the ABLS was pri-

marily personal membership. It is now no longer that. ABLS is an association of schools and is much more concerned with policy matters and management of schools. It is the formal link between college administrations and the professional associations, and takes care to be represented on all important bodies in the library and information field, such as the Library Advisory Councils for England and Wales, the Council for National Academic Awards, and the committees of the Awards Branch of the Department of Education and Science. The staffs of schools no longer meet with any regularity. Some of them find a satisfactory alternative in a Library Association Education Group that was formed a few years ago; but I think many feel the lack of a common intercollegiate life these days. Though the schools no longer need mutual support to guarantee their future, the quality of teaching and study must be reduced when school staffs no longer exchange their ideas and experiences so frequently.

I would like now to speculate a little about the future of the library schools and of professional education in the United Kingdom. In one major respect the shape is discernible already. The schools and the professional associations must go along together in partnership in pursuit of agreed objectives. There is much to do, in matters small and large. Take as a small illustration the case of good quality recruits to the profession who turn towards it at a later age than usual, in their thirties, forties, or fifties from another kind of job - teaching, medicine, law, industrial research, government service. The Library Association and the schools have devised a 'Mature Entrants' scheme that dispenses with the need for full-time education for approved graduates or those with comparable qualification. It substitutes attendance at short intensive courses, arranged by schools or the association's sections and groups or by Aslib for other purposes, often to allow practising librarians to become up to date in some subject or other. Attendance at these, plus written work and some supervision, can yield accumulating credits over

several years, and allow for entry to the professional register in due course. Another example is the training of non-professional staff for a kind of technician's certificate, a 'Library Assistants' Certificate', that can justify promotion on merit in non-professional posts, or provide a step towards acceptance for professional training.

Another matter of common concern is the proper financial support for students in full-time education. At present non-graduates receive local authority awards, and few applicants with the required number of school examination successes fail to obtain one. Graduates however are less fortunate. Central government bursaries are allocated to library schools, but they cover only half of the number of places available. Many students have to pay their own way. Some library authorities are now operating schemes of secondment. They employ youngsters straight from school or college, sometimes after joint interviewing with staff of a school of librarianship. After a year or so of practical employment on a student-trainee basis the student goes to a full-time school on full salary, on condition that he or she returns to the employing authority for a further period, usually of two or three years.

Another scheme that has been devised with professional association help is aimed at providing a year of preliminary practical library experience, in a university or college or special or government library, in a systematic manner that opens up to the trainee all the parts of the library's work during the year. This scheme is operated by the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries. Students apply to it in their final year of degree study, expressing their preferences about library or place, and most get a placing, though maybe not in the library of first choice. They receive salaries that are low, but sufficient for the purpose.

Financial support for higher degree study is small. A few government awards are offered for competition each year, research projects that receive government funds do of course support the workers concerned, and

these workers sometimes gain a higher degree in the course of the research. Individual libraries, or groups of libraries, may support a researcher on work they want done, and this too can happen in a higher degree study framework. The largest two schools, the College of Librarianship Wales and the Polytechnic of North London, do a significant amount of research study for libraries, and publish a regular research bulletin, each term or year; but in their cases higher degrees are not usually involved. I mention them, however, because the linking of all schools with libraries and the government in advanced study and research projects is an important part of our professional future.

This ought to be merely one aspect of a fuller and natural partnership between schools and professional associations in the service not only of readers but of the individual library practitioner. We accept that personal education is life-long; we must not fail to see that professional education is career-long. The implications for professional associations and schools are large, separate but complementary. They also overlap, for men ask their basic personal questions within their field of employment no less than in their leisure, and many obtain their main intellectual satisfactions in professional study and practice.

The British Library Association's progressive withdrawal from the conduct and control of teaching and examinations is timely, and will enable it to take a more active interest in matters such as re-education, re-training, dual qualifications for special subject fields, short courses and colloquia on topics of emerging importance, the proper recording and utilisation of the expertise and knowledge that at present largely stays in the special groups where it has developed. If one had to name the chief technical responsibility of a professional association, it would be, for me, the provision of the most effective possible clearing house system for information of all kinds necessary to the practitioners. Its chief moral responsibility would be to care for the practitioner at every stage of his career.

I would like to consider next a few areas of difficulty that have become more important with the new educational opportunities for librarians. One is the expansion of interdisciplinary studies. The consequences for study and practice are larger than in other professions because libraries serve every subject or grouping of subjects. It is the scale of the difficulty that is new; the problem itself has always been part of library studies. Looking back one can marvel that historical, analytical and critical bibliography was brought into library studies so uncritically and to the obvious detriment of other subjects. Benefit of hindsight also allows us to criticise the early work in classification of W.C. Berwick Sayers. He was a delightful colleague and important pioneer, but we are now hard pressed to explain his reluctance to criticise and re-think the traditional knowledge classifications and formal logic that he introduced into British library studies. By chance, a modern example I wish to offer also comes from the field of classification. An information scientist non-librarian teaching in a library school can disagree strongly with a teacher of classification, and with a scientist-librarian, about the desirable method of classification study for a science graduate library student. In a case I remember without pleasure, the information scientist insisted that the field of microbiology, in its internal and external relationships, was the natural and sufficient source of understanding of theoretical and practical classification, for a library student who had graduated in that specialism. The librarian lecturer in classification insisted upon the study of microbiology on librarians' terms, as a subject needing a special classification, calling therefore for the learning of rules for the construction of classifications—rules one can deduce from a study of special features of special classifications. The points at issue were, the amount of time the study justified, the sequence of study, and the discomfort of a specialist student called upon to reconsider the internal relations of the special field from a viewpoint outside it, maybe out-

side science altogether. Notice that both agreed that the student's specialisation was the right way to a personal understanding of library classification. They differed on all else. 'Playing library games' for one, was teaching library classification for the other. I guess that many library school staffs know this sort of situation. In the case in question, the advice of an experienced scientist and librarian was helpful. He pointed to the disagreements about topics' relationships among biologists themselves, differences in national practices, differences between older and younger biologists, between this and previous generations of biologists, with the certainty of yet more change in the future. With all modern workers needing access to all the literature, he argued, all would welcome a classification adopting conventions that gave it universal utility. The natural supplier, the librarian, can provide a point of universal equilibrium. The special studies and skills he must bring to classification are an essential contribution to specialist research, in any subject whether science based or not.

A disagreement of this kind may stir memories of the librarian versus documentalist dispute, but the present issue is less crude and more important. It is that the range of modern studies in the library, information and archive field is so extensive, and professional schools have so much independence, that they need to state and review their objectives in terms more precise than were formerly needed. We rightly individualise studies and use methods that recognise the personal character of learning. We agree that students will have individual career intentions, and we do what we can to allow for these in subject choices and levels of attention to common studies. The more we do this, the more do we need a set of objectives, as a reference point to return to frequently for corrections in our own and our students' thinking. We also need this aid in the school's inter-departmental relationships within the college or university. Without such a measure, we cannot specify the right kind of teaching help

from neighbourly departments or faculties that offer relevant studies. It is of course absurd to deny one's school the benefits that can come from the historians, linguists, management specialists, statisticians, engineers, philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, computer specialists and other colleagues of our academic life. Yet every other specialised study, every course, has emphases, contents, proportions, presentation, sequences and timing that are wrong for our purpose. To get inter-disciplinary and inter-collegiate studies right, requires uncommon goodwill and patience by all concerned, and the clearest possible understanding of the objectives and responsibilities of one's own department, as a whole and in each separate syllabus and course. A school's objectives must therefore include what is special and unique in professional studies and professional responsibilities, and the special opportunities and responsibilities that derive from its collegiate and academic life, I have stressed here these practical and domestic issues deliberately and for several reasons. One is that a school of library, archive and information studies can acquire in time a peculiarly central position in the intellectual life of a college. Its interests are so obviously catholic and inclusive that they are not impeded by the boundaries of subjects. Teachers and researchers in other fields meet problems which remind them of the school and its concern with bibliography, classification, linguistics, information science, education and literature. They turn to its staff informally for practical help or informative discussion, and their own knowledge and viewpoints provide valuable corrections to our own.

As lecturers and tutors, we rarely appreciate how much we need to be forced periodically to reconsider our attitudes to our subjects, our teaching methods and our professional assumptions. Our mastery of a subject is at best partial, temporary, and won at the cost of neglect of other relevant studies. It is personal, differently based and differently related from our counterparts' studies in other

schools or countries. It has individual roots and unique routes of growth. Yet we may need conscious effort to refrain from prescribing the same or similar ways towards mastery, for our students or colleagues. More seriously, we forget our initial assumptions about the subject's limits and proportions, though they were probably received as part of the unchallenged dogma of our days as professional recruits. It is unfortunate that students and school colleagues do not challenge our assumptions sufficiently; but if our college life offers a network of inter-disciplinary, inter-faculty information concerning our subjects, the contradictions and ambiguities and wrong values in our thinking should eventually become apparent, even to ourselves.

I must however point out an attendant danger of collegiate life. Study and research aims at analysis of problems and rational explanation, but there is a temptation to pay too much attention to analogous problems in other disciplines. The nature and values of problems in library, information or archival studies are determined by professional practice. It is easy to forget this necessary connection, in the excitement and pleasure of inter-disciplinary attention to communication studies, computer studies, sociological studies, psychological or educational or any other kinds of currently well-regarded studies. It is all the easier in a profession such as ours, in which basic purposes and values, and overall justification, have never been studied and stated in a generally satisfactory way. It is not surprising that schools' programmes vary so widely in their subject coverage and subject valuation, or that our academic colleagues cannot readily take our point of view. Administrators in government, local government or local education bodies are at a disadvantage too, and vulnerable to the tendentious advice of specialist enthusiasts or the currently held layman's view of librarianship. Older persons, inside or outside librarianship, will be able to summon from memory quite a number of images that librarians have created for themselves, which hint at various definitions of librarianship that

have been held and may still attract support. One remembers, for instance, the bookman scholar-librarian in college or university, not seldom a librarian because of his scholarly reputation. In public library systems one used to respect very highly the mature, well-read chief librarian who embodied the qualities available to all through systematic self-help. There is also the image of the elegant bibliographer-librarian playing a leading part in the country's bibliographical associations, and sharing specialist enthusiasms for printers and print, binders and binding, and critical and analytical bibliography. Other images show old and new type administrators, librarians as specialists in reference work and information service, librarians as alert technicians, as social workers, as therapists, as leaders in communities' cultural activities, as ardent liberal thinkers and educators, as mass medium communicators, and so on. Doubtless we all keep a preferred image, and for most purposes we do not need any strict definition either of a librarian or librarianship; rough and ready categorisation will do. Educators in library schools need more. Before they can use precious teaching and study time to best advantage, they need to know what is special or unique about librarians' work, and what studies justify librarians' claim to be professionals. Educators need to compare these activities and studies with those of other occupations, and with formal educational subjects studied in school and university. They can then begin their task of harmonising student needs in their first important exploration of the profession and its studies, with employers' needs and the profession's responsibilities to society. When we examine library schools' syllabuses and timetables for evidence about these basic decisions and consequent divisions, we must remember that special skills, techniques and technologies may be derivative from the unique element in library practice and study, not part of the definitive studies though perhaps as demanding or more demanding on teaching time and learning time. A syllabus and timetable must be read

with the understanding of a professional teacher if it is not to be misunderstood, and judgments must be qualified in many ways. Yet allowing for this I own to being frequently discontented with what I infer from prospectuses. There has of course been undeniable improvement. One remembers the pleasure we felt years ago when the Library Association accepted the 'library and the community' kind of study and examination, and again the welcome when historical and social studies in librarianship began to take their proper shape and rightful place. But I see more evidence of good-natured willingness to accept an accompanying framework of generalised social or communications study for library subjects, than earnest endeavour to find the unique criteria and value-scales for library and information work.

Schools newly permitted to offer first degree courses in librarianship have had a real incentive to re-think basic principles, in the planning of three or four year courses of librarianship and related subjects. Those which have attended seriously to communications studies have come closest to the study which I think is uniquely important to librarians—the study of reading. I have attempted a justification of my view elsewhere¹, and a recently compiled selection of readings on mass communications² is a welcome mediating study. To invite students to read about other communications processes, about changing cultures and the world's literacy problems, argues the importance for librarians of a concentrated and expanding study of reading itself. To some extent this work is being done by researchers in the field of education, but librarians' involvement with reading is more extensive and complete than is the case with teacher. Yet librarians as a whole have turned away from the basic questions about reading, staying content with surveys of reading preferences and the mechanics and mathematics of stock provision. The unique contribution of reading in a multi-media age is surely more important a matter for librarians than for any other professionals, yet they have left

the searching questions to be asked by others.

Among these others are those responsible people from all walks of life who ask anxious questions about the impact of television upon our lives. Their questions are much the same as were asked about low quality reading matter formerly, but they are asked more urgently. The answers that are being given are relevant to reading study. When government commissions on television revealed the poverty of knowledge about its effects, a Television Research Committee was set up. It quickly exposed the need for inter-disciplinary research, for long term study by educationalists, psychologists, sociologists, political scientists and many others. A Centre for Mass Communications Research was established. The committee itself recognised its own total inadequacy as a research body, and became instead a trustee body controlling and administering research operations on a country-wide basis, and consulting with the Social Science Research Council in developing most areas of mass communications research. The complexity of studies of learning, personality, and persuasion is very great and always increasing, for research at present seems only to extend the areas of uncertainty and expose new gaps. What can confidently be said is

that easy generalisations, complacent appeals to one's own personal or professional experience, can no longer be tolerated as substitutes for organised study and research. This example from television for British librarians can be matched in the field of education by the large-scale studies of materials, methods and media in the Schools Council's research programme which is funded by the Department of Education and Science. The central importance of language study and reading study to schools, and by extension to libraries, is unavoidably clear if one reads no more than the list of a single year's work of the Council. If these examples arouse impatience with other, reluctant librarians, they also give reason for hope. Librarians, after all, know very well that reading was once regarded as a mystery of tremendous importance. More of us may be emboldened by those who do *not* shrink from investigating the mystery.

- 1) Staveley, Ronald. "A theory for practical education in librarianship," *Journal of documentation*, vol. 28, March 1972, p. 1-10.
- 2) McGarry, K. G. ed. *Mass communications: selected readings for librarians*. London, Clive Bingley, 1972.