

ARCHIVISTS AND PROFESSIONALISM IN THE UNITED STATES REVISITED: A REVIEW ESSAY¹

RICHARD J. COX

ABSTRACT: The past decade was a period of self-scrutiny by the archival profession. The 1990s might be a time when the navel-gazing of the 1980s is translated into more intensive activity by the archival community. This is indicative of the dynamic nature of all professions. Two important recent studies on the nature of professions—one a general analysis of professional systems and the other an investigation of librarianship as a profession—suggest some ways to understand the recent development of the American archival profession. This essay reviews these two studies, assesses the archival discipline as a part of the system of professions, and re-evaluates the agenda for professional change suggested by the author in 1986.

Introduction

Few would deny that the 1980s were a time of tremendous self-scrutiny by the archival profession. The amount of such activity is staggering, with evidence of its results and effects everywhere. For example, more than forty states completed statewide assessment reports on the condition of archival and historical records. The image of archivists by employers and resource allocators was thoroughly analyzed for the first time. The Society of American Archivists' (SAA) Task Force on Goals and Priorities issued an important planning document for the profession and one update to that report; the SAA has now constituted this task force as a standing committee. The SAA Task Force on Institutional Evaluation published a self-study guide and completed the most extensive census of archival institutions ever undertaken; a more detailed workbook for institutional self-study concluded the work of the task force. SAA completed membership surveys in 1982 and 1989. The Committee on the Records of Government studied and reported on the manner in which government was being documented and its records utilized. The National Association for Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA) released a detailed, and disturbing, report on the preservation of state archival records. NAGARA also finished its work on reporting standards for state archival pro-

grams that provide the basis for regular profiles of the activities of these important institutions.²

Not surprisingly, skeptics of the focus the archival profession had during this decade also abound. There are those that see such efforts as taking time, energy, and resources from what they perceive to be the more basic responsibilities of the archival profession: servicing records. The traditional emphasis on the "lone arranger" suggests to many that the archivist's work should focus on what could be done in the stacks, rather than through management, planning, research and development, or advocacy. However, most archivists, regardless of their view of archival work, would nevertheless admit that some substantial events have resulted from all that is going on. Two examples will suffice. SAA commenced a program for individual certification in 1988, leading to the Academy of Certified Archivists in 1989. Although a controversial action, this decision has seemed (it is obviously too early to predict its full impact) to spur on work in other areas such as defining archival competencies and knowledge. Those who argued against certification because there was not a substantial body of knowledge have been at least partially silenced by the initial progress made on the development of a suitable examination. At nearly the same time, SAA also approved considerably expanded graduate archival education guidelines that point to a resurgence of interest in establishing multi course programs considerably beyond the traditionally accepted three course sequence.³ Might not the 1990s be a time, then, when a considerably stronger and more focused archival profession emerges to meet its societal mission?

All of these are, I believe, the marks of an active and growing profession. Reflecting on the condition of their profession is an activity that archivists should indulge in from time to time. At the midpoint of the decade I attempted, with the aid of the Bentley Library Fellowship program, to assess the nature and condition of the archival community as a profession. Drawing upon sociological and historical analyses of professions and specific case studies of other disciplines, I made a general characterization of the archival profession and formulated an agenda for strengthening it.⁴ The appearance of two new studies on professions⁵ and the passage of five years since the earlier assessment suggest that the topic be considered again.

The purpose of this essay is to direct the attention of archivists to two new important monographs on the nature of professions—one a general analysis of professional systems and the other an investigation of librarianship as a profession—and, based on these works and the developments of the past few years, to make some new assessments about the state of the archival profession. Like the earlier assessment, this essay is largely impressionistic, written with the hope that serious research⁶ will some day provide more accurate information.

An Ecology of Professions

Andrew Abbott's book, *The System of Professions*, represents a departure from standard sociological studies of professions. Contending that previous studies on the organizational forms of professions fail to say "why those forms emerge when they do or why they sometimes succeed and sometimes fail,"⁷ Abbott identifies a "system" of professions that includes considerable inter-professional competition. He sees what he terms the "jurisdictional control" of

professions—in other words, which profession “had control of what, when, and how”—as the essential element in such competition.⁸

Abbott offers his “theoretical alternative to professionalization” which theory he views as empirically weak. Abbott writes that

each profession is bound to a set of tasks by ties of jurisdiction, the strengths and weaknesses of these ties being established in the processes of actual professional work. Since none of these links is absolute or permanent, the professions make up an interacting system, an ecology. Professions compete within this system, and a profession's success reflects as much the situations of its competitors and the system structure as it does the profession's own efforts.⁹

To develop this theory, Abbott presents chapters on professional work, jurisdiction, and competition.

The foundations of professional work, according to Abbott, include objective characteristics such as technology, organization, natural objects and facts, and cultural structures as well as more subjective aspects that emerge from a profession's jurisdiction. For example, just as the idea of private property is a fundamental part of the cultural structure of the American legal profession, the notion of access to public records is an important element of the structure supporting federal, state, and local government archives. A profession's jurisdiction includes its claims for diagnosis, reasoning, and treatment. These are also “tied directly to a system of knowledge that formalizes the skills on which this work proceeds.”¹⁰ Moreover, the “ability of a profession to sustain its jurisdictions lies partly in the power and prestige of its academic knowledge.”¹¹ The latter has been most troublesome for archivists, who continue to wrestle with both the development of a body of knowledge and the place of graduate archival education in the universities.

Jurisdiction is where “a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure through exclusive rights”¹² This is central to Abbott's notion of an ecology of professions. Any group can take on aspects of a profession in creating an association or forming a school, “but it cannot occupy a jurisdiction without either finding it vacant or fighting for it.”¹³ Any movement by one profession causes a reaction in another profession because the professional groups are part of a system. Jurisdictions can be formed in several possible arenas, including the legal system, public opinion, and the work place. Abbott also considers how jurisdictions are generally debated and established. One profession becomes subordinate to another, the contested area is split or shared by competing professions, one profession assumes advisory rather than direct control over the area, or the labor is divided according to the nature of the client. Although the battles for jurisdictions are resolved in many different fashions, Abbott notes that every profession aims for full jurisdiction or, as he describes it, a “heartland of work over which it has complete, legally established control.”¹⁴ Another important point that Abbott makes is that in order to compete for jurisdictions a group must claim or view itself as a profession. The multi-disciplinary nature of archival work and the continuing tension within the archival community about its identity and relationships to academic historian, public historians, librarians, records managers, and others reveals jurisdiction as a relevant issue for archivists.

Competition between professions is prompted in a number of different ways, some external and some internal to a specific profession. Forces external to the profession open or close areas affecting the profession. Existing or newly emerging professions seek new jurisdictions. Technological changes and organizations that define new tasks are the main external forces. The impact of the computer on archival work and institutions is an obvious example of this. Changes internal to the profession include the development of new knowledge or skills, transformation in the social structure of the profession, and reformulation of the profession's knowledge base. Not surprisingly, the knowledge base is considered one of the fundamental aspects of competition. "Many occupations fight for turf, but only professions expand their cognitive dominion by using abstract knowledge to annex areas, to define them as their own proper work." Knowledge is, according to Abbott, the "currency of competition." The continued internal debate about archival theory versus practice indicates that this is a matter about which archivists ought to worry and work towards resolving.

The next major portion of *The System of Professions* examines the social and cultural trends that "environ" the system. Abbott first looks at what he calls the "internal differentiation and the problem of power," or the manner in which a profession's internal changes affect its ability to compete in the professional ecological system. Sources of internal differentiation include academic education, the work place, client differentiation, and career patterns. These internal aspects are also affected by power, the second part of Abbott's scheme. "Professional power can be operationally defined as the ability to retain jurisdiction when system forces imply that a profession ought to have lost it."¹⁶ The sources of such power include public acceptance, the work place, "objective aspects of the professional task," and government assistance. The lack of public awareness and understanding of the archival mission, well documented in many articles over the past decade, suggests that archivists need to consider more carefully their environment and its implications.

The next two chapters look at the social and cultural environments of professions. Technology and the rise of large organizations are seen as social forces that open and close professional jurisdictions. Abbott also identifies three great cultural changes remaking professions: the nature of professional knowledge, new types of legitimacy claimed for that knowledge, and the rise of the university. Universities, to take just one example, serve as legitimators for the profession, providing a place to advance the profession's knowledge and educate young professionals. The still tenuous, although improving, condition of archival education in the universities brings archivists face-to-face with what they perceive to be their legitimate demand for existence and resources.

Abbott's book concludes with three case studies on the information professions, law, and the psychotherapeutic professions. In some ways, even though Abbott intends these chapters to put more flesh on the bones of his earlier theorizing, this part of the book is the least satisfying for those looking for application to their own profession.¹⁷ His description of the information professions is, for example, much broader than what librarians, archivists, and other information workers generally accept.¹⁸ He does, however, make a few interesting points worth some additional consideration. Because information is an essential part of the diagnostic function of professions, Abbott asserts, "information professions are in some sense specialists in diagnosis and hence

represent a general threat to all professions."¹⁹ This is counter to the parochial notion held by most archivists and librarians—that *they* are threatened by other professions. Abbott also states that, lacking a dominant group, "it seems likely that all the professions in the information area... will end up as small, elite professions with intellectual jurisdictions over large areas."²⁰ Perhaps this accounts for some of the prevailing uneasiness that the various information professions feel about their own status and why archivists and others feel compelled to address and readdress the matter.

Librarianship As A Profession

Michael Winter has scrutinized librarianship in a book entitled *The Culture and Control of Expertise: Toward a Sociological Understanding of Librarianship*. Winter's book has two purposes, both far more traditional than the Abbott monograph. First, his writing is intended "to change the way librarians think about their work, and indirectly the way they work." Second, he hoped "to show how the sociological study of professions and occupations can be used to understand librarianship."²¹

In order to do so, Winter tries to blend together aspects of the various methods used to study professions. His first chapter on the rise of modern professions places librarianship's origins in this context. "Like other relatively new fields," he writes, "the information occupations emerged as a result of the increase of complexity in the division of labor, and a parallel increase in the quantity and complexity of the knowledge and available information that are used in typical occupational routines."²² Similar to Abbott's view of the information fields as facilitators and controllers of the use of information, Winter sees librarianship as the "first of the information-handling occupations to confront the need for new ways of classifying and organizing the recorded forms of this new knowledge."²³ Winter goes on to say that librarianship is an applied metascience in that it is involved in "mediating between the user and the public record of knowledge."²⁴ Archivists will likely recall that their community also emerged from many of the same events that Winter describes as part of the professionalization of society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Winter next describes the various ways that professions have traditionally been studied. He first examines the trait theory, "the view...that a profession is an occupation with certain characteristics."²⁵ He then considers alternate approaches, such as the functionalist and occupational control theories. The functionalist approach sees that "professionalization is not primarily a matter of acquiring attributes but rather is a process by which certain occupations come to play particular kinds of social roles." The control theory looks at professions not as occupations, "but rather [as] a complex set of procedures for controlling an occupation."²⁶

Winter uses these various approaches to examine the library community. First, he looks at librarianship as occupational control, suggesting that most of its authority is based on collective agreement or group cohesion; reference and selection functions enhance the control, as does the community's sense of its own knowledge base. Next he examines the social context of this control. Returning to the notion that its role in providing access to knowledge strengthens librarianship, Winter writes "Librarians are much closer to the production

and distribution of knowledge as a whole, and thus much closer to the problems of metascience than are most other professions."²⁷ Finally, he confronts the traditional question that librarians and others have asked: "Is librarianship a profession?" Here he expresses dissatisfaction with the existing models and wonders whether anyone really knows what a profession is. Winter concludes by urging a new model that blends the best of the existing approaches to studying professions, emphasizing schools, associations, and the relationship of these to providing services. All of these concerns are, of course, very similar to the roles that archivists have assigned themselves and the questions that archivists have posed about their field.

Although in a sense Winter's study leaves one dangling, (is librarianship a profession or what?), the feeling is mitigated by his final chapter that proposes a research agenda for studying the library profession. Winter urges the reader to look at librarianship as a social system: its professional culture, its tasks and functions, its historical development, and its social and demographic characteristics. In addition to these empirical approaches, Winter encourages the use of librarianship as a basis for the theoretical work in the sociological study of professions. Although the end result is a sense of frustration about whether the reader has been looking at a study of librarianship or a book on sociological examination, the author probably wanted it both ways. The book is certainly a valuable contribution to the literature on the nature of the information professions.

Winter's book is a more valuable study for archivists interested in professionalism because of his observation that librarianship is a more traditional profession; it also allows a comparison to some of the most important points in Abbott's volume. Abbott's idea that the information professions threaten other professions is similar to Winter's description of librarianship as a metascience. Moreover, both strongly emphasize the importance of a knowledge base to any profession. In other words, Winter's description of librarianship fits comfortably within Abbott's professional ecology framework. Reading the two studies together, one has the opportunity to see librarianship from within and as part of a larger social system. Archivists, representing one of the information professions, also have another source for contemplating their own field.

Thinking of Archivists As Part of the System of Professions

Many of the points made by both authors have significant relevance for the archival community. Abbott's concept of jurisdiction, for example, reminds one of the *angst* that archivists have felt for decades about their own professional identity and whether the proper place of graduate archival education lies with historians or librarians or, perhaps, information scientists.²⁸ Without presuming to offer a solution to this problem, one might suggest that the competition is natural and should not be the topic of so much soul-searching or hand-wringing. Abbott's book demonstrates that efforts within a profession, like that represented by archivists, will inevitably bring reactions and complaints from closely related professions—in this case, history, public history, records management, librarianship, and information science.

Both authors' emphasis upon knowledge points to the most important issue for archivists. Although the archival literature has improved considerably,²⁹

archivists are only now beginning to think about profession-wide competencies, skill, and attitudes. There are still those who do not recognize that archivists have knowledge or competencies that are distinct, and others who fear that there is an insufficient body of knowledge on which to base an examination for certification.³⁰ Some of these individuals even wonder whether the archival community constitutes a profession at all. Technology also looms as a major cause of shifts within the archival profession, just as in librarianship. The implication of the Abbott and Winter studies is that technology does not necessarily mean the end of the archival profession, it simply means the shifting of some professional priorities, professional boundaries, and responsibilities.³¹ In fact, Abbott and Winter both attest to the potential influence of the information-based professions like archives on other professions. This should make archivists rethink the uniqueness of their mission in the information professions and how that uniqueness can be used to benefit society and to ensure a continuing role for the archival profession in the future.

In my 1986 essay I identified six components of an agenda for strengthening the archival profession. These were, in order of their original presentation (not necessarily their priority) the (1) need to define and promote the social utility of historical records; (2) the need to stress the importance of individual archivists in accomplishing the archival mission; (3) the need to develop a much stronger national voice for archival issues and concerns; (4) the need to strengthen the educational foundation, theory and public profile by forming full masters level archival administration programs; (5) the need to develop systems for individual certification and institutional accreditation in order to support their educational standards and broader mission in society; and, finally, (6) the need by archivists not to limit their quest for increased professional growth by dwelling on the small size of their profession, but instead to concentrate on the potential for employment and other opportunities for societal influences. The Abbott and Winter books help to place such an agenda into a new perspective that has great potential; the archival profession as one of the group of information professions that possesses an advantage in the competition for resources, influence, and continued viability.

While much has happened over the past few years in these six areas, nearly all remain (in my opinion) as legitimate aspects of a national professional agenda. While today there is a stronger sense of archival professionalism, the greatest failure in the past few years has been the inability to develop a stronger public profile and voice or to establish more exact definitions and criteria for the practice of archival administration (although certification might eventually rectify the latter issue). Here the Abbott book especially provides a sense of needed perspective, as well as giving some direction for future action. In considering how jurisdictional boundaries are formed, he noted that "jurisdictions are renegotiated in work places over two- to three-year periods, in public over ten- to twenty-year periods, in the law over twenty- to fifty-year periods."³² Since we are considering a profession that has viewed itself as a profession at best for fifty years (since the founding of SAA and the National Archives in the mid-1930s) and more likely only over the past twenty (since the report of the Committee on the 70s and the emergence of a full-fledged professional association), it is little wonder that greater movement in the strengthening and profile of the profession has not occurred. Perhaps the archival profession's relative

youthfulness has given it an ingrained inferiority complex that has prevented it from capitalizing on its fullest potential.

If we reformulated my 1986 agenda for strengthening the archival profession, what changes could be made? First, now that SAA's Task Force on Institutional Evaluation has produced a workbook that individual archival programs can use to evaluate themselves and to compare their program to others of similar size and nature, it is probably time to consider more seriously the matter of institutional accreditation. This is a noteworthy objective that is obviously gaining interest, as illustrated by NAGARA's effort to develop reporting standards and a recent publication by the New York State Archives and Records Administration for guiding institutional self-study.³³ SAA's re-establishment of the task force as a standing committee with the specific charge of promoting the use of SAA's workbook *and* a longer view of considering an institutional accreditation program modeled after what the Association of American Museums has had for the past twenty years is a step in the right direction. The AAM program has elicited a wide range of views during its existence, but there appears to be a least *some* consensus that it has aided both individual institutions and the museum profession.³⁴ A program to accredit archival repositories could also make the archival profession better able to carry out its mission. This fits into Abbott's consideration of systematizing a profession's internal elements, in this case the work place.

Second, the archival profession needs to define better its own knowledge base and competencies and, building on these, work to develop precise standards and practices, such as those governing archival description. Through the 1980s we have debated whether or not we have an archival theory.³⁵ We now need to follow the librarians' lead and define what it is that an archivist needs to know, studying what archivists do in the workplace, and considering in a more systematic fashion what employers want archivists to know. This is an especially important task if the archival profession really wants to have "standards" and if it expects to be able to cope with a rapidly changing society that is driven in part by increasingly sophisticated uses of information technology. Promoting the archival mission requires, as much as anything, a firm sense of what archival knowledge and competencies are required to identify, preserve, and make available for use records of enduring value. Terms such as "art" or "subjective" hardly characterize all of the archivist's work, and their use is often an excuse for not developing the precise tools and procedures we need. Certification has given us an opportunity to define archival knowledge and competencies, but research (and dissemination of that research), stronger graduate education programs, and a financially stronger national professional association with resources to commit to such work are also required if we expect any harvest. Abbott's notion of knowledge as the currency of competition and Winter's metascience come to mind here when considering such archival issues and the strengthening of educational programs.

Finally, the archival profession needs to consider the accreditation of graduate education programs. Archivists have debated placement of these programs and, to a lesser extent, the content of archival course work, but they have dealt less directly with the issue of their quality and effectiveness. The present library school accreditation program standards (now under review) exist "to identify the indispensable components of good library education" as well as to be "suffi-

ciently flexible to allow for future developments”³⁶ There appears to be a wide range of opinions in the library community regarding the value of the accreditation program. Nevertheless, the *existence* of such standards has provided librarianship with a base for evaluating educational programs, faculty, students, and a myriad of other issues and concerns of vital importance to that profession.³⁷ Although the archival profession has new graduate education guidelines, these are completely voluntary and unregulated. They still tend toward the lowest common denominator of existing programs rather than focusing on what such programs should be in order to educate better new archivists. A program of accreditation for educational programs that meet higher standards could strengthen the archival profession.

Conclusion

Both the Abbott and Winter books reveal significant evidence about the stresses and fluidity of professions, suggesting why archivists should keep abreast of such studies. In fact, both should remind archivists that probably no profession is destined to last forever. Although I have a great love for my profession, I am more interested in seeing that its *mission* to identify, to preserve, and to make available records of enduring value remains present in our society. Whether that mission is carried out by the archival profession or incorporated into one or more other professions is an issue that is of less importance to me. I am absolutely convinced, however, that for the mission to survive we must now work to strengthen the profession. Remembering that we are competing in a large system of professions and that we have some potential advantages in this competition should help us to understand the continuing immensity of our task. Strong archival institutions, on which we all so readily and naturally fix our attention, will more likely be possible when there is a dynamic archival profession to support them. I think that message comes through an applied reading of the Abbott and Winter studies.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Richard J. Cox is a lecturer in archives and records management at the School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh. His most recent publication is *American Archival Analysis: The Recent Development of the Archival Profession in the United States* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1990). He was elected a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists in 1989.

NOTES

1. The idea for this essay developed out of required course reading of one of the two books reviewed here. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Margaret Kimmel, School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh, for the use of the book by Andrew Abbott.
2. Lisa B. Weber, ed., *Documenting America: Assessing the Condition of Historical Records in the States* ([Albany, N.Y.]: National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators [1984]); *Committee on the Records of Government: Report* (Washington, D.C.: The Committee, March 1985); [Howard P. Lowell], *Preservation Needs in State Archives* (Albany, N.Y.: National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, 1986); *Planning for the Archival Profession: A Report of the SAA Task Force on Goals and Priorities* (Chicago: Society

of American Archivists, 1986); *An Action Agenda for the Archival Profession: Institutionalizing the Planning Process: A Report to SAA Council by the Committee on Goals and Priorities* ([Chicago]: Society of American Archivists, August 31, 1988); David Bearman, "1982 Survey of the Archival Profession," *American Archivist* 46 (Spring 1983): 233-241; Paul Conway, "Perspectives on Archival Resources: The 1985 Census of Archival Institutions," *American Archivist* 50 (Spring 1987): 174-191; Sidney J. Levy and Albert G. Robles, *The Image of Archivists: Resource Allocators' Perceptions* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1984); Task Force on Institutional Evaluation, *Evaluation of Archival Institutions: Services, Principles, and Guide to Self-Study* ([Chicago]: Society of American Archivists, [1982]); *Program Reporting Guidelines for Government Records Programs* (n.p.: National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators [1987]).

3. For the guidelines see *American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988): 380-389. For the importance of more fully developed graduate archival education programs, refer to Terry Eastwood, "Nurturing Archival Education in the University," *American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988): 228-252 and Paul Conway, "Archival Education and the Need for Full-Time Faculty," *American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988): 254-265.

4. "Professionalism and Archivists in the United States," *American Archivist* 49 (Summer 1986): 229-247.

5. Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988) and Michael F. Winter, *The Culture and Control of Expertise: Toward a Sociological Understanding of Librarianship*, Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science no. 61 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988).

6. By research I simply mean the effort to solve problems systematically and empirically and to confirm what other researchers have suggested that they have already resolved. The research process includes the formulation of questions, careful planning, hypotheses, and the testing of hypotheses through the accumulation and interpretation of data.

Very little "hard" research has been done in or about the archival profession. One example of what I mean can be seen by looking at archival education. Despite a long tradition of writing about this topic, the majority of the writing about archival education has been devoted to descriptions or case studies of educational programs, arguments or opinion pieces about the nature of archival education, historical analyses, and proposals for particular methods to train archivists. The archival profession has done little research on such issues as basic knowledge and theory, archival employers and institutions (needs, hiring practices, work levels), students (recruitment patterns, learning traits and styles), and educational programs (effectiveness of graduate programs, archival educators, and textbooks, curriculum materials, and tools).

7. *Ibid.*, 2.

8. *Ibid.*, 3.

9. *Ibid.*, 33.

10. *Ibid.*, 52.

11. *Ibid.*, 54-55.

12. *Ibid.*, 59.

13. *Ibid.*, 86.

14. *Ibid.*, 71.

15. *Ibid.*, 102. Another recent book on this topic that is worth looking at is Eliot Freidson, *Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986). A more traditional sociological study than Abbott's, *Professional Powers* is an in-depth analysis of this particular component of modern professions.

16. Abbott, 136.

17. I am not defending, incidentally, that sociological studies should be used primarily to understand how a particular occupation can be strengthened into a profession. That they are used this way shows that such studies can be valuable for application by professionals. What is most desired, however, is for a sociologist to study the archival profession with independent or neutral judgment. Such a study would be the *most* useful to archivists in the long run, providing a view of themselves and their mission that they rarely get.

18. Abbott not only considers librarians and information scientists as part of this profession, but wraps in accountants and advertising professionals. Although Abbott's characterization of internal occupational changes, jurisdictional battles, and external societal influences seem plausible enough, some of the fine points and distinctions are difficult to follow because of the amorphous group making up, in his view, the information professions.

19. Abbott, 224.
20. *Ibid.*, 245-46.
21. Winter, xiii.
22. *Ibid.*, 3.
23. *Ibid.*, 5.
24. A metascience intends to "provide some sense of the structure of knowledge as a whole, and the dream behind it is to provide a set of concepts that would actually bring the various fields together in a kind of master science" (Winter, 6-7).
25. Winter, 21.
26. *Ibid.*, 42.
27. *Ibid.*, 82.
28. Consider, for example, just a few of these arguments. Refer to John C. Colson, "Modifying Library School Curricula: Archivists and Education," *RQ* 12 (Spring 1973): 267-272; Nancy E. Peace and Nancy Fisher Chudacoff, "Archivists and Librarians: A Common Mission, A Common Education," *American Archivist* 42 (October 1979): 456-472; George Bolotenko, "Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983): 5-25; Virginia J.H. Cain, ed., "Archives By Degrees: Personal Perspectives on Academic Preparation for the Archival Profession," *Provenance* 2 (Fall 1984): 39-60; and Lawrence J. McCrank, "Prospects for Integrating Historical and Information Studies in Archival Education," *American Archivist* 42 (October 1979): 443-455. The early debate about this issue is covered in Jacqueline Goggin, "That We Shall Truly Deserve the Title of 'Profession': The Training and Education of Archivists, 1930-1960," *American Archivist* 47 (Summer 1984): 243-254.
29. See, for example, Richard J. Cox, "American Archival Literature: Expanding Horizons and Continuing Needs, 1901-1987," *American Archivist* 50 (Summer 1987): 306-323.
30. For such a view, see John W. Roberts, "Archival Theory: Much Ado About Shelving," *American Archivist* 50 (Winter 1987): 66-74.
31. See, for example, Randall Jimerson, "Redefining Archival Identity: Meeting User Needs in the Information Society," *American Archivist* 52 (Summer 1989): 332-340.
32. Abbott, 135.
33. The new self-study volume is *Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs: A Self-Study Guide* (Albany, N.Y.: New York State Archives and Records Administration, 1988). Although it is directed for use by programs in the Empire State, its advice is generic enough that it could be used profitably by any historical records program.
34. For a variety of articles on this topic, see Patricia E. Williams, "Promoting Professional Standards in America's Museums," *Museum* 37, no. 3 (1985): 150-155; Thomas D. Nicholson, "Why Museum Accreditation Doesn't Work," *Museum News* 60 (September/October 1981): 5-10; Kenneth Starr, "In Defense of Accreditation: A Response to Thomas D. Nicholson," *ibid.* 61 (January/February 1982): 5-21; Randi Glickberg, "Historic Sites and Accreditation," *ibid.* 60 (November/December 1981): 42-49; Joy Youmans Norman, "Reaccreditation: How It Works and How It's Working," *ibid.* 61 (July/August 1982): 63-67; Alexander J. Wall, "Demystifying the Accreditation Process," *ibid.* 60 (September/October 1981): 49-51; Thomas W. Leavitt, "Reaccreditation: Learning from Experience," *ibid.* 60 (September/October 1981): 40-41.
35. Frank G. Burke, "The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States," *American Archivist* 44 (Winter 1981): 40-46; Lester J. Cappon, "What, Then, Is There to Theorize About?" *ibid.* 45 (Winter 1982): 19-25; Gregg D. Kimball, "The Burke-Cappon Debate: Some Further Criticisms and Considerations for Archival Theory," *ibid.* 48 (Fall 1985): 369-376; and Roberts, "Archival Theory" (see note no. 30).
36. See *Standards for Accreditation 1972* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1972), 3.
37. The literature is far too extensive to summarize here. However, I am completing a paper on a research agenda on archival education that summarizes and refers to many such studies in the library field.

Copies of articles from this publication are now available from the UMI Article Clearinghouse.

For more information about the Clearinghouse, please fill out and mail back the coupon below.



Yes! I would like to know more about UMI Article Clearinghouse.
I am interested in electronic ordering through the following system(s):

- DIALOG/Dialorder
- OnTyme
- Other (please specify) _____
- I am interested in sending my order by mail.
- Please send me your current catalog and user instructions for the system(s) I checked above.

Name _____

Title _____

Institution/Company _____

Department _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone (_____) _____

Mail to: University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road, Box 91 Ann Arbor, MI 48106